

ELITES AT THE PLANNING TABLE: A CASE STUDY OF THE POLITICS OF
PLANNING AN INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC EXCHANGE PROGRAM

(USA, MEXICO)

by

STEPHEN ROBERT SMITH

(Under the Direction of Ronald M. Cervero)

ABSTRACT

The problem this case study addressed was that theories for planning international academic exchange programs do not make central the role of stakeholders, ignoring important social, political, and ethical dimensions of practice. The purpose was to show how the University of Georgia – University of Veracruz social work academic exchange came into existence through a social process of stakeholders negotiating interests within relationships of power. The Study was rooted in a theoretical perspective developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006). This perspective holds that program planning is a “social activity whereby people construct educational programs by negotiating personal, social, and organizational interests in contexts marked by socially-structured power relations” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998). The two research questions for the case study were:

1. What are the interests of the major stakeholders and stakeholder groups for the academic exchange program?
2. How have negotiations among and between stakeholders affected the features

of the academic exchange program?

Stakeholders were divided into six groups including administrators, faculty, and students from both institutions. The study used observations and interviews to determine the exchange history, stakeholder actions and interests, and whether the exchange met stakeholder interests. Stakeholders held personal, organizational, and societal interests. There was little within but significant across group interest conflict due to contextual asymmetries between stakeholder groups, institutions, and societies. The exchange program came into existence through alternating meta-negotiations about stakeholder power relationships and substantive negotiations about course features. Meta-negotiations and substantive negotiations shaped one another and the course.

This study had four major conclusions: 1) internationalization of higher education is an agent and reactor to globalization; 2) stakeholders' negotiation of power and interests at planning tables frame and shape the development of international academic exchange programs; 3) values and rationales underpin strategies, programs, and policies driving international academic exchange; and, 4) power relations among and between elite stakeholder and researcher pose methodological challenges.

INDEX WORDS: Globalization and internationalization of higher education, International academic exchange (USA and Mexico), Stakeholder evaluation, Program planning, Negotiation of power and interests

ELITES AT THE PLANNING TABLE: A CASE STUDY OF THE POLITICS OF
PLANNING AN INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC EXCHANGE PROGRAM
(USA, MEXICO)

by

STEPHEN ROBERT SMITH

B.A., Indiana University, Bloomington, 1986

M.Ed., Indiana University, Bloomington, 1994

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2007

© 2007

STEPHEN ROBERT SMITH

All Rights Reserved

ELITES AT THE PLANNING TABLE: A CASE STUDY OF THE POLITICS OF
PLANNING AN INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC EXCHANGE PROGRAM
(USA, MEXICO)

by

STEPHEN ROBERT SMITH

Major Professor: Ronald M. Cervero

Committee: Talmadge Guy
Robert Hill
Ray MacNair

Electronic Version Approved

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2007

DEDICATION

To my family, each of whom sacrificed their comfort and security,
so that I could pursue self interests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this dissertation is the culmination of a twenty-five year love affair with Latin America, especially Mexico. In the summer of 1983, as an undergraduate at Indiana University, I traveled to Mexico City for Spanish language study at Universidad Iberoamericana, in preparation for participation in the 1983-84 Overseas Study Program in Lima, Peru. That summer Mexico defaulted on its foreign debt, the beginning of the Latin American debt crisis, which marked a sea change in international development assistance programs, moving control from public to private hands, and beginning the march of Neoliberal Globalization throughout the hemisphere. The year in Peru was transformational, instilling in me a love for Latin America, with its diversity of cultures and people. The lifelong friends that emerged from that experience are dear to me, including Carol Behrens, Jaime Camacho, Carol Doughty, and Merritt Green. Together we discovered the wonders of South America.

For those opportunities, I thank the faculty and staff at Indiana University, who gave a high school dropout the basic skills needed to obtain a wonderful liberal arts education. In particular, I am grateful to Robert Arnove, Harbans Bhola, Paul Kuznits, Kevin Middlebrook, and George Stolnitz, both for exposing me to scholarship, and for encouraging me to pursue graduate study. I am also thankful to have known Elba Gonzalez at the Centro Hispano in Indianapolis.

I am deeply grateful to have been exposed to the beautiful people of Mexico, especially those in Veracruz, a magical place. In particular, I would like to thank the administration, faculty, staff, and students at the Universidad Veracruzana in Xalapa, and

at the Schools of Social Work in Minatitlán and Poza Rica. Their warm hospitality and support made my work in Veracruz a joy to perform. Special thanks go to Angel at Cafe Navál, and Irma Hernandez, for assisting in transcription.

I am fortunate to have pursued graduate study at the University of Georgia, and gratitude is deserved by many, though it is impossible to acknowledge everyone here. I was fortunate to have received training by many outstanding scholars in the UGA School of Arts and Sciences, especially Andy Herod in Geography, José Gomez Martínez in Romance Languages, and William Power in Religion. Special thanks go to Peggy Kreshel in Mass Communications, Christine Langone in Agricultural Education, and Han Park in Political Science, each of whom trained me in research methodology and methods. Many thanks go to the faculty, staff, and students in the UGA School of Social Work, especially Ray MacNair.

I will be indebted always to David Boyle, from Dalton State University, for his encouragement and support throughout this long road, and for his facilitation of my activities in Veracruz. During the course of our relationship, we co-authored a published article in *Educación Global*, and co-presented at the annual conference of the Mexican Association of International Education (AMPEI). I look forward to an opportunity for future collaboration with him.

Special appreciation goes to the many wonderful people in the UGA Department of Adult Education who provided me with teaching, counseling, support and encouragement to grow both as scholar and as a human being. In particular, I am thankful for the guidance of Brad Courtenay, Juanita Johnson-Bailey, Sharan Merriam, Bernie Moore, Karl Umble, Tom Valentine, and especially Margaret Holt, who helped me in so many ways to find my place in the program. I am very grateful and proud to have

become friends with Tonic Maruatona, with whom I spent many enjoyable evenings together engaged in stimulating conversation.

I will always appreciate those who served on my committee for the guidance, encouragement and support. Thanks go to Talmadge Guy and Robert Hill from Adult Education, and Ray Macnair from Social Work. I will always be grateful to Tal, who challenged me to question hardened assumptions about race and class, a process by which, I believe, has made me a more accepting and compassionate person.

Finally, profound thanks to my Major Professor, Ronald Cervero. Throughout my many years in the PhD program, Ron's patience and understanding of my often erratic behavior were instrumental for my eventual success. Moreover, Ron has served as a role model for me and others, demonstrating a strong work ethic, professionalism, scholarly recognition, and integrity – all attributes that I admire, but can never match. It has been an honor to be associated with him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	7
Purpose of the Study.....	8
Theoretic Framework.....	9
Significance of the Study	11
Definition of Terms.....	11
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	15
Globalization, Neoliberalism, and Education.....	16
Globalization and Internationalization of Higher Education.....	45
Globalization, Internationalization, and Social Work Education.....	52
Adult and Continuing Education Program Planning.....	62
Conclusions.....	71
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY.....	73
Qualitative Research	74

Research Design	79
Data Collection.....	80
Data Analysis.....	88
Reliability and Validity.....	93
Problematic Issues.....	96
Research Timeline.....	100
CHAPTER FOUR: CASE STUDY PLANNING TABLES.....	102
Institutions and Planning Tables.....	104
Places and Planning Tables	113
United Mexican States.....	121
State of Veracruz.....	131
City of Xalapa.....	133
City of Minatitlán.....	134
City of Poza Rica.....	135
United States of America.....	137
State of Georgia.....	140
City of Athens.. ..	144
Case Study Stakeholders.....	146
CHAPTER FIVE: STAKEHOLDER INTERESTS.....	216
Construction of Planning Tables.....	216

Identification of Stakeholder Interests.....	218
CHAPTER SIX: NEGOTIATION OF POWER AND INTERESTS.....	320
Dimensions of the Planning Table.....	322
Social, Historical, and Structural Factors Influencing Planning Tables.....	331
Stages of Development for the UGA – UV Academic Exchange.....	340
Features of the exchange.....	343
CHAPTER SEVEN: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	392
Summary of the Study.....	392
Conclusions and Discussion.....	398
Implications For Theory, Practice and Research.....	422
REFERENCES.....	427
APPENDICES.....	457
Appendix A.....	457
Appendix B.....	458

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

On January 1, 1994, Mexico formally joined the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with the United States and Canada. NAFTA proposes opening completely the trade frontiers between the three North American countries by 2010. With the signing of the agreement, the country ranked 48th on the United Nations Human Development Index entered into a partnership with the countries ranked consistently near the top of the measure. Shortly after joining NAFTA, Mexico also officially became a member state of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). These moves underscore the importance of science and technology-driven modernization for a series of Mexican governments over the past two decades. By entering NAFTA and OECD, the Mexican government took on the difficult challenge to bring the country "in a relatively short 15 years, to an economic and social level that will allow it to compete with major economic powers" (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1994, p. 141).

Policies such as NAFTA, and its likely successor, the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (FTAA), may appear to have little to do with issues of educational policy, planning, or international academic exchange programs for social work education. In public discourse, NAFTA is widely described as an economic pact that opens the economies of industrialized nations - United States and Canada - to a major developing

country, Mexico. But closer scrutiny of NAFTA reveals another scenario. Less than a decade after its implementation, it is clear that the treaty is part of a larger set of “globalization” processes, which are driving changes in social relations, policies, and services in all three North American countries. Indeed, history may judge the metaphorical “NAFTA” to be one of the most important North American social policy decisions of the 20th century (Poole, 1996).

In context of higher education, globalization is the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities. Internationalization of higher education is one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalization yet, at the same time, respects the individuality of the nation (Knight, 2001).

The concept of internationalization differs dialectically from that of globalization because it refers to the relationship between nation-states, which promotes recognition of and respect for their own differences and traditions. By contrast, the phenomenon of globalization does not tend to respect differences and borders, thus undermining the bases of the very same nation-states, and leading to homogenization. In this sense, internationalization can be understood as complementary or compensatory to globalizing tendencies, given that it allows for a resistance to the latter’s denationalizing and homogenizing effects (Gacel-Ávila, 2005). In context of higher education, the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution (Knight, 1993). Any systematic, sustained efforts aimed at

making higher education responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labor markets (Van der Wende, 1997). Internationalization is not merely an aim itself, but an important resource in the development of higher education towards: 1) a system in line with international standards; and, 2) one open and responsive to its global environment. Internationalization is seen as one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalization, yet at the same time respects the individuality of the nation (Qiang, 2003).

An outstanding aspect of globalization observed in Mexico is the conformation to a new world economy with the liberalization of the flow of financial and industrial capital, while the mobility of labor from South to North is increasingly controlled (Laurell, 2000). This new configuration of the world economy expresses a new international relation of power that emerged through the series of economic crisis in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, and the historical defeat of Soviet and Eastern European socialism (Harvey, 1989; Hirst & Thompson, 1996). This dual crisis opened a political opportunity for the New Right, and it has managed to impose the neoliberal project inside almost every country of this hemisphere (Navarro, 1998). This brand of globalization can be interpreted as a political process that implies an integral reorganization of the economy and social relations (Sadler & Gentili, 1995).

Educational Responses to Globalization: Sustainable Social Work Education Exchange

Globalization is not a new phenomenon in Mexican education. In higher education, the first academic institution was established in 1551 by the Catholic Church, and continues in operation today as the National Autonomous University of Mexico

(UNAM), serving more than 250,000 students. While the modern U.S.A. research university originated from a 19th century German model, in Mexico, after independence in 1821, education planners copied the modern, technically oriented French University. In recent decades, American research universities and graduate schools became the model to copy in Mexico (Schwartzman, 1999). Today, however, the old pattern of adoption and copy has become just a small part of a larger trend of international integration. As part of this integration, there exists a series of features, problems, and concerns that affect most higher educational systems worldwide in similar ways, while eliciting different and often contradictory responses depending on contingencies of particular places.

Given current projections, more persons will attend colleges and universities in the next century than in all of human history (Goodman, 1999). However, most of the capacity to accommodate this demand is yet to be built, and most of it will need to be built outside the U.S.A. Exacerbating this challenge, higher education has profoundly changed in the past 25 years, yet as Altbach and Davis (1999) indicate, “those involved in the academic enterprise have yet to grapple with the implications of these changes” (p. 3). Worldwide, academic institutions and systems have faced pressures of increasing numbers of students and demographic changes, demands for accountability, reconsideration of the social and economic role of higher education, implications of the end of the cold war, and the impact of new technologies, among others. While academic systems function in a national environment, the challenges play themselves out on a global scale.

Although it may not yet be possible to think of higher education as a global system, there is considerable convergence among the world's universities and higher education systems. The basic institutional model and structure of studies are similar worldwide. Academic institutions have frequently been international in orientation. For example, during the medieval period Latin was the common language of instruction. In the contemporary period, however, English has assumed the role of the primary international language of science and scholarship, including the Internet. As Altbach and Davis (1999) suggest, "Now, with more than one million students studying outside their borders, with countless scholars working internationally, and with new technologies such as the Internet fostering instantaneous communications, the international roots and the contemporary realities of the university are central" (p. 4).

Varying motivations may exist within universities for developing international programs including common interests in research and economic development. However, a significant long-term trend pushing the growth of international programs in North America is the increasing ethnic diversity of the population, driven substantially by immigration (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000). Although international programs have existed in colleges and universities for at least a century, since the 1990s there has been a rapid expansion in the internationalization of American higher education (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000; Desruisseaux, 1999). Increases have been substantial in numbers both of foreign students studying at U.S.A. institutions, and U.S.A. students studying at foreign institutions.

International experiences originating from within schools of social work in the United States have mirrored those of higher education, and there has been considerable increase in interest in international issues within schools of social work education (Asamoah, Healy, & Mayadas, 1997). As Boyle and Cervantes (2000, p.12) indicate,

Global interdependence has created important avenues for international involvement by reshaping the social work environment in the following ways: a) international issues and events, especially movements of populations, have changed U.S.A. domestic practice and demand new knowledge and competencies; (b) social problems are commonly shared by developed and developing countries to an unprecedented degree; (c) the political, economic, and social actions of one country directly affect other countries' social and economic well-being; and, (d) exchanges are made possible by extraordinary technological developments, such as the Internet (Asamoah, Healy, & Mayadas, 1997)

From the perspective of social work education in Mexico, there is a growing need to for international exchange programs with the U.S.A. to acquire knowledge and resources to better prepare students and faculty in an age of increasing professional specialization and expansion of knowledge, as well as to address critical issues of social well-being. Although historically based on a development and social action model, during the 1990s social work education and practice in Mexico changed its orientation increasingly towards a clinical model. Thus, there also exists a desire within the field of social work in Mexico to adopt and diffuse knowledge of clinical social work from international education exchange with the U.S.A. On the other hand, from a U.S.A.

perspective, there is a need for international social work exchange programs with Mexico to develop Spanish/English, bilingual, culturally competent social work scholars and practitioners who can effectively address a range of education and practice issues related to the growing Hispanic population in the U.S.A.

These distinct Mexican and U.S.A. social work educational responses (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000; Boyle, Nackerud, & Kilpatrick, 1997) have arisen from forces of globalization supporting internationalization in both U.S.A. and Mexican universities. In particular, educational responses to globalization processes are being pushed along by commitments of social work education stakeholders at Mexican and U.S.A. schools of social work to broaden the preparation and experiences of their students, faculty, and graduates (Boyle & Cervantes, 1997). However, it is important to recognize also that educational responses to globalization are occurring within the context of institutional internationalization (Gacel-Avila, 1999) in each country, with commitments from social work education stakeholders at the highest levels within and outside university systems.

Statement of the Problem

Given the effects of neoliberal globalization processes in North America, a growing need exists in the field of social work education to develop faculty and student exchange programs between Mexico and the U.S.A., as well as joint research initiatives. These educational responses to globalization are developing within contexts of internationalization in North American higher education (Gacel-Avila, 1999), with commitments from college and university systems, and stakeholders at the highest administrative levels.

These educational responses are being shaped by North American social work education stakeholders, in part to broaden the international knowledge, skills, and abilities of faculty, pre-professional (undergraduate and graduate), and continuing professional education students (Boyle & Cervantes, 1997). From a policy and planning theoretical perspective, these programmatic responses are being shaped in part by negotiations of power and interests among and between stakeholders situated in relational contexts. (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006).

If the field of social work in North America is to rely on education, and international academic exchange, to be an effective means through which to advance research, develop knowledge, skills, and abilities of faculty and students, as well as implement policy, then ethical and democratic program planning will play a crucial role. The social act of planning programmatic interventions *ipso facto* shapes programs (Umble, 1998). Just as importantly, these programs then contribute to the shaping of professional practice by those who participate in them. Ultimately, these socially constructed programs impact the public at large. Thus, the manner in which (how) these educational programs are planned influences significantly the quality and efficacy of the programs, and the welfare of society.

Purpose of the Study

The aim of the research is to determine how the interests and negotiations of stakeholders – persons who affect a social work education academic exchange program (Mexico – U.S.A.), or whom the program affects – are shaping the program through their relational practice of educational program planning. This practice occurs among and

between stakeholders with interests in social work education in Mexico and the U.S.A. The purpose of the study is to describe how stakeholders and stakeholder groups negotiate interests to shape a social work education academic exchange program.

The Study is rooted in a theoretical perspective developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006). This perspective holds that program planning is a “social activity whereby people construct educational programs by negotiating personal, social, and organizational interests in contexts marked by socially-structured power relations” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998).

The two research questions for the case study are:

1. What are the interests of the major stakeholders and stakeholder groups for the academic exchange program?
2. How have negotiations among and between stakeholders affected the features of the academic exchange program?

Theoretical Framework

The study was rooted in a theoretical perspective of educational program planning developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006) . This perspective frames educational planning as a “social activity whereby people construct educational programs by negotiating personal, organizational and societal interests in contexts marked by socially-structured power relations” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998, 2006). Four concepts structure the theory -- power, interests, negotiation, and responsibility. These concepts account for the world that planners experience, and define their actions, as well as prescribe their ethical obligations.

Guiding planning actions in real world contexts, Cervero and Wilson provide a toolbox for planning practitioners and researchers consisting of technical knowledge and skills, a framework for political analysis, and a normative standard, all of which are necessary for substantively democratic and responsible educational planning. Viewed through this lens, program planners engage in a process of negotiating multiple, historically developing, and intersecting interests in relations of power in their planning worlds. Through this process, stakeholders shape programs through their practical judgments, resulting in educational outcomes, but also social and political outcomes. Consequently, their judgments in planning practice either reproduces, or changes, the social and political relationships that characterize their real worlds.

In addition to having used the Cervero and Wilson theoretical framework, their metaphor of the planning table was used in this study to describe, analyze, and interpret the dynamics of stakeholder actions in real world contexts, where factors such as race, class, gender, and political economy confound use of more traditional frameworks (Cervero & Wilson, 1998, 2006). The planning table metaphor enables a critical vision of planning practice. This vision sees planning as a situated process, not just one of negotiation of power and interests, but also one requiring that an ethical determination be made. In the real world of multiple planning tables in varying contexts, this vision of planning frames a realistic process through which stakeholders make ethical determinations about whose interests actually get to the planning table.

Finally, the vision of planning used in this study enables a political interpretation of planning practice, asking who benefits from adult education and in what ways. This

vision of adult education views it as a struggle for knowledge and power in social situations (Cervero & Wilson, 2001, 2006; Wilson & Cervero, 2001, 2003), in this case located in the planning spaces of the international academic exchange program in Georgia and Veracruz.

Significance of the Study

This study contributes to the literature on adult and continuing education program planning in the social work professions by supporting the development of practical and ethically instructive theory that is consistent with the human world of social relations and practice. No studies in social work education have examined program planning from the Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006) perspective. By extension, the study contributes to general continuing professional education theory and practice, and general adult education theory. Further, it extends the domain of Cervero and Wilson perspective into international context.

Definition of Terms

1. “Globalization.” In context of higher education, globalization is the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities. Internationalization of higher education is one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalization yet, at the same time, respects the individuality of the nation (Knight, 2001).
2. “Internationalization.” The concept of internationalization differs dialectically from that of globalization because it refers to the relationship between nation-states, which

promotes recognition of and respect for their own differences and traditions. By contrast, the phenomenon of globalization does not tend to respect differences and borders, thus undermining the bases of the very same nation-states, and leading to homogenization. In this sense, internationalization can be understood as complementary or compensatory to globalizing tendencies, given that it allows for a resistance to the latter's denationalizing and homogenizing effects (Gacel-Ávila, 2005). In context of higher education, the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution (Knight, 1993). Any systematic, sustained efforts aimed at making higher education responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labor markets (Van der Wende, 1997). Internationalization is not merely an aim itself, but an important resource in the development of higher education towards: 1) a system in line with international standards; and, 2) one open and responsive to its global environment. Internationalization is seen as one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalization, yet at the same time respects the individuality of the nation (Qiang, 2003).

3. "Stakeholder." Based on Mitroff (1983), this research defines a stakeholder as a person who significantly affects, or is affected by, a program. Stakeholders may be internal or external to the organization which sponsors the program. Because these stakeholders have invested something of themselves or their resources in producing

- the program, or because they are affected significantly by it, they have a “stake” or interest in the program.
4. “Interests” are “predispositions, embracing goals, values, desires, and other orientations and inclinations that lead a person to act in one direction or another,” (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, p. 88). Stakeholder interests in the case were distinguished as “personal,” “organizational,” or “societal,” sometimes termed “public” interests. A “personal interest” was one that directly benefited the person or persons from whom it was expressed. By contrast, an “organizational interest” was one that directly benefited one or more of the many departments or organizations in the exchange. “Societal”, or “public interests”, held by stakeholders were those most directly related to benefiting society at large.
 5. “Concerns, claims, and issues.” A concern is “any assertion that a stakeholder may introduce that is unfavorable to the evaluand” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 40). A claim is “any assertion that a stakeholder may introduce that is favorable to the evaluand” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 40). An issue is “any state of affairs about which reasonable persons may disagree” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 40).
 6. “Power” is defined as the “socially structured capacity to act” (Cervero & Wilson 1998).
 7. “Substantive negotiations and meta-negotiations.” Substantive negotiations are the activities by which “people *act in* the web of power relations” (Cervero & Wilson 1998) to construct the program’s purpose, content, audience, format, place, and evaluation. In substantive negotiations, “planners negotiate with, between, and about

the interests of stakeholders” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998). Meta-negotiations are the activities by which “people *act on* the power relations themselves, either strengthening or weakening those macro-level boundaries” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998, emphasis in original, p. 13). In meta-negotiations, “people negotiate about the power relationships between stakeholders” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998).

8. “Social Work Education.” Through undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education, “social work education” aims to prepare social work practitioners and scholars who will be leaders in the elimination of oppression and inequality through an emphasis on skill-based social work practices, policy development, and research initiatives. While many theories underlie the practice of social work, the UGA School of Social Work emphasizes the application of a social ecological framework and is grounded in systematic inquiry. Through the academic, service and research programs, the school promotes the goals of economic and social justice for individuals, families, and communities.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The aim of the research is to determine how the interests and negotiations of stakeholders – persons who affect a social work education academic exchange program (Mexico – U.S.A.), or whom the program affects – are shaping the program through their relational practice of educational program planning. This practice occurs among and between stakeholders with interests in social work education, and academic exchange, in Mexico and the U.S.A. The purpose of the study is to describe how the interests of stakeholders and stakeholder groups are negotiated in the shaping of a social work education exchange program.

The study is rooted in a theoretical perspective of adult education program planning developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006). This perspective holds that program planning is a “social activity whereby people construct educational programs by negotiating personal, social, and organizational interests in contexts marked by socially-structured power relations” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998).

The two research questions for the case study are:

1. What are the interests of the major stakeholders and stakeholder groups for the academic exchange program?
2. How have negotiations among and between stakeholders affected the features of the academic exchange program?

Given the purpose of the study, the first section of Chapter Two reviews literature concerning the relationship between globalization and higher education. The second section of this chapter reviews literature of internationalization of higher education. The third section of this chapter reviews literature of adult education program planning.

Globalization, Neoliberalism, and Education in Mexico

Neoliberalism and Social Policy in Mexico

Globalization is an highly contested concept. Depending on the commentator, the concept of globalization ranges from a desirable state-of-affairs to a dreaded evil condition; from reality to myth; from new postmodern phenomenon to an aging extension of the processes of modernity. Some of the contradictory tensions emerging from the usage of the concept of globalization have been highlighted as a series of binary opposites including universalization versus particularization, homogenization versus differentiation, integration versus fragmentation, centralization versus decentralization, and juxtaposition versus syncretization (Hall, Held, & McGrew, 1992). Moreover, commentators distinguish accounts of globalization that identify a single causal factor, such as economics, from those accounts that apply multi-causal logic. Of those who believe in multi-factoral causation, some describe globalization as “a set of processes which in various ways – economic, cultural, and political – make supranational connections” (Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard, & Henry, 1997). Regardless of particular viewpoint, given the frequent use of the term in academic literature and the popular press, it is difficult to contest the claim that globalization is the hegemonic discourse of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries (Jones, 1995; Salt, 1999).

The outstanding aspect of globalization observed in Mexico is the conformation of a new world economy with the liberalization of the flow of financial and industrial capital, while the mobility of labor from South to North is increasingly controlled (Laurell, 2000). This new configuration of the world economy cannot be explained by a “natural” law of evolution, but instead expresses a new international relation of power that emerged with the economic crisis of the 1970s and early 1980s (Harvey, 1989) and the historical defeat of Soviet and Eastern European socialism (Hirst & Thompson, 1996). This dual crisis opened a political opportunity for the New Right, and it has managed to impose the neoliberal project inside almost every country of this hemisphere (Navarro, 1998). This brand of globalization can be interpreted as a political process that implies an integral reorganization of the economy and social relations (Sadler & Gentili, 1995).

The new world economy has had a significantly negative impact in Mexico. Consequently, today the country is politically divided and increasingly confined within the orbit of the U.S.A., pressured by international financial agencies to adopt prescribed adjustments, and fractured by inequality and social exclusion (Laurell, 2000). There is the question, however, of what has changed, since many of these conditions are perennial. Perhaps the most important problem is the *acritical* acceptance by politicians and policy makers of two postulates: (1) the only manner to survive in globalization is to be competitive at any cost; and (2) the only road to economic growth are exports.

Like almost all countries in the Americas, Mexico has adopted structural adjustment programs (SAPs) imposed from above by the government, and from abroad

by international financial agencies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The purpose of the SAPs is to promote and support a new pattern of accumulation based on the export of manufactured goods (Valenzuela, 1991). These policies are both caused by, and a condition for (Carnoy, 1984), a specific form of “neoliberal globalization” dominated by the interests of large multilateral corporations and financial groups that expresses new international as well as national power relations (Navarro, 1998).

The rapid application of these policies with little apparent consideration of the huge asymmetry between Mexico and the three regional economic powers (U.S.A., Western Europe, and Japan), and their national economic and social situations, has caused serious problems. The measures taken in Mexico to constitute this new pattern of accumulation have not only sacrificed the national general interests, but have also provoked unstable and inequitable growth with a dramatic social impact (CEPAL, 1996a, 1996b).

Examining the impact of neoliberal policies in the Americas at large is useful in placing Mexico in context of a broader phenomenon. For example, the richest 10 percent of the population in Brazil earns 69.5 times more than the poorest 10 percent of the population, 49.7 times more in Mexico, 41.7 times more in Columbia, 36.4 times more in Chile, and 25.6 times more in Argentina (Latin American Weekly Report, March 4, 1997). Even though some countries in the region have improved their economic growth and employment rates in recent years, the lowest income strata have not benefited. In Argentina, a country with relatively *less* inequality, the earnings of the top 10% were

only 8 times higher than the lowest in 1975; but by 1991 they had increased to 15 times more; and by 1997 to greater than 25 times more (emphasis added, Latin American Weekly Report, January, 12, 1999). Moreover, predictions for the future are rather grim, particularly in terms of unemployment, since the region's economically active population (ages 16-64) is expected to increase from 292 million in 1995 to about 460 million in 2025, with the largest increase in the 15-24 age group (Latin American Weekly Report, September 8, 1998)

Although the SAPs may be considered mainly economic, they require a profound reform of the state that is another face of the integral reorganization of Mexican society that has occurred in the past 20 years. There are different propositions regarding the content of this reform (Vellinga, 1997), but the one that is being instrumented obeys the neoliberal premise (Vilas, 1995). The so called social reform of the state is crucial to social policy, since it redefines in economic terms the conception of how to satisfy social needs and involves all major social welfare institutions. In this particular field the World Bank plays a dominant role which explains the striking uniformity of this reform in the countries of the Americas.

Globalization and Mexican Education

In the broader educational literature, much has been written in recent years about globalization and education. Within this literature, globalization theory has been used to explain a range of diverse and complex phenomena and has garnered a central position in all sub-disciplines, including adult and continuing education. A problem with many accounts of globalization and education is that they frequently lack a clear definition of

the concept of globalization. Related to the problem of definition is the tendency in the educational literature to “keep the underlying view of the *nature, extent, and future trajectory* of globalisation implicit rather than explicit” (emphasis in original, Tikly, 2001, p. 152). This is despite the existence of numerous distinct viewpoints within the social sciences and of the varying implications of different viewpoints for education.

Held et al. (1999) distinguish between three broad approaches to the analysis of the concept of globalization within the social sciences: (1) the hyperglobalist approach; (2) the skeptical approach; and, (3) the transformationalist approach. The hyperglobalist approach is premised on the idea that we are entering a truly “global age,” heralded by the triumph of global capitalism, in conjunction with the advent of new forms of global culture, governance, and civil society (Ohmae, 1995; Strange, 1996). This approach is demonstrated within the educational literature by authors such as Donald (1992), Usher & Edwards (1994), Kress (1996), and Edwards (1994). Hyperglobalists argue that global postmodernity has undermined the modernist goals of national education and lifelong learning, and of creating national culture. For example, in his analysis of new technologies and globalization, Edwards (1994) argues that the interaction of the information superhighway with global markets will lead to the demise of schooling in traditional forms.

In response to the hyperglobalists, Green (1997) points out that such claims are overstated because national governments still hold primary responsibility for providing education. Green also indicates that information technologies and strategies for their use

are still relatively underdeveloped in relation to schooling. Further, even in the affluent North, he argues, schools are very unlikely to be replaced by virtual networks.

Green's viewpoint on the concept of globalization is located within what Held et al. (1999) call the "skeptical" approach to globalization. Those who espouse viewpoints of this second approach typically argue that trading blocks are in fact weaker now than in earlier periods of history, although they acknowledge that there has been a growing trend towards "regionalization" in trade and politics (Tikly, 2001, p. 153). The skeptical approach to globalization sees the logic of capitalism leading to greater polarization between the developed and developing countries. It also sees, paradoxically, a greater role for the nation state in managing the deepening crisis tendencies of capitalism (Boyer & Drache, 1996; Hirst & Thompson, 1996).

This view is reflected in many skeptic's viewpoints by their assertion that there has not been any meaningful globalization of education (Green, 1997). While admitting that national education systems have become more "porous" and "have become more like each other in certain important ways," skeptics claim that there is "little evidence that national education systems are disappearing or that national states have ceased to control them" (Green, 1997, p. 171). Instead, they suggest that there has been a more limited process of "partial internationalization" of education involving increased student and staff mobility, widespread policy borrowing and "attempts to enhance the international dimension of curricula at secondary and higher levels" (p. 171).

The skeptical approach to globalization, with its references to the increasing polarization between high and low income countries, appears on the surface to be a useful

and compelling frame for analysis of education systems in Mexico. Structural adjustment and austerity, combined with rising populations, have led to a decline in enrollment rates and quality of education in Mexico and Latin America overall (Carnoy & Torres, 1994; Torres & Schugurensky, 1997). There are, however, other aspects of the skeptical approach that are less helpful when applied to Mexico. For example, the role of the state in managing crisis does not fit with recent empirical reality in Mexico. A powerful feature of structural adjustment programs has been to undermine the role of the state in managing crisis, and so it has been multilateral agencies and NGOs that have often taken the lead in this respect (Carnoy & Torres, 1994; Torres & Schugurensky, 1997). This amounts to more than just a “partial internationalization” of education. Rather, structural adjustment policies are global in origin and affect many more people than Green’s examples of “limited policy transfer” (1999, p. 55-71).

These criticisms of the skeptical approach led Held et al. (1999) to identify a third broad approach within the social science literature and its sub-disciplines in education. Held et al. call this the transformationalist approach. Similar to the hyperglobalist approach, the those who fall into the transformationalist camp argue that there are indeed unprecedented levels of global interconnectedness (Castells, 1996; Giddens, 1990; Harvey, 1989). Unlike the hyperglobalists, however, the transformationists question whether we are entering a new “global age” of economic, political, and cultural integration. Instead, they see globalization as an historically contingent process replete with contradictions. Consequently, globalization is resulting in greater fragmentation and stratification in which “some states, societies and communities are becoming increasingly

enmeshed in the global order while others are becoming increasingly marginalized” (Held, et al., 1999, p. 8).

In contrast to the skeptics, transformationists argue that these contradictory processes are “unruly problematics” (Herod, Ó Tuathail, & Roberts, 1998), which are linked to a transformation in the global division of labor, such that the core-periphery relationship is no longer just about relationships between nation states, but involves new social relationships that cut across national boundaries. According to Hoogvelt (1997), the “core” of the world economy now includes not only wealthy nations, but elites in the poorer nations as well. Conversely, the periphery now increasingly includes the poor and the socially excluded in the more affluent nations. In a similar manner, transformationists see nation states retaining much power over what occurs in their territories, while at the same time their power is being transformed in relation to new institutions of international governance and law (Torres & Schugurensky, 1997).

As one who views globalization as essentially a phenomenon of late modernity, Anthony Giddens (1992) frames globalization as a transformation of time and space in which the development of global systems and networks reduces the hold of local circumstances over people’s lives. According to Giddens, through this process, the “disembedding” of social relations occurs, during which they are lifted out from “local contexts of interaction” and recombined across time and space (p. 66). David Harvey (1992) also frames globalization as a process involving change in our experience of time and space, but he emphasizes the “intensification of space-time compression” (p. 67). Harvey (1989) interprets this as being less of a developmental process than an historical

discontinuity associated with periodic crises of capitalism, such as occurred during the late 1970s and early 1980s.

Transformationist writers such as Appadurai (1996), Hall (1992, 1996), and Hoogvelt (1997) have commented on how processes of migration, diaspora formation, and cultural hybridization have transformed individual and group identities and created “new ethnicities”. Rather than being fixed and “essentialized”, these new forms of cultural identity are contingent and fluid (Hall, 1992). Within the broad education literature the transformationist perspective is represented by Ball (1998), Jones (1998), Brown & Lauder (1997), Dale (1999), Marginson (1999), Blackmore (1999), and Henry et al. (1999).

Although these authors each deal with a distinct aspect of globalization and education, they share a common view of the contingency and reciprocity of effects between globalization and education. Their argument is summarized by Marginson (1999):

Globalization is irreversibly changing the politics of the nation-state and its regional sectors, domestic classes and nationally-defined interest groups. It is creating new potentials and limits in the politics of education. Its effects on the politics of education are complex ... Increasingly shaped as it is by globalization – both directly and via the effects of globalization in national government – education at the same time has become a primary medium of globalization, and an incubator of its agents. As well as inhibiting or transforming older kinds of education, globalization creates new kinds. (p. 19).

Importantly, what distinguishes this view is the idea that globalization both acts on and through (acts in) education policy. This viewpoint sees education not only affected by globalization, but also having become a principle mechanism by which global forces affect the daily lives of national populations.

There are multiple advantages of a transformationalist approach from the point of view of a “reconceptualization” of globalization theory. As Tikly (2001) indicates:

[T]hey revolve chiefly around the extent to which the approach allows for a complex and contingent view of the relationship between education and globalisation; the role of the state and civil society in mediating the influence of global forces, and an exploration of issues relating to culture, language, and identity....Further, those who have adopted a transformationalist perspective within education do try to relate the emerging global division of labor and increased social stratification within and between countries to developments in education policy. (p. 155).

Nevertheless, according to Tikly (2001), “The transformationist perspective has not gone nearly far enough in extrapolating the educational implications of increasing stratification along the lines of race, culture, class and gender and that this analysis will need to be deepened in relation to highly stratified countries” such as Mexico (p. 155). Moreover, he argues that “exponents of the transformationist perspective fail to acknowledge the continuing impact and relevance of *prior forms* of globalisation, especially those associated with European colonialism” (emphasis in original, p, 155).

Globalization and Contemporary Mexican Education

In this section a framework for understanding the effects of globalization on education policy and systems in Mexico will be synthesized. The analysis will draw on the strengths of previous models, while attempting to address their weaknesses. First a definition and account of globalization is presented. The definition of globalization adopted for this study is taken from recent work by Held et al. (1999). The authors define globalization as:

A process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions – assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact – generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power. (p. 16)

The authors explain that by “flows” they refer to “the movements of physical artifacts, people, symbols, tokens and information across space and time”, while “networks” is used to refer to “regularized or patterned interactions between independent agents, nodes of activity, or sites of power” (p. 16).

In important respects, Held et al.’s definition and understanding of globalization furthers the development of the transformationist perspective. As Tikly (2001) explains:

It is based on an understanding of globalisation as a set of *processes* rather than a single ‘condition’, involving interactions and networks within the political, military, economic and cultural domains as well as those of labour and migratory movements and of the environment. These processes are fractured and uneven

rather than linear and involve a complex ‘deterritorialisation’ and ‘reterritorialisation’ of political and economic relations. (p. 156)

According to Held et al. (1999), power is a fundamental attribute of globalization:

[P]atterns of global stratification mediate access to sites of power, while the consequences of globalisation are unevenly experienced. Political and economic elites in the world’s major metropolitan areas are much more tightly integrated into, and have much greater control over, global networks than do the [non-elite]. (p. 28)

As suggested above, Held et al.’s (1999) analysis attempts to move beyond a transformationalist perspective by providing an historical “periodisation” of different forms of globalization, coinciding with the pre-modern, early modern, modern, and contemporary periods.

Held et al. (1999) argue that international and global interconnectedness is not a novel phenomenon. In their pursuit to advance understanding, using units of analysis composed of global flows and networks, they have developed an historical framework for assessing the qualitative and quantitative differences between forms of globalization in different eras (Tikly, 2001). For example, they have determined that in the modern era (1859-1945), globalization expanded enormously in terms of global, political, and military relations associated with western global empires, and the soaring of global trade and investment. Moreover, an additional important global network established during this era was education.

Moreover, according to Held et al. (1999), the contemporary era (post-1945) of globalization is historically unprecedented in terms of extensity, intensity, velocity, and impact of global processes. Held et al. (1999) identify the current era as one in which Empires, once the principle form of political rule and world political organization, had given way to a worldwide system of nation-states, overlaid by multilateral, regional and global systems of regulation and governance. Moreover, whereas previous epochs were dominated by the collective or divided hegemony of western powers, the contemporary era can claim to have only a single potential hegemonic power: the United States ... [whose] ... enormous structural power has remained deeply inscribed in the nature and functioning of the present world order. (p. 425)

For example, in regard to extensity, intensity, velocity, and impact of global processes during the contemporary era of globalization, American hegemony has been accompanied by ever tightening systems of economic regulation -- first through the Bretton Woods system and more recently through NAFTA and the World Trade Organization -- all occurring alongside a more liberal world economic order (Tikly, 2001). More ominously, during this era the world has witnessed a massive increase in migrations of populations; and the increasing significance and impact of environmental issues and concerns and developments in mass media and communications technologies. Contemporary globalization also involves reflexivity on the part of a growing worldwide elite, as well as popular culture and a consciousness of global interconnectedness.

Finally, it is also contested, as states, citizens, and social movements resist or manage its impacts.

Historical Forms of Globalization and Mexican Education

The importance of taking account of previous forms of globalization and their impact on education in postcolonial Mexico cannot be overemphasized, particularly if one hopes to understand the relationship between globalization and education in the contemporary era (Held et al., 1999; Tikly, 2001). Held et al.'s (1999) analysis offers a framework through which to understand these relationships. The diffusion of Christianity to Mexico carried with it a particular educational form and system of schools and universities. These interacted with, disrupted, and displaced indigenous forms of education, ceremonies, skills and crafts training.

The historical significance of colonial education in Mexico is at least threefold (Tikly, 2001). First, it instituted a key mechanism and template for the spread of contemporary forms of education. Depending on the particular country, during pre-modern and early modern eras there was variance in forms of educational systems depending on the "type" of colonialism in place (Altbach & Kelly, 1978), or the nature of the educational program (White, 1996). Importantly, European "colonial education spread a common structure of schooling ... and a form of curriculum based on *episteme* (ground base of knowledge) throughout colonial regions, including Mexico (Tikly, 2001, p. 157). Consequently, colonial forms and structures either replaced, or worked alongside, earlier forms of education from pre-colonial eras, and so they provided the basis on which postcolonial reform efforts have been built. In Mexico, as in most

postcolonial contexts, the colonial form of schooling and education at all levels and the pedagogy and forms of knowledge they engendered have proven remarkably resistant to change.

The second significant aspect of colonial education for Mexico was that during both the modern and contemporary periods, colonial education was itself an important site for the spread of global flows and networks in the economic, cultural and political spheres. During the modern era in Mexico, education was a key mechanism for the imposition and diffusion of Christianity into indigenous populations under colonial rule. Moreover, colonial educational forms and structures directly contributed to the development of global trade and commerce by providing indigenous labor in Mexico with basic skills and dispositions required by economic and administrative systems. However, because colonial education in Mexico only typically offered a very limited basic education, and was never universal, after liberation it provided a limited human resource base for Mexico in its pursuits to become globally “competitive” (p. 158). In this way, colonial education in Mexico contributed to the marginalization of postcolonial Mexican economies in the contemporary period. Colonial education in Mexico was also highly selective and elitist in the opportunities it offered for secondary and higher education, and thus was significantly responsible for the formation of indigenous elites, who in turn have become part of the global elite.

The third significant aspect of colonial education in Mexico was that it has provided an important seedbed for local resistance to contemporary global forces. Most leading intellectuals and revolutionaries during the heyday of national liberation struggles

in Latin America were products of colonial education. For example, Fidel Castro is an attorney and was schooled in an elite Jesuit educational system in Cuba. Che Guevara was a physician and received his medical education in an elite private system in Argentina. In contemporary Mexico, the iconic Comandante Marcos, leader of the Zapatistas, is actually Rafael Guillen from Tampico. Dr. Guillen received a PhD in philosophy of communications from the Mexican public higher education system. His particular field of study seems appropriate given the success of the Zapatista movement to exploit public opinion worldwide through its keen use of global media and the Internet. Finally, western intellectual traditions, such as Marxism, also have inspired and influenced revolutionary thinking. Mazrui (1978) has described “how the ‘mystique’ of the Graeco-Roman [epistemological] tradition provided not only a crucial point of reference for European identity and ‘colonial arrogance’ but also, ironically, became an inspiration for its antithesis” (in Tikly, 2001, p. 158).

Globalization and Postcolonial Education

Most scholars agree that globalization is multidimensional involving a range of global flows and networks. However, much of the “first wave” of literature on globalization and education in postcolonial countries tends to focus on the implications of economic globalization and structural adjustment policies for education and training. This is evident in many of the contributions to special editions of the *International Journal of Educational Development* and of *Prospects*, which have been devoted to themes of globalization and education in “developing countries” (Tikly, 2001). On the one hand, according to Carton and Tawil (1997), such an emphasis is understandable

because of the devastation that occurred to education and training systems in the South after the imposition of structural adjustment policies in the 1980s and 1990s. On the other hand, the authors claim that an economic focus is also indicative of certain reductionism in the literature and the view that “globalization has been promoted primarily by economic agents” (Carton & Tawil, 1997, p. 21). They stress that such an approach limits understanding of the impact of political, cultural, and other aspects of globalization on education systems. In this regard, quoting Tikly (2001) at length is useful:

Little indication is given in this body of work, for example, of the role of the state in [postcolonial] countries in mediating and/or contesting structural adjustment policies or of the significance of cultural issues such as language policy in global perspective. This reductionism also does not allow for an analysis of the impact of epidemiological aspects of globalization such as the HIV/AIDS pandemic that is sweeping across sub-Saharan Africa [and the Caribbean]. Nor does it allow for an analysis of the global arms trade. This trade impacts on education systems because [potential learners] have been dragged into conflict facilitated by arms dealing. Indeed, it is often at the point where all of these global forces intersect that the true magnitude and tragedy of the crisis in education can be comprehended. (p. 158)

In an attempt to avoid crude economic reductionism and understand the relationship and relative impact of different aspects of globalization on education, Bayart’s (1993) work on the postcolonial state is useful. Building on Gramsci, Bayart

(1993) introduces the idea of the “postcolonial historical block”. Bayart uses this concept to describe a unity of economic, political, and cultural relationships that collectively constitute the basis for the maintenance of social order in postcolonial nations. What is crucial to recognize and understand is the idea underlying the concept that economic, political, and cultural factors articulate together in maintaining the status quo. Although economic factors may “determine” what transpires culturally and politically, economic policies and strategies can also be influenced by cultural and political factors. Therefore the question of determination is a matter for empirical investigation at any stage in the development of an historical bloc and cannot be considered as given. Bayart’s idea of the postcolonial bloc is similar to Hoogvelt’s (1997) concept of “postcolonial formations” mentioned earlier. Importantly, the implication of the use of Gramsci’s ideas is that history becomes “open ended” rather than predetermined. This is especially pertinent to Mexico where change is multi-causal and inherently unpredictable, given contingencies of time and particular place.

Economic Globalization and Postcolonial Mexican Education

To understand the significance of economic globalization for education in Mexico, it is necessary to understand the position of the Mexican economy in relation to global economic flows and networks. Hoogvelt (1997) identifies three distinctive features in the contemporary period. First, she describes the arrival of a “new market discipline” that in an increasingly “shared phenomenal world” creates an “awareness of global competition which constrains individuals and groups, and even national governments, to conform to international standards of price and quality” (p. 124).

Second, she describes “flexible accumulation through global webs” in which she refers to the “way in which the fusion of computer technology with telecommunications make it possible for firms to relocate an ever-widening range of operations and functions to wherever cost-competitive labour, assets and infrastructure are available” (p. 126). Finally, Hoogvelt (1997) describes “financial global deepening” as distinctive to the contemporary period and describes it in this way:

[It has] involved a tremendous increase in the mobility of capital. This mobility refers not only to the speed and freedom with which money can move across frontiers at the press of a computer button, it also, more significantly, refers to the way it is being disconnected from social relationships in which money and wealth were previously embedded. (p. 129)

Critical for the analysis of Mexico, financial deepening has involved the concentration and increased flow of capital within a geographically confined area, including the western and newly industrialized countries. Much of the world, however, including most of Latin America, is increasingly on the periphery of these processes (Hoogvelt, 1997).

For authors such as Castells (1993) and Amin (1997), the result of these new features in the contemporary period has been to create pockets of the “Fourth World” in the former First, Second, and Third Worlds. Much of Latin America, and most of Mexico, has fallen into this emerging “Fourth World” with the result being that a significant portion of the region’s population has shifted “from a structural position of exploitation to a structural position of irrelevance” within the new world economy (Castells, 1993, p. 37).

In regard to how education in Mexico has fared in regard to globalization, the relevant education literature has focused on two aspects. First, it has focused on the implications of economic globalization for education provision by providing a critique of the negative impact of structural adjustment policies on enrollment rates and the quality of educational provision (Colclough & Manor, 1991; Samoff, 1994; Tilak, 1997). Second, relevant education literature has focused on the relationship between skills formation and global labor markets (Riddle, 1996; Steward, 1996).

Although this small body of literature offers a useful critique of the effects of structural adjustment on Mexican education, according to Ilon (1994), it does not sufficiently problematize the plight of lower income, postcolonial countries within the emerging global economy. This deficiency in the literature results from the use of a human capital framework that, which assumes that investment in human resources will facilitate a “smooth” linear model of economic growth. In this regard, it is similar in premise and discourse to policy writings of governments and multilateral organizations, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. According to Ilon (1994), this discourse does not consider the role of inevitable economic crisis, nor the highly differentiated and inequitable impact of economic globalization on the education of the poor, and of elites. Moreover, neither do they consider education’s role in legitimizing the emerging global division of labor and the “new world order”.

In contrast, Ilon (1994) offers a framework through which to conduct such an analysis. However, what is seen as a result of it suggests a dim future involving a growing gulf in educational opportunities between emerging global elites and the rest of

the population. According to Ilon (1994), “a national system [of education] is likely to give way to local systems for the poor and global systems for the rich” (p. 99). In this highly stratified environment, a top tier elite will benefit from a private education making them globally competitive; a middle tier will receive a “good” but not “world class” education; while the majority third tier will have a local, state education that will make them “marginally competitive for low-skill jobs” (p. 102).

While Ilon’s ideas are compelling because they appear to correspond to the reality of education in many postcolonial countries, especially Mexico, it is important to “avoid crude functionalism and the idea of a clear-cut ‘correspondence’ between education and the emerging global division of labour” (Tikly, 2001, p. 161). Following this line of reasoning, according to Fritzell (1987) and Ball (1990), “it is possible to conceive of different sectors within education having more or less *positive* or *negative* correspondences with the global economy at different times (emphasis in original, Tikly, 2001, p. 161). This is to suggest that at times education may be highly “functional” for global capitalist accumulation, and also provide legitimacy for the capitalist system, and at other times not. Importantly, as Tikly (2001) explains, “Education can also have a *critical* correspondence with the global economy because of its role in providing a focus and a forum for the development of resistance to the status quo” (p. 161).

Examples of the functionality of colonial education and legitimatization of colonial capitalist systems in Mexico were suggested earlier. However, as Dore (1997) indicates, colonial education and the “diploma disease” were in other respects highly dysfunctional for national development, and during anti-colonial struggles, actually

developed a critical correspondence with the colonial project. In this regard, Quoting Tikly (2001) at length is worthwhile:

The nature and correspondence between education and contemporary economic globalisation remains contradictory. For a tiny minority, access to prestigious private education has provided the forms of socialization and high skills development required for integration and participation in the global economy. The inclusion of individuals from the South within the board rooms and debating chambers of transnational corporations and global political institutions also helps to legitimize the global capitalist system. This ‘positive correspondence’ can, however, turn critical. This is to assert that although there exists at one level a commonality of interests, the economic and political interests of the global elite are not always of a piece. In order to secure their own position within the emerging historical bloc, postcolonial elites from [Latin America] may also use their participation in global forums to form a bulwark against Western economic and political hegemony. (pp. 161-162)

Lower down the system, at Ilon’s second tier, the picture is more uncertain. At this level, there remains a negative correspondence between the high skill requirements of business and the public sector at the national level, and skills that the indigenous education systems in contemporary Mexico can produce. Moreover, this gap is exacerbated by “brain drain” that increasingly affects most high skills occupations in Mexico. However, it is at Ilon’s third tier that the problem of correspondence is most serious. In this tier at least 50% of the population in Mexico can expect to be

permanently excluded from employment with another 20% in low income insecure employment (Hoogvelt, 1997).

The State in North America: The Traditional System Responding to Neoliberal Globalization

In this section the review of the literature will broaden out to include education responses to globalization that are occurring in the North American education systems at large. In this regard, the review begins to narrow towards the dynamics in which the case study are situated, particularly the internationalization of higher education in North America, and international education exchange.

In regard to education in North America at large (Canada, Mexico, U.S.A.), public education system in the old capitalist order was oriented toward the construction of “citizens” for the nation state, as well as the production of a disciplined and reliable workforce of the type now characterized as “Fordist” production processes (Apple, 1979, 1982; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Carnoy, 1972, 1974; Meyer, Ramirez, Rubinson, & Boli-Bennett, 1979). In the context of intensified globalization of the contemporary period, the very nationalism linked with traditional citizenship training has been called into question. Consequently, new importance has been given to a cosmopolitan conception of citizenship, such as the type promoted by “international studies” in a liberal arts curriculum (Kushigian, 1998).

More ominously, however, the new post-Fordist global economy of the contemporary period seems to require workers who are adaptable to flexible work regimes and insecure employment, a process with negative implications for the functions

of educational institutions. From this perspectives organizations such as education labor unions serve primarily as an obstacle to adapting educational systems to this new imperative (Morrow & Torres, 2000). Given these changes, the tasks of education in the formation of national citizenship will necessarily reorient toward the direction of a greater recognition of global diversity and interdependence.

Depending on the perspective of the author, celebration and condemnation of the supposed decline of the welfare state can be found in many different ideological and analytical forms. But most of these analyses fail to address the more precise question of how the waning of state powers has potential negative consequences given the logic of globalization (Morrow & Torres, 2000). Moreover, many commentators confuse a loss of sovereignty with a loss of power, as opposed to its changed forms. As Castells (1997a) explains:

While global capitalism thrives, and nationalist ideologies explode all over the world, the nation-state, as historically created in the Modern Age, seems to be losing its power, although, and this is essential, *not its influence*....Indeed the growing challenge to state's sovereignty around the world seems to originate from the inability of the modern nation-state to navigate the uncharted, stormy waters between the power of global networks and the challenge of singular identities. The instrumental capacity of the nation-state is decisively undermined by globalization of core economic activities, by globalization of media and electronic communication, and by globalization of crime. (pp. 243-44).

Neoliberalism versus the Challenge of Globalization in North America

The neoliberal challenge to the welfare state has provided the most influential ideological arguments for advancing the weakening of state powers (Apple, 2001; Morrow & Torres, 2000). But the rise of neoliberalism comes about due to more than its ideological appeal. Rather, its very success is closely related to the pressures of globalization that emerged in the 1970s. The fiscal crisis of the state produced by the classical Keynesian strategies of the welfare state did not produce a crisis of legitimation of the type (critical correspondence) that led to the revival of democratic socialism as hoped for by many on the Left. Instead, Thatcherism and Reaganism became the ideological apparatus for a vast process of restructuring that reduced demands on welfare states and provided a more flexible regulatory environment within which globalizing processes could proceed (Morrow & Torres, 2000). Paradoxically, these policies that oriented toward a smaller, more business oriented state were also implicated in some industrialized (Britain and Australia) and postcolonial (Africa, Asia, Middle East, Latin America) contexts with the use of massive state power to reorganize and downsize the education systems.

Noam Chomsky (1998) convincingly argues that universities have always been “parasitic” institution insofar as they depend upon public and private funds. Indeed the overall process of funding poses severe limits to the autonomy of universities, as Chomsky (1998) explains:

Universities are parasitic institutions. They do not generate their own funds. We don't really have a market society – limited, guided market society – the

universities aren't in the market. So they don't support themselves by tuition, they support themselves by funding from somewhere. Some of their funding is public. You can call it different names: you can call it scholarships, you can call it research grants. But one of the sources is the public through the government. Another source is rich people making endowments. A third source is corporate sponsorship through research, and so on. Those are basically the funding sources. Now the universities have the serious problem that, in fact, individuals in departments within them have microcosms of this problems of maintaining intellectual independence and integrity in the face of a parasitic existence. And that is not an easy line to walk ... serious universities – and that is a serious statement – have to face a conflict between the sources of their existence and funding which is going to be overwhelmingly supportive of existing systems of power and authority. It can't be otherwise. (quoted in Morrow & Torres, 2000, p. 38)

Chomsky appears to agree with the implicit assumption of Castells that the state may be weakened by a number of processes – globalization being one of them – but that its influence is not weakened. Moreover, the traditional function of state subsidies for corporation has not been abandoned under neoliberal policies (Morrow & Torres, 2000). Interestingly, in the past, industrial policy was simply and clearly outlined in the function of the military. According to Chomsky (1998):

The function of the military is to subsidize mass technology, they don't really care about the military application. Their role is to create a technological and

scientific basis for the next generation of corporate profit ... it is called industrial policy. (quoted in Morrow & Torres, 2000, p. 38)

Indeed, for Chomsky (1998), the current neoliberal condition is not so different from the past, assuming one looks at military research funding and the implications for one of the growing and most popular business tools, the Internet:

Actually, one of the most recent examples of this is the Internet, which is now considered the great business opportunity, the triumph of free enterprise, and all of this grew out of a defense research agency. They got most of the ideas in software, they gave the initial funding....Throughout thirty years the intellectual initiative and funding came overwhelmingly from the state sector: the Pentagon, the National science Foundation. Finally, a couple of years ago it was handed over to corporations. And now they are using it as a tool for their tremendous profits, so that's a dramatic case with almost every useful technology. (quoted in Morrow & Torres, 2000, p. 39)

Globalization and Implications for Education in North America: The Local, the Global, and Commodification of Education

As has been suggested previously, the educational changes linked to the globalization of capitalism cannot readily be summarized in general theses, because education is implicated in broader cultural changes that are contradictory. As Kellner (2001) argues, "Culture is an especially complex and contested terrain today as global cultures permeate local ones and new configurations emerge that synthesize both poles, providing contradictory forces of colonization *and* resistance, global homogenization *and*

local hybrid forms and identities” (p. 305). Consequently, simplistic visions of dependency theory and cultural imperialism are not adequate to explain the emerging patterns relating to the local and the global (Morrow & Torres, 2000).

However, in the context of education, it is possible to identify a crucial and pervasive structural effect – commodification -- that defines the specific, neoliberal form of globalization currently taking place in the contemporary period. As Morrow and Torres (2000) explain, historically, the state retained considerable autonomy in constructing public education systems, as well as regulating private, profit-oriented, educational ventures. Although early theories of cultural reproduction (Apple, 1979, 1982; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Carnoy, 1972, 1974; Meyer, Ramirez, Rubinson, & Boli-Bennett, 1979) emphasize the ways in which the use of state autonomy contributes indirectly to the perpetuating of existing class systems, they also retain the assumption that the state should exercise this directive responsibility, but on a more equitable basis. Moreover, globalization in principle includes the possibility that such radicalized educational planning could take on international forms, addressing cross-national inequalities.

What the early theories of cultural reproduction did not anticipate, however, was the possibility of massive privatization and commodification of educational activities that would be legitimized in terms of inevitable “logic” and imperatives of globalization understood as a deterministic process (Morrow & Torres, 2000, p. 39-40). Quoting Morrow and Torres (2000) at length on this issue is useful:

In this respect the advent of globalization provides a rationale for reorganizing the “correspondence principle” that links, according to structural Marxists, the economy and educational systems. But this linking of “competitiveness” with privatization and a market orientation in education is more an expression, we would argue, of neoliberal ideology than any inherent or invariant imperatives stemming from globalization. (p. 40)

Therefore, what Morrow and Torres are arguing is the need to differentiate neoliberal globalization, as an ideology, from the globalization of the economy, politics, and eventually culture as a historical and structural process.

Crucially, the original creation of mass education as a public good was based on a fundamental moral principle stemming from insights into the strengths and weaknesses of markets as a means of organizing social activities. Above all, in societies that are highly segmented by class, there is a profound discrepancy between educational “needs” and the capacity to pay (Apple, 2001). Moreover, there are critical societal requirements for long-term educational planning, which cannot be met by short-term, individualistic, highly-fluctuating, market-based decisions (Morrow & Torres, 2000). As Morrow and Torres (2000) insist, despite the importance of a critique of educational expertise in the context of state planning (Popkewitz 1991; Popkewitz & Brennan 1998), this should not be confused with the abandonment of public responsibility to market forces (McLafferty, Torres, & Mitchell, 2001; Wells & Oakes, 1998).

In broad terms, the emergence of the globalization problematic in education has contributed to a reconfiguration of political positions in regard to education policy

(Carnoy, 1998). For example, the Left has been increasingly defensive in defending the more traditional humanistic values and face-to-face methods of instruction of traditional education (Freire, 1997). In this defensive context, many of the earlier leftist criticisms of the effects of education on reproducing class, race, and gender inequalities have been set aside (Morrow & Torres, 2000). Moreover, the agenda of educational reform in response to globalization has been largely dominated by the neoliberal right, and by prophets of new educational technologies.

Globalization and Internationalization of Higher Education

As was suggested previously, globalization is not a new phenomenon in Mexican education. In higher education, the first academic institution was established in 1551 by the Catholic Church, and continues in operation today as the National Autonomous University of Mexico, serving more than 250,000 students. While the modern U.S.A. research university originated from a 19th century German model, in Mexico, after independence in 1821, education planners copied the modern, technically oriented French University. In recent decades, American research universities and graduate schools became the model to copy in Mexico (Schwartzman, 1999). Today, however, the old pattern of adoption and copy has become just a small part of a larger trend of international integration. As a consequence of internal integration, there exists a series of features, problems, and concerns that affect most higher educational systems worldwide in similar ways, while eliciting different and often contradictory responses depending on contingencies of particular places.

Given current projections, more persons will attend colleges and universities in the next century than in all of human history (Goodman, 1999). However, most of the capacity to accommodate this demand is yet to be built, and most of it will need to be built outside the U.S.A. Exacerbating this challenge, higher education has profoundly changed in the past 20 years, yet as Altbach and Davis (1999) indicate, “those involved in the academic enterprise have yet to grapple with the implications of these changes” (p. 3). Worldwide, academic institutions and systems have faced pressures of increasing numbers of students and demographic changes, demands for accountability, reconsideration of the social and economic role of higher education, implications of the end of the cold war, and the impact of new technologies, among others. While academic systems function in a national environment, the challenges play themselves out on a global scale.

Although it may not yet be possible to think of higher education as a global system, there is considerable convergence among the world’s universities and higher education systems. The basic institutional model and structure of studies are similar worldwide. Academic institutions have frequently been international in orientation. For example, during the medieval period Latin was the common language of instruction. In the contemporary period, however, English has assumed the role of the primary international language of science and scholarship, including the Internet. As Altbach and Davis (1999) suggest, “Now, with more than one million students studying outside their borders, with countless scholars working internationally, and with new technologies such

as the Internet fostering instantaneous communications, the international roots and the contemporary realities of the university are central” (p. 4).

While international programs have existed in colleges and universities for at least a century, the 1990s in particular was a decade of rapid expansion in the “internationalization” of higher education (Desruisseaux, 1999). For example, as suggested above, during the decade, increases were substantial in numbers of foreign students studying at U.S.A. institutions, and U.S.A. students studying at foreign institutions. Varying motivations may exist within universities for developing international programs including common interests in research and economic development. However, a significant long-term trend pushing the growth of international programs in the U.S.A. is the increasing ethnic diversity of the population, fueled by globalization processes and their impact on immigration (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000).

Although trends and circumstances vary from country to country, there is enough convergence to identify ten issue clusters that seem to be central to current developments in higher education worldwide (Altbach & Davis, 1999). First, in all areas worldwide, the links and transition points from school to work are weakly articulated. The formal structures by which education systems prepare students are weakly developed. While professional education often links well to employment in many countries, education in the arts and sciences is less well articulated.

Second, While the initial transition from school to work may be poorly articulated, the demand for education throughout the lifecycle is becoming apparent. As the nature of work has evolved, so have the needs of those in the workforce to continually

upgrade their capacities. This has led to the development of a variety of educational forms, such as certificate programs, and continuing professional education, that occur beyond the bachelor's degree. In many developing countries, graduate education is just beginning to escalate, as the need for advanced skills and continuing professional education becomes increasingly clear.

Third, although still primarily situated in the developed countries, technological developments have wrought massive changes, including many of the dislocations in the transition from school-to-work, as well as pushing demand for lifelong learning. Moreover, distance education has important implications for the accreditation of educational institutions and assurance of quality in these circumstances. Technology is also revolutionizing the library due to its centrality to the communication, storage, and retrieval of knowledge.

Fourth, as indicated above, there has been a rapid increase in the number of international mobile students, but this trend is not without serious consequences. As the market for individuals with transnational competencies has surged, so have international opportunities for those with marketable skills in other countries. In the U.S.A., the stay rates for advanced students in the engineering disciplines and the sciences can exceed 75 percent for students from particular countries. From the perspective of education authorities from their home countries, this represents a considerable loss of talent.

Fifth, although seldom discussed, one of the greatest expansion areas worldwide has been in graduate education – the post-baccalaureate training for the professions as well as for science, technology, and teaching. Thus, graduate education offers

outstanding opportunities for international links and cooperation, facilitated potentially by linkages from new technologies.

Sixth, the privatization of higher education is a worldwide phenomenon of crucial importance. In Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, and parts of Asia, the fastest growing parts of the academic system are private institutions. Public universities are in some places being “privatized” through increasing responsibilities in fund raising. The expansion of the private sector raises issues of quality control and accreditation, and in many parts of the world there are few or no controls on private sector expansion. Access is also a critical issue, and is discussed further below in context of commodification of education.

Seventh, the academic profession is in crisis almost everywhere, given the rapid growth of part-time faculty, and the loss of traditional tenure systems. The professorate is being asked to do more with less, and student-teacher ratios, academic salaries, and morale have deteriorated. Without a committed academic profession, the university cannot be an effective institution.

Eighth, access and equity remain central factors, but as indicated above, in the current policy context are frequently ignored. While academic systems worldwide have expanded dramatically, there are problems of access and equity in many parts of the world. Gender, ethnicity, and social class remain serious issues. Moreover, in most parts of the world, higher education remains an urban phenomenon, and one reserved primarily for elites.

Ninth, accountability is a contemporary rule in higher education, and demands by funding sources, mainly government, to measure productivity, control funding allocations, etc., is increasing rapidly. Governance systems are being strained to the breaking point. To meet the demands for accountability, universities are being “managerialized” with professional administrators gaining increasing control.

Tenth, expansion brings with it increased differentiation and the emergence of academic systems. Consequently, new kinds of academic institutions are emerging, and existing universities are serving larger and more diverse groups. In order to make sense of this growth and differentiation, academic systems are organized in ways to provide coordination, control, and management of resources.

Problems of Definition of International Social Work

As Midgley (2001) notes, an initial problem one encounters in exploring this issue is that there is no standardized definition of the term “international social work” nor any agreement about what international social work involves (p. 24). Moreover, even the “experts” in this area have different views about the meaning of the term. Healy (1995) indicates that numerous definitions have emerged, and her own review of the terms employed by social workers shows that a large number of different terms are currently used.

For example, some writers define international social work as a “field of practice”, stressing the importance of specific skills and knowledge to enable social workers to work in international agencies. This definition is the oldest, having been formalized in the 1940s and 1950s. Friedlander (1955, 1975) used the term to refer to the

social welfare activities of international agencies such as the Red Cross and the United Nations. Healy (1995) indicates that this approach was widely accepted in the past and that it governed the first definition of international social work adopted by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) in the United States in 1957. A similar approach defines international social work as social work practice with immigrants or refugees. Sanders and Pedersen (1984) put forth this definition, suggesting that social work education should include more international content to allow domestic social workers to become culturally-competent in order to better work with immigrants and refugees and be more sensitive to their needs.

Another approach places less emphasis on practice and defines international social work as the contacts and exchanges that take place between social workers from different countries. Midgley (1990) questions the view that international social work is a distinctive field of practice, arguing instead for a definition based on variety of international exchanges. Healy (1995) agrees with this notion, suggesting that international social work is a “broad umbrella term referring to any aspect of social work involving two or more nations” (p. 422). Moreover, Hokenstad et al. (1992) elaborate this idea, indicating that international social work is concerned with “the profession and practice in different parts of the world . . . the different roles social workers perform, the practice methods they use, the problems they deal with and the challenges they face” (p. 4). As Nagy and Falk (2000) indicate, this idea comes close to proposing the creation of an academic field of comparative social work that would systematically study social work in different countries.

Others take an even broader view and define international social work as a global awareness that increases the ability of social workers to “transcend their preoccupation with the local and contextualize their role within a broad, global setting” (Asamoah, et al., 1997). Asamoah et al. (1997) propose to end the international - domestic dichotomy in social work, instead creating more of a global mindset that transcends local concerns. This idea is similar to Robertson’s (1992) notion that a global consciousness is gradually emerging among ordinary people today. Other writers have echoed this idea, with the notion that social work must enhance international linkages and provide a professional education that develops greater global awareness among students, as well as address problems on a worldwide scale (Hokenstad & Midgley, 1997).

Needless to say, many in the field of social work believe that the issue of definition needs to be resolved. Their argument is that if schools of social work are to increase international curriculum content, they need to know what this content should comprise. As Healy (1995) points out, currently social work educators have a poorly defined conceptual and practical knowledge base on which to build an adequate curriculum. Nagy and Falk (2000) indicate that the failure to resolve the issue of definition is a formidable barrier to internationalizing the curriculum.

Globalization, Internationalization, and Social Work Education

Like in the broader education literature, many writings on the subject of globalization by social work authors focus primarily on economic issues and basically conclude that global economic integration has negative consequences for human well being. Dominelli (1999) claims that globalization has dramatically affected countries

such as the UK, where the “market discipline” accompanying globalization is no longer simply confined to economic matters, but rather to activities of government, the social welfare system, and human relationships. Along this line of thought, the practice of social work has also been affected by this development. Its caring commitments have been replaced by commercialism, which imposes business ethics on the helping process, creates technocratic service delivery, and weakens the profession’s ability to serve those in need (Midgley, 2001). Moreover, this school of thought believe that social work has suffered from a lowering of professional standards in the social services, and has lost control over its own affairs.

Mishra (1999) offers a similar analysis of the impact of globalization on social policy, arguing that it has undermined the governments’ ability to pursue full employment policies, created pressures to cut social expenditures, and is destroying the ideological consensus that legitimated the welfare state. He believes that the logic of globalization is diametrically opposed to the logic of social policy.

Although other social work writers agree that economic globalization driven by speculative capitalism has caused serious harm, they emphasize its multifaceted dimensions and stress the opportunities globalization offers through enhanced international collaboration, and the promotion of cultural understanding. Embracing an ideology of internationalism, this line of thought carries a more optimistic viewpoint of the prospect of regulating global capitalism and of renewing collective responsibility for social welfare.

For example, Midgley's (1997a) embraces a comprehensive definition of globalization suggesting that enhanced global human interaction has positive implications for social welfare. Although critical of speculative finance capitalism, he argues that international efforts to regulate the global economy can succeed. Deacon et al. (1997) also hold a positive view, believing that it is possible to formulate a "global governance reform agenda", which could result in the beneficial regulation of international economic activities. According to these authors, this development could increase the accountability of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, strengthen the United Nations, empower international nongovernment organizations and popular movements, and advocate the adoption of a global system of political, legal and social rights (Deacon et al., 1997). In the new global environment, they believe, social policy could increasingly be formulated at the supranational level.

Although on the surface it might appear that pessimistic accounts of the impact of globalization are irreconcilable with more optimistic assessments, when one explores deeper it seems that there is consensus among international social work scholars on several important issues and that the tendency to polarize different approaches can be transcended (Midgley, 2001). For example, there is universal agreement that international speculative capitalism has had a negative impact on social welfare. Unlike in some economic literature, no apology for international capitalism appears yet in social work publications. Moreover, many social work writers who define globalization narrowly in economic terms do not reject a broader view that includes its other dimensions. Finally,

most agree that steps should be taken to address the negative impact of economic globalization.

However, there may be less consensus about how best to resolve the problem. While some authors believe that the challenges of economic globalization could be met through concerted international effort, others favor a greater emphasis on local activities (Ife, 1998; Wagner, 1997). This strategy offers an alternative to the proposal that governmental action should be mobilized at the supranational level, but there is a shared belief in the need for more effective political mobilization to combat unregulated financial speculation. Mobilization will be needed not only at the global level, but at the local and national levels as well. All agree that social work has a vital role to play in promoting political action of this kind.

Which Brand of Social Work Education for International Exchange?

For over one hundred years, social work has used different practice methods to apply the knowledge, skills, abilities, and values of the profession to the task of enhancing human well being. These methods include clinical social work, group work, and community work (Midgley, 2001). Although there is agreement generally that these different methods form the essence of social work practice, preferences for these methods give rise to different conceptions of social work's wider commitments, roles, and functions.

While a majority of social workers believe the profession should be concerned with treating the problems of needy people, others contend that it should be actively involved in social reform. Moreover, while some stress the need for preventive forms of

intervention, others argue that social work should seek to promote development and progressive social change. Although these different viewpoints on the role and function of the profession are often heard in domestic debates, they are especially apparent in international circles, particularly with reference to the developing countries of the global South (Midgley, 2001).

Most social workers today engage in direct practice, in which they work with individuals and their families in treating personal problems. This focus reflects the hegemony of remedial orientation within the profession, and its widespread use of psychological behavioral and treatment theories. In the industrial countries, especially the U.S.A., social work has become heavily involved in psychotherapy, resulting in criticisms that it has abandoned its true mission to serve the poor and oppressed (Lowe & Reid, 1999; Specht & Courtney, 1994).

On the other hand, in developing countries, social workers are also primarily engaged in remedial practice, but their interventions frequently deal with the material needs of their clients. Although relatively few engage in psychotherapy, professional education in these countries often depends on a Western curriculum, which emphasize the teaching of psychotherapeutic skills. Consequently, there is a gap between the professional education social workers in the developing world receive, and the real tasks they are required to perform.

Criticisms of remediation have been expressed by social work writers from the developing countries, who claim that the profession's individualized, therapeutic approach is unsuited to the pressing problems of poverty, unemployment, and lack of

basic needs attainment that characterizes the global South (Bose, 1992; Midgley 1981). These criticisms have helped to develop an awareness of the need for social work to play more of a role in development. Consequently, in recent years there is evidence of a greater commitment to developmental forms of social work practice, both in the developing and the industrial countries (Midgley, 2001). Moreover, community work principles and strategies have been utilized to mobilize and organize localities, and to empower local people to become involved in community projects that improve health, nutrition, literacy and infrastructure.

Social workers have also increasingly become involved in productive activities through the creation of agricultural and manufacturing cooperatives and through the use of micro-credit and micro-enterprises (Midgley, 1993; Midgley, 1997b). Activities such as these are compatible with international efforts by the United Nations to promote social development and they support the notion that social work can contribute to addressing the material needs of hundreds of millions of poor people around the world today.

Nevertheless, some writers believe that developmental forms of social work do not address underlying social inequalities and injustices, and that they fail to challenge the pervasive exploitation of the poor, women, gays and lesbians, people with disabilities, and other oppressed groups. They argue for a much more activist commitment, which challenges oppression and promotes liberation. In the 1970s many social workers (and others) in Latin American countries were inspired by the writings of Paulo Freire, and sought to apply his ideas in social work practice (Resnick, 1976). Activism also found expression in the efforts of some social workers to challenge oppressive dictatorship in

countries such as Chile and South Africa (Jimenez and Alwyn, 1992; Mazibuko et al., 1992).

Midgley (2001) believes that it will be difficult to reconcile these different views about social work's proper role and function in society. Disagreements have been in place for many decades and no real accommodation has yet been forged. However, he also believes it is possible to conceive of a situation where the profession recognizes and institutionalizes its different commitments and places appropriate stress on their application in different situations (Midgley, 2001). Obviously, the social needs of prosperous middle-class communities in the United States are not the same as those of the impoverished, whether in Latin America or elsewhere. Accordingly, social workers in these and other communities will emphasize different approaches when seeking to meet their needs. Nonetheless, Midgley (2001) urges that remedial, preventive and developmental functions are not mutually exclusive and, as social workers in diverse situations are now demonstrating, it is possible to integrate these different functions within the same practice setting. However, if these different functions are to be effectively integrated, social workers will need to recognize the value of the profession's diverse commitments and appreciate the extent to which they can all contribute to human welfare. As Midgley (2001) recognizes, this will, in turn, require a greater commitment from the profession's leadership to build consensus and end the internal disagreements which have plagued social work since its formative years.

Whose Values in International Education Exchange?

A final issue in international social work concerns deeply rooted beliefs about values, cultural diversity, and national identity. At first glance, the rhetoric surrounding these terms would suggest that the topic is not contentious. It is widely believed that social workers share a common set of universal values, respect cultural diversity and recognize national rights. However, a deeper analysis suggests that these issues are not as straightforward as they appear. The social work profession has historically been committed to formulating a set of universal value principles (Midgley, 2001). In the United States, the generic principles were formulated in the 1920s to provide a common base for diverse forms of social work practice. However, they were eventually institutionalized as a set of ethical norms. They included concepts such as individuation, self-determination, non-judgmentalism and confidentiality (Midgley, 2001). They exerted a powerful influence in social work, and shaped the attitudes of generations of social workers, not only in the United States but in other countries as well.

While they have now been superseded by more sophisticated descriptions of social work values, they continue to be relevant today. Although these principles attained canonical status (Midgley, 2001), their ideological derivation was often criticized in the 1960s and 1970s. Some experts pointed out that social work's values were rooted in an individualistic culture derived from Western liberalism and, as such, were not universally shared (Council on Social Work Education, 1967).

The question of whether social work's liberal values are relevant to societies with very different value systems gradually became an issue in international social work. In

response to criticisms that social work's values were not relevant to culturally different societies, some scholars sought to demonstrate that there was a high degree of congruity between the profession's values and those of other cultures (Midgley, 1981). These publications concluded that social work values had universal applicability and were not a Western import unsuited to the cultural realities of other societies. Others expressed doubts about social work's value universality (Almanzor, 1967; Wijewardena, 1967).

As a result of these debates, social workers engaged in international activities began to reflect more critically on the relevance of Western social work to the cultural as well as economic and social realities of other societies. Much of the discussion focused on the developing countries of the global South, which were characterized by a high degree of cultural diversity and also by pressing problems of poverty and deprivation. Some writers argued that these problems required new forms of social work practice that focused directly on the needs of the developing societies (Nagpaul, 1972; Shawkey, 1972). As a result of these debates, notions such as "indigenization" and "authenticization" emerged in international social work circles to connote the need for appropriate theories and practice approaches suited to other cultures (Midgley, 1981; Walton & El Nasr, 1988). These ideas have gained wider acceptance and there is today, as Midgley (1989, 1994, 2001) suggests, a greater appreciation of the need to respect differences and develop indigenous forms of social work practice that address local cultural, economic and social realities.

Nevertheless, there are still many examples of the uncritical transfer of Western social work approaches to other nations. It is in the context of these developments that

some writers have asked whether social work's apparent acceptance of cultural and social diversity is, in fact, the best posture to take. They believe that social work does have universal values which all social workers should respect. For example, Otis (1986) criticizes the acceptance of cultural relativism in international social work, claiming that it is philosophically flawed and fails to address the complex issues of transferring social work to other societies. Although Otis writes from a minority perspective, his observations have implications for the position social work should take on difficult issues. Should the profession respect practices because they are institutionalized in other, different cultures, or should they challenge them? The issue of universalism is related to the question of social work's commitment to internationalism. As Midgley (2001) points out, internationalism is an ideology which, in contradistinction to nationalism, advocates greater international integration, the suppression of national identity and the dissolution of the nation state. Internationalists also favor the replacement of national governments by some form of global governance. Supporters of internationalism believe that transcending the nation state will foster social integration, enhance cooperation between peoples of different cultures and end international conflicts.

Some social workers such as Estes (1992) believe that it is only through the adoption of internationalism as a belief system that humankind can solve its pressing social problems. Like other people, many social workers will be uneasy about abandoning their national identities in favor of membership in an abstract global society. Despite the gradual emergence of a global consciousness, most people are closely identified with their countries and many are proud of their ethnic identity. Indeed, in

keeping with trends elsewhere, social work has made a commitment to respect and appreciate ethnic and cultural identity. It is extremely difficult to reconcile these different positions. However, it is possible to recognize the centrality of ethnic and national identity in many people's lives, and to respect these sentiments within a wider recognition of the role that international collaboration can play in promoting mutual understanding, tolerance and an appreciation of cultural difference.

As Midgley (2001) stresses, given the need to address the prevalence of ethnic and racial hatred in the modern world, an accommodation of this kind is urgently needed. However, it is clear that these difficult issues need to be more widely debated by the social work profession. The challenges of accommodating diversity within a wider internationally shared value system can only be met when the profession as a whole makes a commitment to discuss and understand the issues involved. This will also require that more social workers are exposed to these issues and that international social work becomes a more integral part of the profession's discourse.

Adult and Continuing Education Program Planning

This section provides an overview of adult education planning literature. There is also a thorough description of the theoretical perspective of Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006).

Reimagining Adult and Continuing Education Theory and Practice

Adult and continuing education is deeply embedded in the production and distribution of knowledge and power in society (Cervero & Wilson, 2001). However, in viewing day to day practice, it is often difficult to see educational pursuits as critical sites

of struggle for knowledge and power. Nevertheless, whether as adult and continuing education practitioners or academic scholars, it is crucial to be able to understand how the power relations in society -- within contexts and processes of globalization -- are manifested in the planing of educational programs, practices, and policies for adults. Because of what is at stake for everyone, we must begin to see and understand how these connections are made; we must understand the reciprocal relationships between our everyday educational work and the transnational systems in this era of globalization, and, we must begin to understand ways of acting in the face of these power relations. This is to understand that there are clear connections between the “how to” of adult and continuing education planners and practitioners, and the imperatives of “what for,” which connect the “why” of our work with the wider social, economic, cultural, and political systems in which we all dwell (p.xvii).

In our struggles for knowledge and power within the field of adult and continuing education our highest mission is about trying to change a world of inequities. However, in order to confront and change our world, it is necessary to have a vision of what society should be. In this task of “reimagining adult and continuing education,” we must understand that

The task of critical analysis is not, surely, to prove the impossibility of foundational beliefs (or truths), but to find a more plausible and adequate basis for the foundational beliefs that make interpretation and political action meaningful, creative, and possible (Harvey quoted in Cervero and Wilson, 2001, p. 279).

This is not an easy task and there are no easy solutions at hand. However, just as individual persons have a vision in mind when making the journey from home to host country, in a politics of power it is imperative that we see what matters: “[T]he struggle for knowledge and power is about the constitution of individual lives and the society we create” (p. 279).

Adult and Continuing Education Program Planning

Cervero and Wilson (1994, 1998) have observed repeatedly that in the area of adult and continuing education program planning, most planners do not see a reflection of their reality in the planning literature. In this regard, Cervero and Wilson (1994) note that:

[C]ertainly there is an abundance of theories for planning programs, as well as many books on specific aspects of planning, such as needs assessment, program evaluation, instructional design, administration, and management. Yet most practitioners consider that books about planning, even the best ones, go only part way toward capturing what it means to act responsibly in the world. Advice on how to plan is given, these practitioners say, as if the world in which they must plan were devoid of disagreeable people, nasty politics, and concerns about the economic bottom line. Thus, planners feel they are walking through quicksand and are getting advice about the characteristic land formations instead of a rope. (1994, p. xi)

As the authors suggest, the reality of adult and continuing education program planning is that the process is unclear, messy, ambiguous, contextually significant, and

very political. Thus, while there is no shortage of theories for program planning in adult education, in reality there is a large gap between existing theories and actual practice.

Schon (1987) elaborates on Schein's insights into the gap between theory and practice:

[T]he gap lies in the fact that basic and applied sciences are 'convergent', whereas practice is 'divergent'. [Schein] believes that some professions have already achieved, and that others will eventually achieve, 'a high degree of consensus on the paradigms to be used in the analysis of phenomena and ... what constitutes the relevant knowledge base for practice'....Schein also believes that the problems of professional practice continue to have unique and unpredictable element. One of the hallmarks of the professional, therefore, is his [or her] ability to 'take a convergent knowledge base and convert it into professional services that are tailored to the unique requirements of the client system,' a process that demands 'divergent thinking skills.' (pp. 45-46)

With the publication of *Planning Responsibly for Adult Education: A Guide to Negotiating Power and Interests*, Cervero and Wilson (1994) fundamentally altered the discourse on program planning in adult education. Before their book, the discourse about program planning in adult education revolved mostly around a purely technical-rational dimension of the process (Boone, 1985; Boyle, 1981; Sork & Busky, 1986; Sork & Caffarella, 1989). After their book, however, the discourse about program planning in adult education shifted substantially, and began to address the socio-political dimension and context being of primary importance in the planning process (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a, 1994b, 1998; Sork, 1996, 2000; Wilson & Cervero, 1997). Moreover, during this

time, the general thinking about planning processes in education has changed. Moving from an understanding of planning that was lock-step, phased and a linear process, education planners are now more likely to view it as social, political, and multidimensional. In this newly framed process, planners must assess multiple and usually conflicting interests, then negotiate these interests in contexts of historically evolving and pervasive power relationships. As Cervero and Wilson (1998) observe:

[T]he successful execution of technical planning tasks (for example, assessing needs, determining objectives, formatting programs) depends directly on the successful exercise of power in the service of specific interests. Thus, planning practice is more than technical task competence. Planning practice is a complex social and political process of negotiating power and interests....[W]hat lies before us is [the task of] trying to understand in greater detail the political exigencies of adult educators' daily work and how they practice the political craft of constructing adult education. (pp. 20-21)

Historically, the literature on negotiation in planning has been very prescriptive and lacks empirical evidence to show how people actually negotiate in context. Both Forester (1999) and Lax and Sebenius (1986) address the issue from prescriptive and empirical approaches. Yang's (1996) deep analysis of the literature on power and interests will be reviewed, and adds yet another dimension to the larger topic of negotiation. Elgstrom and Riis (1992) provide yet another way to understand negotiation through their discussion of substantive and meta-negotiations. Cervero and Wilson

(1998) and Umble (1998) both conduct empirical analyses of the substantive and meta-negotiations that occurred in several case studies.

Cervero and Wilson: The Social Turn in Adult Education Planning Theory

Although theories and models of program planning normally have not considered the role of stakeholders, many are beginning to advocate the need for more inclusive perspectives. Indeed, the broader adult education planning literature now recognizes that broadly-based stakeholders plan and shape programs (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a, 1994b; Sork, 1996, 2000; Sork & Caffarella, 1989). Moreover, they have begun to incorporate this insight into program planning theory development (Cervero & Wilson, 1998; Umble, 1998; Yang, 1998).

Adult and continuing education program planning literature has historically focused primarily on technical aspects of program planning (Boone, 1985; Boyle, 1981; Caffarella, 1988; Sork & Buskey, 1986). Familiar to most adult educators, these technical aspects of educational program planning normally include a multi-phase process of assessing needs, defining goals and objectives, selecting instructional strategies and learning experiences, selecting content and media, managing programs, and evaluating them (Tyler, 1949). Sork (1996, 2000) refers to these steps as those that fall along the technical dimension of program planning.

During the 1990s research began to focus attention on what Sork (1996, 2000) refers to as the socio-political and ethical dimensions of program planning. To this end, Cervero and Wilson (1994, 1998) have argued that program planning be understood as a social activity in which adult educators negotiate personal and organizational interests

within relationships of power. Their research has demonstrated that interests are causally related to which programs get planned. The central activity and ethical responsibility of planning practice is to negotiate whose interests will be represented at the planning table.

A number of studies in adult and continuing education have demonstrated the centrality of negotiating power and interests (e.g., Mills, Cervero, Langone, & Wilson, 1995; Umble, 1998). From this body of work we can say with some confidence that we know *what* adult educators do. We know relatively less, however, about *how* adult educators and other stakeholders in the planning process actually negotiate multiple -- and often conflicting -- interests in practice (Mabry, 2000; Yang, 1998).

In an attempt to strengthen program planning theory by describing the actual character of these stakeholder negotiations, Cervero and Wilson (1998) combined frame theory and negotiation to refine their analysis, and found this move useful to distinguish different types of negotiation that occurs in the social process of program planning. Thus Cervero and Wilson have begun to describe how stakeholders manifest their own power by both maintaining as well as by transforming relationships of power through employing both substantive as well as meta-negotiations (Cervero & Wilson, 1998; Elgstrom & Riis, 1992; Umble, 1998; Umble, Cervero, & Langone, 2001).

This move recognizes that planners and other stakeholders have strongly held notions of not only what needs to be done, but also how it should be done, and they develop and utilize tactical strategies to do so (Mabry, 2000; Yang, 1998). Planners use these tactical strategies to negotiate power and interests – practically and discursively - among the key stakeholders in their institutions to accomplish their objectives by either

maintaining or transforming relationships of power (Mabry, 2000). Indeed, these substantive and meta-negotiations strategies are often used simultaneously. Cervero and Wilson (1998) write about these phenomena:

Thus, substantive and meta-negotiations are simultaneously interwoven in daily practice...Using the metaphor of the planning table, we have shown how adult educators are always simultaneously negotiating about the important features of educational programs (substantive negotiations) and about the political relationship of those who are included and excluded from such negotiations (meta-negotiations). (p. 20)

In other words, planners employ both substantive and meta-negotiation strategies to alter the relationships of power among stakeholders in order to make it more productive for them. If schools of professional education are to rely on international education exchange to be an effective means through which to advance knowledge and skills, as well as implement policy, then effective program planning will play a crucial role. The social act of planning programmatic interventions *ipso facto* shapes programs (Umble, 1998). Just as importantly, these programs then contribute to the shaping of professional practice by those who participate in their development and implementation. Ultimately, these socially constructed programs impact the public's social behavior. Consequently, the manner in which (how) continuing education programs are planned influences significantly the quality and efficacy of the programs.

The Cervero and Wilson Vision of Planning Tables in Real World Contexts

The theoretical perspective of educational program planning developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006) frames educational planning as a “social activity whereby people construct educational programs by negotiating personal, organizational and societal interests in contexts marked by socially-structured power relations” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998, 2006). Four concepts structure the theory -- power, interests, negotiation, and responsibility. These concepts account for the world that planners experience, and define their actions, as well as prescribe their ethical obligations.

Guiding planning actions in real world contexts, Cervero and Wilson provide a toolbox for planning practitioners and researchers consisting of technical knowledge and skills, a framework for political analysis, and a normative standard, all of which are necessary for substantively democratic and responsible educational planning. Viewed through this lens, program planners engage in a process of negotiating multiple, historically developing, and intersecting interests in relations of power in their planning worlds. Through this process, stakeholders shape programs through their practical judgments, resulting in educational outcomes, and also social and political outcomes. Consequently, the result of their judgments in planning practice either reproduces, or changes, the social and political relationships that characterize their real worlds.

In addition, Cervero and Wilson have developed the metaphor of the planning table to describe, analyze, and interpret the dynamics of stakeholder actions in real world contexts, where factors such as race, class, gender, and political economy confound use

of more traditional frameworks (Cervero & Wilson, 1998, 2006). The planning table metaphor enables a critical vision of planning practice. This vision sees planning as a situated process, not just one of negotiation of power and interests, but also one requiring that an ethical determination be made. In the real world of multiple planning tables in varying contexts, this vision of planning frames a realistic process through which stakeholders make ethical determinations about whose interests actually get to the planning table.

Finally, this vision of planning enables a political interpretation of planning practice, asking who benefits from adult education and in what ways. This vision of adult education views it as a struggle for knowledge and power in social situations (Cervero & Wilson, 2001, 2006; Wilson & Cervero, 2001, 2003), in this case located in the planning spaces of the international academic exchange program in Georgia and Veracruz.

Conclusion

Because of the purpose and international context of the study, there has been an attempt in this chapter to provide insights into the relationship between globalization and higher education, particularly in postcolonial Mexican context, as well as educational responses to globalization processes. Because the study utilizes a theory of adult education program planning, there was a review of this literature. The latter included a description of the theoretical perspective of Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006), which frames the study.

Section One began with a brief description of globalization, and later included a definition and typology of differing accounts in the literature, culminating in a synthesis

and reconceptualization of these accounts, and their relationship to contemporary education systems in Mexico. Given the important historical variations in the globalization processes and the impact on postcolonial education systems in Mexico, some historical coverage of globalization in colonial context in Mexico was offered in Section One. Because of the importance of the relationship between neoliberal globalization and education, and the importance placed on the issue of commodification, this concept was discussed. Finally, some general trends in internationalization of higher education were described.

Section Two provided insight into issues of adult and continuing education program planning. Because it frames the study, there was a thorough description of the theoretical perspective of Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The aim of the research was to determine how the interests and negotiations of stakeholders – persons who affected a social work education academic exchange program (Mexico – U.S.A.), or whom the program affected – shaped it through their relational practice of educational program planning. This practice occurred among and between stakeholders with interests in social work education in Mexico and the U.S.A. The purpose of the study was to describe how stakeholders and stakeholder groups negotiate interests to shape a social work education academic exchange program.

The Study was rooted in a theoretical perspective developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006). This perspective holds that program planning is a “social activity whereby people construct educational programs by negotiating personal, social, and organizational interests in contexts marked by socially-structured power relations” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998).

The two research questions for the case study were:

1. What are the interests of the major stakeholders and stakeholder groups for the academic exchange program?
2. How have negotiations of interests among and between stakeholders affected the features of the academic exchange program?

Qualitative Research

This study employed qualitative research (case study) as its approach. Qualitative research is a broad approach to the study of social phenomena that is naturalistic, interpretive, and utilizes multiple methods of inquiry (Denzin, 1994). This form of research is conducted in natural settings rather than controlled ones; it assumes that humans use their senses to make sense of social phenomena, and it relies on a variety of data gathering techniques.

According to Rossman & Rallis (1998), qualitative research has two unique features: (1) the researcher is the means through which the study is conducted; and, (2) the purpose is learning about some facet of the social world. These characteristics are central to a view of learning through research in which the researcher is seen as a constructor of knowledge rather than a receiver of it (Eisner & Peshkin, 1990). From this perspective, the researcher learns by accumulating data, not reality itself, but rather representations of reality. The researcher transforms these data through analysis and interpretation into information. Ideally information can become knowledge when put to practical use through judgment and wisdom to address social issues (Lindblom & Cohen, 1979).

Merriam (1998) has identified five key characteristics of qualitative research. First, the understanding of meaning that people have constructed of their world requires an emic (insider's perspective) rather than an etic (or outsider's) view. Second, the role of the researcher is central to data collection and analysis requiring much sensitivity to the circumstances surrounding the data collection site. Third, while it is possible to

conduct qualitative research using only documentary evidence, the use of fieldwork as a medium is much more common. Fourth, qualitative research is inductive rather than deductive. Finally, the end product should be rich in qualitative verbal description, rather than quantitative numerical analysis.

This study was intended to be applied research. Traditionally, basic research has been distinguished from applied research (Chelimsky & Shaddish, 1997; Weiss, 1998). Basic research generates theory and produces knowledge for its own end, while applied research informs action and enhances decision-making. Basic research is judged by the explanations it provides, while applied research is judged by its effectiveness in helping policymakers, practitioners, and the participants themselves make decisions and act to improve the human condition (Patton, 1996).

Situated Qualitative Research of Stakeholder Elites

Given the purpose of the study -- to describe how stakeholder negotiations in program planning shaped a social work education academic exchange program – the focus was on stakeholder groups comprised of elites in Mexico and the U.S.A. These elite groups included administrators, faculty, practitioners, and even some students in the U.S.A. and Mexico. As Cormode & Hughes (1999) have indicated, researching “the powerful” poses significantly different methodological and ethical challenges from studying “down” (p. 299). The characteristics of those studied, the power relations among and between them and the researcher, and the politics of the research process differ substantially between elite and non-elite research. When studying elites, the researcher is a “supplicant,” dependent on the cooperation of a small number of people

with specialized knowledge, rather than a potential emancipator or oppressor (McDowell, in Cormode & Hughes, 1999, p. 299). Outside of political science, until recently little attention had been given to methods of elite research, in contrast to the large literature on general qualitative research methods. As a result, there is a significant “methodological gap” in the literature (Hughes & Cormode, 1999, p. 299).

This neglect reflects to some extent the perceived difficulties of gaining access to elite networks, as well as the political commitment of many social scientists to studying the less privileged. Nonetheless, the importance of studying those in positions of power is growing and worthy of attention (Sayer, 1985) because the gap between “haves” and “have nots” continues to widen in terms of income distribution, conditions of work, and ease of international mobility (p. 299). For example, Lasch (1995) and Sklair (1991) have both claimed that there is growing divergence between elite and non-elite opinion, with interests of some elites now tied more to the global system than to national territory.

Moreover, globalization, “glocalization” (Swyngedouw, 1992) and the rise of regional trading blocs (such as the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA]) are also impacting elite networks. While the geographic scope of networks of professionals, such as social workers, is expanding, the spatial scale at which elite processes like social work professional education exchange occur is also changing. More and more corporate elites – in this case educational administrators, faculty, professional practitioners, and other stakeholders – are now constituted “glocally”. In this “new economic geography” that describes spatial characteristics of globalization, “the social”, “the cultural” and “the economic” are understood as being interconnected and mutually self-constituting, these

socio-economic and political changes raise important questions about how to study these increasingly important actors and networks (Hughes & Cormode, 1999).

Characteristics of Elites: Control of Resources, Connectedness, Embeddedness, and Social Capital

When thinking of elites, sometimes one may think of the various types of individuals that are somehow “above the rest of us” (Orinas, 1999; p. 352). As C. Wright Mills (1959) indicated in his prescient *The Power Elite*:

As the means of information and power are centralized, some ... come to occupy positions ... in society from which they can look down upon, so to speak, and by their decisions mightily affect, the everyday worlds of ordinary men and women.

They are not made by their jobs; they set up and break down jobs for thousands of others ... They need not merely ‘meet the demands of the day and hour’; in some parts they create these demands and cause others to meet them. (in Orinas, p. 352).

Etzioni-Halevi (1993, 1994) defines elites as “those people who have an inordinate share of power, on the basis of their active control of resources” (in Orinas, p. 352). As Mills (1959) noted, “They are not the owners of the corporate properties, and yet they run the corporate show” (in Orinas, p. 352).

Even though elites do not own the corporate resources that grant them elite privilege, they possess other resources that can be regarded as essential characteristics of their elite position. For example, elites can be characterized by their involvement with a wide array of social relations. Quoting Orinas (1999):

It may be a contextual ... matter whether the elite status is based on ... extensive networks – or the other way around – but I take it as the defining characteristic of ... elites that they are amply ‘connected’. [P]artially elite power comes from their extended social networks, and their ability to act as connectors. (p. 353)

When studying elites, Oinas (1999) points to the importance of recognizing the role of these “manifold social relationships” in which elites are deeply enmeshed, including their social, political, economic, religious, and family networks (p. 353). Appadurai (1996) highlights the international dimension of “connectedness” among and between elites by claiming “[g]lobalization has shrunk the distance between elites” (Oinas, 1999, p. 353). As Oinas indicates,

The various sets of social relations in which [elites] are involved may remain disparate, but it can be seen as a part of their role to *make connections* between the various sets of social relations. This may function as an empowering resource for them. (p. 353 italics in original)

Because elites tend to be extensively connected means that they are embedded also in several sets of social relations. According to Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993), embeddedness in social relations endows elites with social capital (see also Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988). Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) define social capital as “those expectations for action within a collectivity that affect the economic goals and goal-seeking behavior of its members, even if these expectations are not oriented toward the economic sphere” (in Oinas, p. 353). In this view, embeddedness is seen as the relation

of actors to others, which affects their behavior, and may have positive consequences on their economic action. Quoting Orinas (1999) at length:

The social capital that actors can draw through their embeddedness may have various contents and may serve them in various ways; it may bring them information, introduce them to new ways of believing and behaving, provide access to external material resources, collaborative relations, solidarity, etc. This is the reason why connectedness is an especially effective resource for elite members in their social settings. The fact that they can draw on the social capital that they have access to through their connections to various sets of social relations differentiates them and makes them powerful in each of those sets. In local contexts this is especially the case if other local actors are more locally oriented. (p. 353)

To summarize, managerial elites in the local context can be regarded as power holders who derive their power from the corporate resources that they manage as well as from the resources that they gain through their local and extra-local networks. The stronger their respective corporation and networks are then the stronger their local power position tends to be .

Research Design

This study employed qualitative case study for its research design. Yin (1994; 2003) defined case study as:

A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between

phenomenon and context are not clearly evident... The case study inquiry copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as one result relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and as another result benefits from prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. (1994, p.13)

According to this definition, a case study investigate a complex phenomenon, uses many sources of evidence, and benefits from being rooted in an explicit theoretical perspective. The case studied in this research was the University of Georgia (UGA) – University of Veracruz (UV) Social Work Education Academic Exchange Program. The Study was rooted in a theoretical perspective developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006).

Yin (1994) explained that case studies “are the preferred strategy when ‘how’ or ‘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” (p.1). Therefore the case study approach was appropriate for this research because all of these conditions existed in the case of the University of Georgia (UGA) – University of Veracruz (UV) Social Work Education Academic Exchange Program. For example, this two research questions in this case study had both descriptive and explanatory goals, respectively (Yin, 1993, 1994). As Yin (1994) indicated, a case study is “descriptive” when its research questions begin with “what,” “where,” and “when;” on the other hand,

when a case study has research questions that address “how” and “why” phenomena, Yin labels it “explanatory”.

Data Collection

One of the strengths of the case study is its use of multiple methods for data collection (Yin, 1994; 2003). This study utilized open-ended, “expert” interviews, observation, participant observation, and document analysis.

Interviews

As Bodgan & Bilkin (1992) explain, the interview is “a purposeful conversation...that is directed by one in order to get information from the other” (p. 96). Further, Yin (1994) indicates that:

Interviews are an essential source of case study evidence because most case studies are about human affairs. These human affairs should be reported and interpreted through the eyes of specific interviewees, and well-informed respondents can provide important insights into a situation. (p. 85)

Bogdan and Biklan (1992) caution the researcher to be prepared to answer five questions prior to undertaking an interview. In response to their advice, the researcher prepared answers to these five questions as if they were asked by a stakeholder in the UGA – UV program. The first question was, “What are your going to do?” The prepared response to this question was “I will be interviewing you to gain an insight into the UGA – UV partnership related to social work education and international academic exchange.” The second question was “Will you be disruptive?” The prepared response to this question was “No, because I am here to listen and learn.” The third question was “What

are you going to do with your findings?” The prepared response to this question was “Analyze and publish them so that they may be of service to social work educators.” The fourth question was “Why us/me?” The prepared response to this question was “Because you can provide valuable insights into the issues in which I am interested.” The final question was “What will we get out of this?” The prepared response to this question was “A greater understanding of the current situation of social work education academic exchange.”

This study used semi-structured interviews as a primary data collection method in order to answer all the research questions. The researcher prepared specific questions (see below) that followed from the research questions. However, the researcher often recognized the need to be flexible during the interview process in order to maximize the inductive potential of the study.

To better prepare for researching the topic of social work education, the researcher completed a PhD level course in community development theory construction in the UGA School of Social Work. The researcher is fortunate to have the professor who taught this course as a member of the dissertation committee. The researcher has made three trips to Dalton State College, Dalton, Georgia to learn more about the program’s history from its primary shepherd during the 1990s, a former UGA assistant professor of social work. Consequently, the researcher believed himself to be familiar enough with the topic to avoid totally unstructured, informal interviews, and wished to keep the interview conversations within the bounds of the study -- social work education,

international academic exchange, educational program planning, and processes of globalization intersecting with exchange program contexts and histories.

The majority of formal interviews occurred between May and September of 2002 in Georgia, and during a first trip to Veracruz. Some follow-up interviews were conducted as conversations, without interview guides, during additional trips Veracruz in the summers of 2003, 2004, and 2005. Follow-up interviews were conducted in the same manner in Georgia during the same time frame.

Initial semi-structured interviews were conducted using an “interview guide approach” (Patton, 1996), in which the researcher used a list of “issues and questions.” These issues and questions did not always need to be addressed equally in all interviews, or in the same order, and so there was variation in each, depending on knowledge of the interviewees, their roles as stakeholders, time, etc. Importantly, however, the questions for the interview guide were drawn directly from the research questions for the study, as well as from literature in program planning, stakeholder negotiation of power and interests, and educational responses to globalization. Occasionally questions based on the guide were reviewed and reformulated somewhat for specific stakeholders before their interviews.

The basis interview guide included the following questions:

1. What are the most important accomplishments that you expect from the exchange program?
2. What are your major impressions of the program?

3. What are the main things the program has done to benefit you, or your program?
4. Is the program meeting your expectations? Why or why not? How do you know?
5. What kind of evidence would convince you that the program is effective and worthwhile?
6. What are the most important issues surrounding the program about which the stakeholders may disagree? How might research help to resolve those issues?
7. What are the main problems of the program?
8. How does the program operate, and what is your particular role in its planning and operation?
9. What effects of globalization have you witnessed in relation to the development of the UGA – UV exchange program?
10. Is the program a sufficient educational response to globalization in your context, or should other strategies, tactics, and/or content be added? If so, what else is needed?

All initial interviews were tape recorded and transcribed professionally. For the interviews conducted in Veracruz, translation from Spanish to English was performed by the researcher. A sample of these Spanish to English translations were then back-translated from English to Spanish to check for accuracy. This work was done by a woman from Veracruz, and the results proved the original translations to be very accurate.

Selection of Interviewees

Since the theoretical framework of the study dealt with how planners negotiate the interests of stakeholders (those who affect, or are affected by, the program), the first step in the data collection process was the identification of stakeholder groups. The researcher initially identified groups drawing from the Cervero and Wilson (1994) understanding of the five most immediate interest groups. These included learners, teachers, planners, institutional leadership, and the affected public.

Within the UGA and UV exchange program, a multitude and diversity of stakeholders were involved who affected the program and were also affected by it in various ways. To begin to identify these stakeholders within the two institutions, the researcher solicited the assistance of a former UGA School of Social Work professor, an important stakeholder in the exchange program who was involved in the partnership from its inception until 2001. This stakeholder then identified other key stakeholders from UGA and UV on the basis of formal position and past or present participation in the exchange program, reflecting Mirtoff's (1983) "formal position" and "social participation" approaches to stakeholder identification (p. 34). Reflecting also the Cervero and Wilson (1994) typology of affected interest groups, the key stakeholders in the UGA – UV partnership identified by this stakeholder included learners, teachers, planners, and institutional leadership. The fifth interest group identified by Cervero and Wilson, the affected public, was not included as a stakeholder group because it was beyond the scope of this study. Finally, the researcher decided on six stakeholder groups. For both the UGA and UV, administrators, faculty, students, and external were used,

totaling eight. An additional group, “other”, was used for those stakeholders external to both UGA and UV.

To further identify individual stakeholders within groups to interview, the researcher made inquiries among key stakeholders identified at the outset, and continued to do so as the study progressed. This “snowball” sampling (Bogden & Bilken, 1992, p. 70) involved the progressive identification of stakeholders by asking each interviewee for the names of other persons the researcher should interview. Because the majority of stakeholders were elites within the two university institutions, most were relatively easy to identify, and access to them was not difficult, although all did not agree to be interviewed. As mentioned previously, some interviewees were interviewed more than once, but for each of those, only one “formal” tape recorded interview occurred using the interview guide. Further along in the interviewee selection process, the researcher was informed by Burgoyne (1994), who instructs that a “purest” approach to stakeholder identification might proceed until “no new stakeholders are identified,” but in practice “researchers will have to ‘draw a line’ somewhere, in the context of their research purpose and such practical issues as their research access and the time and resources at their disposal” (p. 191).

Observation

Observation is an important method in qualitative research and was utilized as a data collection method in this study. As Patton (1996) indicates:

The value of observational data in ... research is that [researchers] can come to understand program activities and impacts through detailed descriptive

information about what has occurred in a program and how the people in the program have reacted to what has occurred. (p. 203)

In this light, data for this study was collected using field observations of social work professional and continuing professional education courses, seminars, conferences, and graduate practica that occurred during the 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 summer programs in Veracruz. During these observations, especially in 2002, the researcher took detailed field notes (Merriam, 1998) describing the physical environment in which the courses, seminars, conferences, and practica took place; the formal activities undertaken during these events; informal interactions and unplanned activities that occurred during these events; special terminology of importance to staff and/or participants; and nonverbal communication. Field notes were accompanied by “methodological and theoretical memos” concerning the methods used and the theoretical significance of the findings (Strauss, 1987).

Participant Observation

Participant observation is a data collection method that allows the researcher to observe the research setting as well as to become a participant in it (Patton, 1996). In this study, the researcher became a participant observer in some of the activities of the program described above. As participant observer the researcher is “fully engaged in experiencing the setting under study while at the same time trying to understand that setting through personal experience, observations, and talking with other participants about what is happening” (Patton, 1996, p. 207). Because the researcher in this study was also a student in UGA, participant observation occurred in courses as student and

lecturer, seminars in the same roles, conference attendance and presentation, and other activities while on site in Veracruz.

Document Analysis

Document analysis was another important case study data collection method (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Yin, 1994) that was utilized in this study. When engaged in document analysis, the researcher gathers important documents related to the program under study and analyzes them for relevant data. Such documents were helpful in explaining the course, its objectives and purposes, and the role of key stakeholders, especially for stakeholders who were inaccessible.. In the course of the study, the researcher analyzed institutional mission statements and reports, exchange program partnership agreements, correspondence, evaluation instruments and reports, conference presentations, program marketing materials, pre-travel preparatory materials, materials resulting from curriculum development collaborations, teaching and participant materials, course evaluations, and participant journals (See Attachment C for a list of documents).

Data Analysis

This case study used different data analysis methods for its descriptive and explanatory parts. This section describes the strategy and methods for each of these. Explanatory aspects of the study built on the descriptive aspects.

Analysis of Interviews

To allow the researcher to analyze the interests of program stakeholder groups, the first step in the analysis of interviews was to identify program stakeholders and

groups by categories. These categorical groupings were comprised of stakeholders with the same general organizational positions, roles, and purposes with regard to the program.

As mentioned above, the Cervero and Wilson (1994) typology of stakeholders was used initially as a guide to begin. For example, based on the Cervero and Wilson (1994) typology, stakeholder categories were grouped into the following ten categories: (1) institutional leadership – UV; (2) social work education students, undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education – UV; (3) faculty – UV; (4) program planners – UV; (5) other social work education and international education exchange leadership – Veracruz/Mexico; (6) institutional leadership – UGA; (7) social work education students, undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education – UGA; (8) faculty – UGA; (9) program planners – UGA; and (10) other social work education and international education exchange leadership – Georgia/U.S.A.. Finally, the researcher decided on nine stakeholder groups. For both the UGA and UV, administrators, faculty, students, and external were used, totaling eight. An additional group, “other”, was used for those stakeholders external to both UGA and UV.

Once arranged into stakeholder categories, the interview data was coded using a system described by Miles and Huberman (1984), “who suggest that researchers base codes on syllables related to the research constructs.” Thus a detailed coding scheme developed from prefixes derived from the theoretical framework that informs the study, and it was used to label theoretically relevant sections of the interview transcripts. Again recognizing the dynamic nature of data analysis in the qualitative research process, the researcher continuously revised the codes so that they included the concerns, claims,

issues, interests, evidence, and other data cited by interviewees, and be mutually exclusive. In this process, data sometimes was given multiple codes, for instance when interests were readily identifiable on the basis of claims. Other sections of data were sometimes given less specific codes, such as history of the program, and role of the interviewee in program planning. As suggested in the data collection section above, as the data were interpreted, the researcher frequently wrote theoretical memos indicating how the data fit with other study data and the research questions. These memos were intended to assist the researcher to give meaning to the data as a whole.

After the interviews were hand-coded, they were regrouped into larger categories, and then re-coded using appropriate codes from the coding scheme. The use of the tables function in MS Word was used extensively to compile, sort, and rearrange multiple tables consisting of research data. Using this procedure, the researcher was able to coalesce into themes the concerns, claims, issues, and interests of each stakeholder group, and then conduct further data analysis, such as comparing and contrasting the newly derived themes. Examples of data analyzed in this manner were interests, power and negotiation relations and tactics, outcomes, features of the programs, and themes for the conclusions of the study. Stakeholder group data was then edited into a narrative presentation of the claims, concerns, issues, and interests of the groups, as well as prose for other themes of data mentioned above. Interests were derived in at least two ways: first, in some cases, stakeholders made direct and clear statements of interests by stating their goals for the program; in other cases, however, the researcher needed to infer stakeholder interests from claims and concerns they raise about the program. Other data were used to support

the inferences being drawn from stated concerns and claims. Occasionally, when access to stakeholders was not possible, these data were obtained from document analysis.

Interests were accompanied by emic (participant or insider) perspectives on whether stakeholder interests were being met, evidence cited by them, and additional evidence they desired for program effectiveness as a response to globalization.

Following Merriam's advice (1998), in some cases, the researcher was able to draw on other study data to offer etic (researcher or outsider) about how well interests were being met. These data sometimes confirmed emic perspectives, the importance of which is discussed below in the problematic issues section.

Analysis of Documents and Observations

Documents were obtained and read, and relevant sections were identified and retained for their usefulness in compiling the case description. The researcher drew on sections of documents in order to make inferences in data analysis. Observations were written in a field notebook, and were reread and used to construct the case description, make inferences in data analysis, and to assist in answering the research questions for the study.

Explanatory Analysis

The researcher used a modified form of explanation building, a technique described by Yin (1994; 2003), for the explanatory portions of the case study. In explanation building, the researcher utilized in the analysis a theoretical perspective, which the case verified, occasionally failed to verify, and further developed given the contexts and aspects of the study. This technique was identical to analytic induction

described by Bogdan and Bilkin (1992) and Katz (1993). In this case, the data were analyzed according to the theoretical perspective of the study.

As mentioned previously, this study was rooted in a theoretical perspective of Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006). This perspective holds that program planning is a “social activity whereby people construct educational programs by negotiating personal, social, and organizational interests in contexts marked by socially-structured power relations (Cervero & Wilson, 1998).

Explanation building occurred after the descriptive sections of the analysis identified group interests and data on whether or not the interests were being met. The researcher then composed sections explaining how the program features were produced through negotiation of interests among the study stakeholders. The researcher analyzed the interview and observational data on the program’s history and context to interpret how various types of negotiations about and between interests and power relations had produced the program.

In this process of explanation building in the explanatory analysis, it was assumed that these negotiations would help explain the following: (1) how meta-negotiations contributed to the establishment of relationships among the UGA and UV staff, thus shaping who produced the program; (2) how the substantive negotiations on program were carried out, and their effects on the program; (3) whose interests were represented well, or poorly, in these negotiations; (4) the power relationships among and between stakeholders that shaped how negotiations were carried out; and (5) how the power

relationships among and between stakeholders were reinforced and/or changed as a result of the planning process and program itself.

Reliability and Validity

To achieve construct validity, a study must establish “correct operational measures for the concepts being studied” (Yin, 1994, p. 33). This study examined several constructs that had to be correctly defined and measured, including “concerns, claims, and issues,” stakeholders,” “interests,” “power,” among others. This study sought to achieve construct validity first by defining these terms according to the theoretical literature from which they were derived (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006; Guba & Lincoln, 1981). The researcher sought to maintain the integrity of the definitions of these terms throughout data collection and analysis.

In order to maximize the potential of this study to provide answers to the research questions, it was necessary to “triangulate” the data (Merriam, 1998). Merriam describes triangulation as the employment of “multiple sources of data, or multiple methods to confirm the emerging findings” (p. 204). As described above, the researcher used multiple sources of evidence (interviews, observations, participant observations, documents) to measure the existence and nature of these constructs. Yin (1994) also advises this method to increase construct validity “because the multiple sources of evidence essentially provide multiple measures of the same phenomenon” (p. 92).

In addition to triangulation, two additional strategies to enhance internal validity were employed. These were peer examination and making explicit the biases of the researcher. During the course of analyzing findings, the researcher solicited the advice of

colleagues and committee members, especially the Major Professor and Committee Chair, Dr. Ronald Cervero. Further, the researcher attempted to address personal biases, and remain aware of them throughout the study. Internal validity (Yin, 1994) refers to “establishing a causal relationship, whereby certain conditions are shown to lead to other conditions, as distinguished from spurious relationships” (p. 33). The causal relationships explored in this study involved how stakeholder interests gave rise to the features of the exchange program through a process of negotiation.

Reliability

Reliability, “demonstrating that the operations of a study ... can be repeated with the same results” (Yin, 1994, p. 33), supported by a clear description of the procedures that are followed to collect and analyze data. However, because this research investigated processes under change, complete replication of the study is not possible. Although reliability could be supported by peer and member checks (Guba & Lincoln, 1981), Merriam (1998) advocates that rather than using the term “reliability” in qualitative research, the terms “dependability” or “consistency” should be employed (p. 206). Merriam explains that “rather than demanding that outsiders get the same results, a researcher wishes outsiders to concur that, given the data collected, the results make sense – they are consistent and dependable” (p. 206). Techniques that assisted in this interpretation of reliability were making explicit the assumptions and theoretical underpinning of the study, triangulation, and detailed explanations of how the data were collected and findings emerged (Merriam, 1998). All these procedure were be employed in this study to enhance its qualitative reliability.

External Validity

Firestone (1993) describes three arguments for a study to be generalizable: (1) sample-to-population extrapolation, normally associated with survey research; (2) case-to-case translation; and, (3) analytic generalization. While the data in this study were collected from all major stakeholder groups in Mexico and the U.S.A., the stakeholders interviewed were not randomly selected nor interviewed in large enough numbers for sample-to-population to be generalizable. Consequently, regardless of the findings, the researcher was not able to make a legitimate statistically valid claim that interests found are generalizable to interests of similar stakeholders or exchange programs outside of this research context.

Case-to-case transfer is a form of generalizability that relies on readers to decide whether a case applies to their practice setting (Umble, 1998). The detailed descriptions provided by this case study and the issues surrounding it assisted readers to determine whether the findings fit their practice. In analytic generalization, research findings are not generalized to a population, but to a theory. As Firestone (1993) has indicated, “[t]o generalize to a theory means to provide evidence that supports that theory” (p. 17). Within the experimental social research tradition, this is the type of generalization that has been claimed normally, in which results of experiments that test hypotheses deduced from theory are used to support, fail to support, or further a particular theory (Cook & Campbell, 1979). In regard to case study research, findings can be viewed through the lens of a theory to look for ways in which they support, fail to support, or further that particular theory (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Yin, 1994). While this research did not test

a theory, it did analyze and view a program in light of the literature that views planning as a social process negotiated by stakeholders within power relationships (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a, 1994b). Thus the findings supported and extended some of this theoretical perspective about how program planning occurs.

Problematic Issues

Because this study involves situated transcultural (Mexico – U.S.A.) research of elites, unique methodological and ethical challenges involving the characteristics of those studied, the power relations between them and the research, and the politics of the research process had to be addressed. Hughes and Cormode (1999) have identified three sets of challenges that stand out above others in this type of research. First, the researcher in this study needed to understand the multi-faceted and sometimes contradictory aspects of his positionality. This means going beyond the essentially “reified notions” that have characterized much of the writing about reflexivity in qualitative research (Ward & Jones, 1999). In particular, issues related to social, racial, class, and gender privileges were constantly reflected on by the researcher. Second, it was of vital importance for the researcher to recognize that the elite interviewees, and the researcher himself, were situated within social, economic, and political networks and structures. The researcher had to understand that these structures shape and are shaped by history, actors’ values, relationships, and interactions with those on the periphery and outside of the networks (Mullings, 1999; Oinas, 1999). The structure of these networks and the positions of informants and the researcher within them impacted the research process from its inception to the publication of findings.

Third, because this study explored program planning processes among and between stakeholder elites in Mexico and the U.S.A., it was crucial to maintain awareness of the realities of the transcultural research contexts. In these socially constructed, transcultural contexts, the researcher had to understand that stakeholder actions were enabled and constrained in part by socio-economic and political contextual features (Herod, 1999; Mullings, 1999). The spaces and scales of these contexts were continuously being renegotiated and reshaped over the history of the study, given the rapidly changing and increasingly globalized world in which the program was situated. This is to say also that in the spaces in which the research was conducted, geography and locality mattered.

Conducting Open-ended Interviews with Foreign Elites

Herod (1999) has recognized that conducting interviews with foreign elites is a process that is qualitatively different from one of conducting interviews with one's own nationality or with non-elite foreign nationals. As Herod cautions, because of this difference there were issues of this study that needed be problematized in the research process, especially "transcultural communication and understanding" and "access" (p. 311). Moreover, when problematizing the issues of conducting this type of research, two changes -- "one epistemological, the other political-economic" -- suggest that the practice of interviewing foreign elites is likely to become much more common in the future (Herod 1999, p. 313). This is due in part to the second change suggested here, one that relates to the advance of the processes of globalization and "the material transformations that are occurring within the global political economy" (p. 314). In regard to the

epistemological change suggested by Herod and its impact on research, because non-positivist methodologies have come to prominence in recent years, researchers have increasingly turned to interviewing as a method of data collection. Consequently, as interviewing grows in frequency over time, so too is it likely that the number of foreign-born elites interviewed by researchers will grow, even for those who conduct their field work in their home locality.

While there are many issues for the researcher to keep in mind when using this method, one in particular stands out for Herod (1999), the issue of positionality. While there were many issues that were important to consider when conducting interviews as part of the data gathering process in this study, the one issue that was most problematic when interviewing the foreign stakeholder elites was the cultural positionality of the researcher. The presumed validity and meaningfulness of the knowledge they produced was also problematized. The researcher recognized that in conducting interviews with stakeholder elites of Mexican nationality, he was sometimes at a disadvantage because he could never completely understand the cultural complexities of their world. Consequently, the validity of this research could have seen to be a reflection of the researcher's positionality.

Herod disagrees, however, with the full extension of this notion and, in an important amendment to the emic/etic distinction (Merriam, 1998) mentioned previously, he cautioned the researcher that what this classic dichotomy prevents one from recognizing is that:

[T]he research process is a social one in which *both* interviewer and interviewee participate in knowledge creation and, consequently, although the ‘outsider’ and the ‘insider’ may shape this process in different ways, it makes little sense to assume that one version of this knowledge is necessarily ‘truer’ in some absolute and ‘objective’ sense. (p. 314)

Researcher Bias and Access

Because the study was situated in two countries, the issues of privilege and access were large and affected the challenge of planning and implementing the research plan in both the U.S.A. and Mexico. While access was gained initially through internal university stakeholders, the researcher had to take special care not to leverage his privileged access in a way that might have caused bias in the study (See Herod’s comments above). The requirement of traveling between the U.S.A. and Mexico posed additional challenges, as did the internal travel requirement within Mexico. Also, the researcher had to interview and conduct document analysis using Spanish language. Because of the researcher’s background, which included university work in Mexico and Peru, no undue problems were encountered in general communication. However, because Spanish is not the researcher’s native language, challenges did exist both in normal communication, as well as in acquiring specialized vocabulary in the field of social work, and in the dialect and slang used in Veracruz. Moreover, translation of interview text was challenging because of unique (and sometimes non-translatable) meanings that are embedded within each language.

The issue of bias caused by decades of travel, research and work in Latin America, and particularly Mexico, was a real issue for the researcher. Because of many experiences in this region - fond memories, friendships, hardships and difficulties, as well as witnessing social injustices - the researcher had to strive at all times to be objective, and not to voice political opinions that could have caused bias in data collection. On the other hand, because of the researcher's extensive experience in negotiating within culture, bureaucracies, and geography of Mexico, some advantages were carried into the research context. In particular, the researcher was very aware of time and space differences between the U.S.A. and Mexico that could have served to cause significant frustration.

Research Timeline

The dissertation research consisted of the following tasks and deliverables:

1. Scouting Trip to Jalapa, Minatitlán, and Poza Rica, Mexico: Early summer, 2002. The first task was a trip to Jalapa in order to scout the research field site, organize local support, establish rapport with locals and initiate collaboration with university professors.
2. Review of the Literature: Summer, 2002 until Spring, 2007. The second task consisted of a final review of the literature.
3. Refinement of Research Methodology and Methods: Summer, 2002 until Fall of 2006. The third task consisted of refinement of the research methods and protocol, including the final development of data collection instruments.

4. Data Collection trip to Jalapa, Minatitlán, and Poza Rica, Mexico: Summer, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005. Data collection consisted of a combination of document review, participant observation, observation, in-depth “expert” interviews, and informal conversations in Mexico and the United States.
5. Data Collection in Georgia: Summer, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005. Data collection consisted of a combination of document review, participant observation, observation, in-depth “expert” interviews, and informal conversations in Mexico and the United States.
6. Data Analysis: Fall, 2002 until Spring, 2007.
7. Presentation of Findings: Spring, 2007.

CHAPTER FOUR

CASE STUDY PLANNING TABLES

The purpose of this chapter is to situate the planning tables in this case study for the reader by describing their key contextual factors. This chapter contains five sections: 1) review of the theoretical framework of the study; 2) description of contextual factors of the institutions in the UGA – UV social work education exchange program; 3) description of contextual factors in the places in the UGA – UV social work education exchange; 4) biographies of people in the exchange program, and, 5) stages of development in the exchange program. The aim of this chapter is to provide foundation for the reader to assist in understanding the analysis and interpretation contained in subsequent chapters. The foundation presented consists of the personal, organizational, and social contexts in which stakeholder groups and their planning tables were located in the exchange program. Limitation of space allows mention of only a critical subset of all contextual factors of the exchange. These pertain to culture, history, geography, political-economy, and institutional structures, as well as brief biographical descriptions of the stakeholders and the worlds in which they practice. All of these factors, and many more, combined to shape multiple, historically developing, and intersecting planning tables.

The Study was rooted in a theoretical perspective of educational program planning developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006) . This

perspective frames educational planning as a “social activity whereby people construct educational programs by negotiating personal, organizational and societal interests in contexts marked by socially-structured power relations” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998, 2006). Four concepts structure the theory -- power, interests, negotiation, and responsibility. These concepts account for the world that planners experience, and define their actions, as well as prescribe their ethical obligations.

Guiding planning actions in real world contexts, Cervero and Wilson provide a toolbox for planning practitioners and researchers consisting of technical knowledge and skills, a framework for political analysis, and a normative standard, all of which are necessary for substantively democratic and responsible educational planning. Viewed through this lens, program planners engage in a process of negotiating multiple, historically developing, and intersecting interests in relations of power in their planning worlds. Through this process, stakeholders shape programs through their practical judgments, resulting in educational outcomes, and also social and political outcomes. Consequently, the result of their judgments in planning practice either reproduces, or changes, the social and political relationships that characterize their real worlds.

In addition to having used the Cervero and Wilson theoretical framework, their metaphor of the planning table was used in this study to describe, analyze, and interpret the dynamics of stakeholder actions in real world contexts, where factors such as race, class, gender, and political economy confound use of more traditional frameworks (Cervero & Wilson, 1998, 2006). The planning table metaphor enables a critical vision of planning practice. This vision sees planning as a situated process, not just one of

negotiation of power and interests, but also one requiring that an ethical determination be made. In the real world of multiple planning tables in varying contexts, this vision of planning frames a realistic process through which stakeholders make ethical determinations about whose interests actually get to the planning table.

Finally, the vision of planning used in this study enables a political interpretation of planning practice, asking who benefits from adult education and in what ways. This vision of adult education views it as a struggle for knowledge and power in social situations (Cervero & Wilson, 2001, 2006; Wilson & Cervero, 2001, 2003), in this case located in the planning spaces of the international academic exchange program in Georgia and Veracruz.

Contextualizing Planning Tables: Institutions

During the time frame of the case study, varying motivations existed within universities for developing international programs including common interests in research and economic development. However, a significant force pushing the growth of international programs in North America was the increasing ethnic diversity of the population, driven substantially by immigration (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000). Although international programs have existed in colleges and universities for at least a century, the 1990s was a decade of rapid expansion in the internationalization of American higher education (Desruisseaux, 1999). During the decade increases were substantial in numbers of foreign students studying at U.S.A. institutions, and U.S.A. students studying at foreign institutions. Despite educational funding cutbacks due to global economic crises, the demise of the Cold War, and effects of September 11th, recent trends in

international study pointed to growing vitality of exchange programs (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000).

International experiences originating from within schools of social work in the U.S.A. have mirrored those of higher education. The past 20 years saw considerable increases in interest in international issues within schools of social work education (Asamoah, Healy, & Mayadas, 1967). Moreover, Boyle and Cervantes (2000) indicated,

Global interdependence has created important avenues for international involvement by reshaping the social work environment in the following ways: a) international issues and events, especially movements of populations, have changed U.S.A. domestic practice and demand new knowledge and competencies; (b) social problems are commonly shared by developed and developing countries to an unprecedented degree; (c) the political, economic, and social actions of one country directly affect other countries' social and economic well-being; and, (d) exchanges are made possible by extraordinary technological developments, such as the Internet (Asamoah, Healy, & Mayadas, 1967). (p.12)

From the perspective of social work in Mexico, there was a growing need to for international exchange programs with the U.S.A. to acquire knowledge and resources to better prepare students and faculty in an age of increasing professional specialization and expansion of knowledge, as well as to address critical issues of social well-being.

Although historically based on a development and social action model, during the 1990s social work education and practice in Mexico changed its orientation increasingly towards a clinical model. Thus, there was a desire within the field of social work in

Mexico to adopt and diffuse knowledge of clinical social work from international education exchange with the U.S.A. On the other hand, from a U.S.A. perspective, there was a need for international social work exchange programs with Mexico to develop Spanish/English, bilingual, culturally competent social work scholars and practitioners who could effectively address a range of education and practice issues related to the growing Hispanic population in the U.S.A.

These distinct Mexican and U.S.A. social work educational responses (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000; Boyle, Nackerud, & Kilpatrick, 1997) arose from forces of globalization supporting internationalization in both U.S.A. and Mexican universities. In particular, educational responses to globalization processes were being pushed along by commitments of social work education stakeholders at Mexican and U.S.A. schools of social work to broaden the preparation and experiences of their students, faculty, and graduates (Boyle & Cervantes, 1997). However, it was important to recognize also that educational responses to globalization were occurring within contexts of institutional internationalization (Gacel-Avila, 1999) in each country, with commitments from social work education stakeholders at the all levels within and outside university systems.

From a traditional planning viewpoint, observable planning practice for the UGA – UV academic exchange program began in 1990, when a small number of stakeholders from the two universities came together to begin negotiating the exchange. In the beginning of the UGA – UV academic exchange, planning activities focused only on social work education, which represents one boundary of the case. Over time, a broader UGA -- UV exchange program developed, expanding into other academic areas. These

included: 1) elementary education, secondary education, and early childhood education in the College of Education; 2) child development, housing, and textiles in the College of Family and Consumer Sciences; and 3) several departments of the College of Agriculture, the College of Veterinary Science, and some ancillary services, such as landscape management and auxiliary business management. While all of the stakeholder groups and their interests of the broader exchange intersected and influenced the dynamics of the social work exchange program, any substantive description and analysis of them is beyond the scope of this study.

Historically, both UGA and UV had numerous official agreements for academic exchanges with universities in other countries, most of which amounted to little more than signing ceremonies. Indeed, there was a previous agreement between these two universities that resulted in little activity, substantially due to lack of involvement among individual colleges and departments. During the 1990s, however, the UGA - UV social work exchange began to acquire life and recognizable form. Reinforced by the 1996 Olympic Games experience in Atlanta, UGA began to define itself as an institution of national and international significance. At the same time, Georgia was becoming very active in the resettlement of refugees, especially in Atlanta, due in part to the presence of CARE, the Carter Center, and other international non-governmental organizations. Due to economic and population growth in Georgia, the state became a destination for immigrants and migrant workers, the majority of whom came, and continue to come, from Mexico.

During the same period of time in Mexico, the University of Veracruz aspired to become a premier public university in that country, especially targeting internationalization of the institution. At least as far back as the Spanish colonial era, the Port of Veracruz – indeed, all of the Veracruz region -- has been an area with strong interests rooted in commerce, export, trade, and communications. Given the area's export of citrus (the largest in the world), coffee, oil, and petrochemicals, among many other commodities, during the 20th century it was common for Veracruzanos to establish new relationships, both inside and outside of their state and country.

Because of the history of international exchange, the government of the state of Veracruz was very receptive to helping to facilitate internationalization efforts when communication began between UGA and UV. Given these factors, including the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994, stakeholders in Georgia and Veracruz gained awareness of the discourse and goals of proponents of neoliberal globalization. These goals included North American integration, with reform and privatization of a wide variety of institutions and their activities, such as commerce and trade, education, environmental regulation, health and human services, immigration, law enforcement and criminal justice, social security systems, and taxation.

NAFTA proposed opening completely the trade frontiers between the three North American countries by 2010. In signing the agreement, the country ranked 48th on the United Nations Human Development Index entered into a partnership with countries ranked in the top five. Shortly after joining NAFTA, Mexico also officially became a member state of the Organization for Economic cooperation and Development (OECD).

These moves underscored the importance of science and technology-driven modernization for a series of Mexican governments over the past two decades. By entering NAFTA and OECD, the Mexican government took on the difficult challenge to bring the country "in a relatively short 15 years, to an economic and social level that will allow it to compete with major economic powers" (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1994, p. 141).

Policies such as NAFTA, and its likely successor, the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (FTAA), may appear to have little to do with issues of educational policy, planning, or international academic exchange programs. In public discourse, NAFTA was widely described as an economic pact that opens the economies of industrialized nations (United States and Canada) to a major Third World country (Mexico). Closer scrutiny of NAFTA revealed another scenario. Less than a decade after its implementation, it was clear that the treaty was part of a larger set of "globalization" processes driving changes in social relations, policies, and services in all three North American countries. Indeed, history may judge the metaphorical "NAFTA" to be one of the most important North American social policy decisions of the 20th century (Poole, 1996).

Although NAFTA provided tremendous opportunities for "bottom-up" (globalization from below) formation of social movements and grassroots coalitions, this study was situated more in context of how NAFTA has expanded "top-down" (globalization from above) opportunities for elite participation in planning international consortia and joint projects in higher education and training. For example, in 1994 the Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC) was

formed. CONAHEC was “a trilateral consortium advancing collaboration, cooperation and community-building among higher education institutions in North America” (CONAHEC, personal communication, April 7, 2002). In addition, many private foundations granted funding to drive the process of international convergence, and NAFTA-related research expanded rapidly. Two key funding organizations that facilitated closer North American relations in education and training were the Institute of International Education (IEE), and the U.S.A. - Mexico Commission for Educational and Cultural Exchange (COMEXUS).

In the area of North American social work education, the Task Force for International Social Work of the Council for Social Work Education (CSWE) took the lead in this area by urging faculty exchanges and joint research efforts and by working toward the development of a national accreditation body in Mexico. Several schools of social work provided leadership as well, including the University of Texas at Pan American, Tulane University, University of Calgary, University of New Mexico at Las Cruces, University of Toronto, Mexican National School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, and University of Georgia (Poole, 1996).

Many similarities existed between the two universities in this case study, and between their respective states of Veracruz and Georgia. As large public higher education systems with major missions for teaching, public service, and outreach, UGA and UV served large and diverse geographical regions and constituencies. Both states had three major sub-regions, coastal plains, piedmont (sierra), and mountains, each of which required different approaches to outreach and extension activities. Both institutions

served states with abundant natural resources and large agricultural and agribusiness sectors. There was remarkable congruence between the two institutions in the academic programs offered. On the cultural level, both institutions represented states with diverse populations, strong local and regional identities, with histories of formality and respect for local traditions.

There were significant differences between the academic institutions, and their respective states and nations. Asymmetrical factors existed from the start of exchange planning, especially major disparities of economic resources. In Georgia, during the 1990s, UGA benefited from substantial increases in funding. Supportive governors and legislatures in Georgia invested substantial resources in higher education, especially at UGA, which were driven by sustained economic and population growth.

By contrast, in Veracruz -- indeed, in all of Mexico -- the vast majority of the population experienced harsh economic conditions, both before and throughout the formal history of the exchange. These factors impacted planning tables in myriad ways, both positively and negatively, for all stakeholders and stakeholder groups.

Socioeconomic and political influences on planning contexts derived in part from the Mexican economic crisis of the 1990s, one of a series of financial crises in that country, the first of which erupted in 1983, when Mexico defaulted on its foreign debt. Other economic factors influenced stakeholders and planning tables in complex ways, including a long-term decline of oil and petrochemical production and revenues, especially in Veracruz, harsh international monetary policies and austerity programs, and multiple processes of globalization, leading to the NAFTA accord.

Significant academic differences existed between the universities. One major difference between institutions was academic credentials of faculty and administrators, represented by the fact that most all UGA faculty possess doctoral degrees from institutions across the U.S.A., while UV faculty are primarily graduates of UV, with few obtaining degrees beyond the master's level. Curricular structure was very different between the schools, with UGA having more open and flexible curricula than at UV, especially when the exchange began. Differences in epistemology and professional structures existed. In recent decades at UGA, social work knowledge production and professional practice were organized around a technical-rational, clinical model, with complex professional practice and governance structures. On the other hand, at UV, social work knowledge production and practice methods were organized for decades around a Marxist community model.

The types and levels of degrees offered by the two universities differed in important ways. The terminal degree for social work in Georgia was the Master of Social Work (MSW), while the terminal degree at UV was the Licenciatura degree, which was of a higher level than a Bachelor's Degree, but not the equivalent of an MSW. Further, as suggested above, the state of Georgia had a license law for social workers and a strong professional association. The profession in Veracruz lacked a statewide professional organization. Moreover, job opportunities for Georgia graduates in social work were excellent, while employment opportunities for graduates of social work in Veracruz were few.

Finally, the organizational processes, administrative structures, and the academic cultures at UGA were more open and informal than those at UV, which were strictly hierarchical and very formal. At UGA, as the oldest land grant university in the U.S., with over 200 years of history behind it, much more institutional evolution had occurred than at UV, which is still a relatively young state university, founded in 1944.

Contextualizing Planning Tables: Places

Stakeholders were situated in planning tables located in diverse planning spaces of the international academic exchange program in Georgia and Veracruz. The purpose of this section is to describe contextual factors and features affecting planning practices that occurred in the places located within and between Georgia and Veracruz.

The Borderlands

Traveling to Mexico by bus on Autobuses Adame, it was a 24 hour trip from Chamblee, Georgia, to reach the border at Brownsville, Texas. Compared to U.S.A. domestic bus travel, traveling on Adame was much faster, because other than stops for refueling and using the bathroom, only two others were made between Atlanta and the border. The first stop always occurred during the middle of the night, somewhere on the interstate in Louisiana, when the bus was pulled over by INS, and they did their ritual walk through with no intention of “catching” anyone. Travelers without any documents, real or forged, always faked sleep, and they were never awakened. The others carried all sorts of identification -- driver's licenses, the intentionally vague Mexican Consulate Card (it had neither birthday or any type of identification number), forged documents, an occasional passport. As the young, bilingual, INS officer walked up, then back down the

isle, those awake warily held up and displayed their identification, while the officer shined a flashlight, glancing quickly, sometimes at the documents, more often at their faces, as if he were actually conducting a real inspection, before he said “goodnight, have a safe trip” and exited.

The other stop was in Houston, at the Adame station there, where the bus usually arrived around noon, after the 8pm departure the previous evening. After waking in the morning, the driver made the necessary bathroom break, then like the night before, he or she put on one or two films to entertain the passengers. Some watched, others slept more, and around mid-day the bus pulled into a crowded Houston station, where passengers waited to make connections to all parts of Mexico. Passengers bound for Veracruz from Chamblee had a three hour wait, so they ate in the Adame cafeteria, and waited to change buses for Brownsville/Matamoros. Before they were allowed to board, however, the most confusing process imaginable for switching baggage from one bus to another occurred, one unique to this particular bus station, something akin to Three Card Monte, but without the con. Occasionally, just before departure at 3pm for the border, armed police would come onto the bus and arrest a fugitive on the run back to Mexico.

On arriving in Brownsville around 7pm, passengers always stopped at a one room Adame terminal to change dollars for pesos. During one trip to Brownsville, the bus arrived too late for connections in Matamoros, so passengers were allowed to sleep on the floor of the small Adame office. After changing money, they returned to the bus to cross the U.S.A.-Mexican border, in route to the Matamoros city bus terminal, perhaps the most basic, dirty, and ugliest in all of Mexico. But first, after crossing the Rio Grand,

they were required to stop and pass through immigration, not U.S.A. immigration, but Mexican immigration. For various reasons, to avoid this formality, there were always one or two who got off in Brownsville, then somehow made their way to the Matamoros terminal on their own. For an American, the immigration stop was a relatively painless experience, given the privilege of U.S.A. citizenship. After stepping off the bus, all passengers were ordered to proceed to the waiting room, then were asked to show their documents. Unlike most cuing situations in Mexico, no one hurried or pushed to be first in this line. Some did not have any documents, usually indigenous from Chiapas or Guatemala, or Central American orphans of war from the 70s and 80s, and some had lacked any form of state sanctioned identification since birth. After being confronted by Mexican immigration officials, always one or two of these people never returned to the bus.

For Americans, after presenting identification, they now had to go to a window to purchase a Mexican travel card, a sort of visa, for \$30 cash, then they were sent back to the bus alone. From there, one could see the Mexican ritual of the mordida (bribe) taking place, a sort of accepted transaction between persons of authority and their subordinates that is endemic in social relations in Mexico. One by one, each passenger was thoroughly shaken down by their own Mexican immigration officials. They were ordered to unpack everything, then all items in every bag and box were inspected. Everything was unloaded, laying as a sprawling mess on the ground, their most cherished possessions fingered and violated by the inspectors, after which every traveler was

whispered a price, then discretely passed a few \$20 bills to the guards. Then they were ordered to repack, and get back on the bus.

As they re-boarded, there was always anger from many, sometimes to the point of tears. Even though traveling from north to south was the easiest part of their transcontinental journey, this aspect didn't diminish what they had just experienced at the hands of their own, with it reinforcing their condition of marginalization on both sides of the border. Soon the bus pulled out, and within five minutes it arrived at the Matamoros terminal.

The Mexican bus system is the eighth wonder of the world. At just about any time, day or night, for very little money, one can travel by bus from almost any place in the country, to almost any other place in the country, usually in brand new vehicles. After a cramped night of sleeping upright on the trip from Atlanta to Matamoros, most looked forward to the increase in comfort afforded by domestic Mexican bus service. Traveling from Matamoros to Veracruz city at night, if money allowed, many preferred to travel on the luxury night bus. This was for two reasons. First, after arriving around 8pm in Matamoros, it was always the next direct bus to leave for Veracruz. More importantly, it allowed for sleeping in a fully reclining seat with leg supports, almost the comfort of a bed. A maximum of space and comfort were the guiding principles with this class of service, as there were only 20 seats total on a full size bus, compared to more than three times that number on an average coach.

The bus for Veracruz city departed Matamoros at 9pm, and everyone slept comfortably through the state of Tamaulipas, until reaching its southern most city, the

port of Tampico, where a 30 minute stop was made. The drivers took advantage of the rarity of having an American on board, and invited him to accompany them for tacos at a favorite all-night restaurant across from the terminal. The food was outstanding, but the company was better, with conversation of everyone's mutual enjoyment, including the American's, of the late night talk radio program beamed across Mexico to nocturnal bus and truck drivers, *los amos del camino*, "Lovers of the Road".

The bus departed Tampico around 3am, soon crossing into the state of Veracruz. At first light, as the bus neared Poza Rica, the northern-most city of significance in the state, one was struck by sensual stimuli all around, an unmistakable realization of having passed into the tropics, which so often represents depictions of paradise and Eden. Encircling and covering every square centimeter of ground was outrageously lush tropical vegetation, extending up over cloud covered rolling hills, an almost indescribable beauty. But this beauty was contrasted by frequent images of living conditions marked by extreme poverty and subsistence level living condition. It seemed unjust how poverty like this so often situates in places of extreme wealth in natural resources, with the concomitant exploitation that presents and persists in these phenomenally productive tropical lands.

Before reaching Poza Rica, the bus stopped briefly to check a tire in Casa Roja. Walking down Pancho Villa Street there, one was impressed by quaint houses with their fresh coats of pastel paint, rooftop satellite dishes and swing sets out back. This impression, however, was an illusion, because almost no one lived in Casa Roja anymore. The families -- usually men first, followed later by women and children -- have been

swept north by a desperate torrent that has carried floods of emigrants to the United States in the last twenty-five years, leaving widening swaths of Mexico increasingly abandoned.

More than 3,000 people had left Casa Roja, and fewer than 2,000 remain in the mountain village, which is situated between Tampico and Poza Rica. Many of those who remained spoke of their hometown as a ghost town. One described his brother, a university-trained engineer, who migrated North 9 years ago. He had built an especially nice pink house on a desirable corner lot for his wife and three children. But on his annual visit home two years ago, the scholar-turned-bricklayer packed up his books and took his family north. “The question we always ask is ‘Will our community survive?’”, said the former college Teacher's brother.

For generations, many Mexicans made temporary journeys North and sent money home. But now a shift in migration patterns was squeezing parts of Mexico’s rural core nearly to the brink of extinction.. Moreover, because of the growing U.S.A. law enforcement presence on the border, illegal crossings were becoming more difficult -- even deadly – and more and more migrants and their families were choosing to stay in the United States, rather than risk repeated crossings.

The bus left this dying place, and soon reached the terminal in Poza Rica. After a 20 minute stop there, the bus continued south reaching out to the Gulf coast, traveling along it for the next few hours, passing beautiful coconut palm-lined tourist beaches, popular with middle class Mexicans. Along this coast highway there were an abundance of roadside stands selling all kinds of tropical fruits and juices, grilled fish and meats, and

tourist trinkets. There were seemingly hundreds of cheap motels and campgrounds, many of which were only half constructed, some abandoned long ago. Although rare, occasionally an adventurous American traveler could be seen along this stretch of beaches.

Nearly two days into the journey, by mid-afternoon, the bus finally reached the hustle and bustle of the port of Veracruz, the largest in Mexico, and entered its modern bus station, which resembled an airport terminal in scale and design. It was now incredibly hot and humid. From Veracruz city, the last leg of the trip was a forty-five minute bus ride to Xalapa, for which shiny new Mercedes buses departed every ten minutes. Now filled with commuting professionals and college students, the bus ascended the winding road into the mountains, passing through clouds upward towards Xalapa.

On arrival in Xalapa, one was struck by the beauty of the city, and a feeling of satisfaction came. Although there was little doubt, this brought immediate confirmation that the long journey had been worthwhile. The real reward was the opportunity to stay for the next few months in a place like Veracruz. As the bus entered Xalapa, the air was noticeably cooler, as it traversed hilly, narrow, cobbled streets, many lined with colonial architecture, with most buildings fronted by incredibly colorful and beautiful flowers. On many streets there were parks, restaurants, hotels, artists, and coffee shops; the latter sold European pastries and sandwiches, and rich strongly-brewed Veracruz coffee, made fresh from beans that were grown on plantations encircling the city.

Measured by state sanctioned borders, after making the trip from Georgia to Veracruz just described, one was now officially in Mexico. In reality, however, travelers had entered into the borderlands, much of it of Mexican social construction, over 2000 miles and 48 hours ago, when they arrived at the Adame station in Chamblee, Georgia. At that point, the traveler had entered into the world of the “continentero”, or continental traveler, an honorific title used for and by the many men and women who make transcontinental journeys to the United States in search of economic opportunities and monetary reward. The American traveler in line was perhaps one of few legally allowed to be in that place due to the laws of state. Legislated laws don't reign supreme in borderlands, however. Legal or not, this American traveler was already a foreign tourist in Chamblee.

As they waited for the bus, most in line were heavily loaded down, taking all sorts of things with them back home. Most items were consumer goods -- televisions, electronics, computers, children's toys, furniture, clothing. Paradoxically, because of NAFTA, most all of these things were available in Mexico, often at similar or lower cost, and one wondered why they bothered to take all this home. After reflecting about their lives, it seemed possible that if those old things were discarded here and replaced in Mexico, the new possessions would lack the memories and meanings embedded in the old. So they carried those old things back with them, not because of reason, but because of emotion and meaning. Often, however, what they could not take back (or bring with them) were their loved ones, and as we boarded and pulled away, it was heart wrenching experience for many.

That evening in Chamblee, the American traveler joined a large group of *continenteros* on a bus carrying mostly young men, a few women, some with children, and a half dozen elderly, looking haggard and worn, but always smiling. Many had not returned home for years, after having toiled, almost invisibly, laboring in our new economy. They had come together to board yet another bus, in a continuous series of bus rides carrying them across a lifetime. That night the origination was Chamblee, Georgia; its destination was home, somewhere in Mexico or Central America. Each of them in that place, and all collectively, had contributed their diverse human experiences, which had ebbed and flowed, come and gone, both near and far, made up of human responses to globalization, representing in that moment a snapshot of the borderland called Chamblee,.

The United Mexican States

The United Mexican States, or simply Mexico, is located in southern North America, bounding the United States on its north, the North Pacific Ocean on its south and west, the Caribbean Sea and Central American countries of Guatemala and Belize on its southeast, and the Gulf of Mexico on its east. Mexico is a federal constitutional republic, comprised of 31 states, and the federal district, Mexico City (Krauze, 1998). The area represented by Mexico contains nearly 2 million square kilometers, ranking it the 6th largest country in the western hemisphere, and 15th largest worldwide. In 2005, the population was roughly 108 million, making it the 11th most populous country, and the largest Spanish-speaking country (United Nations Human Development Report, 2006).

From the middle of the twentieth century until the 1970s, Mexico experienced substantial economic growth (Krauze, 1998; Fuentes, 1996; Meyer, 1995). After the oil shocks of the 1970s, which precipitated a rapid rise in the price of oil, the Mexican economy became heavily dependent on sales of petroleum. As a result of its newfound oil wealth, Mexico's rating in the international credit markets soared, and the country gained an ability to borrow substantial amounts in an aggressive lending market awash with “petrodollars.” In an easy credit, low interest rate market, Mexico borrowed heavily for a variety of costly projects that resulted in a large international debt. Inevitably, the markets eventually turned, however, and petroleum prices declined sharply, causing Mexican revenues from the sale of petroleum to decline in similar order.

As the oil markets and revenues turned down, interest rates also rose sharply, making it increasingly more difficult and costly for Mexico to service and refinance its debt. Consequently, in 1983, Mexico announced to its creditors that it was no longer able to pay its debt, and then defaulted (Fuentes, 1996; Krauze, 1998; Meyer, 1995; Preston & Dillon, 2004). This milestone event in 1983 shook the international capital markets, with wide reaching, long term negative economic consequences, not just for Mexico, but for most of the developing world. For Mexico, it was the first in a series of financial crises, which continued in lockstep fashion for more than twenty years. These continuing crises of the Mexican economy wrought widespread economic hardships, due in part to harsh austerity measures imposed on Mexico by international creditors, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank.

In the 1990s, global capitalism's cyclic fluctuations struck again, leading to the collapse of the Mexican Peso. Yet again this led to imposition on Mexico of harsh austerity measures, which restricted social spending, slashed purchasing power for the majority, pushed many into unemployment, underemployment, and poverty, and negatively impacted quality of life in the country (Fuentes, 1996; Krauze, 1998). Later in the decade, capitalism's cycle turned again, this time somewhat in Mexico's direction, enabling neoliberal economic “reform” policies to fuel export revenues through increased trade with a booming United States economy (Preston & Dillon, 2004). Given the never-ending cycle of capitalism, however, the Mexican economy fell into recession in 2001, triggered in normal fashion by a downturn in the United States economy, on which Mexico had become increasingly dependent (Preston & Dillon, 2004).

Like almost all countries in the Americas, to remain a participant in the global capitalist economy, Mexico had little choice but to adopt structural adjustment programs (SAPs) imposed from above by the government, and from abroad by international financial agencies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The purpose of the SAPs was to promote and support a new pattern of accumulation based on the export of manufactured goods (Valenzuela, 1991). These policies were both caused by, and a condition for (Carnoy, 1984), a specific form of “neoliberal globalization” dominated by the interests of large multilateral corporations, financial groups, and capitalist governments that expressed new international and national power relations (Navarro, 1998).

The rapid application of these policies with little apparent consideration of the huge asymmetry between Mexico and most members of the three regional economic powers (North America., Western Europe, and East Asia), and their national economic and social situations, caused serious problems. The measures taken in Mexico to constitute this new pattern of accumulation not only sacrificed national interests, but provoked unstable and inequitable growth with dramatic negative social impacts (CEPAL, 1996a, 1996b).

Understanding the impact of neoliberal policies in the Americas at large was useful, too, in placing Mexico in context of a broader phenomenon in Latin America. For example, the richest 10 percent of the population in Brazil earned 69.5 times more than the poorest 10 percent of the population; 49.7 times more in Mexico; 41.7 times more in Columbia; 36.4 times more in Chile; and 25.6 times more in Argentina (Latin American Weekly Report, March 4, 1997, pp. 114-15). Even though some countries in the region improved their economic growth and employment rates in recent years, the lowest income strata did not benefit. In Argentina, a country with relatively *less* inequality, the earnings of the top 10% were only 8 times higher than the lowest in 1975; but by 1991 they had increased to 15 time more; and by 1997 to greater than 25 times more (emphasis added, Latin American Weekly Report, January, 12, 1999, p. 20). Moreover, predictions for the future were rather grim, particularly in terms of unemployment, since the region's economically active population (ages 16-64) was expected to increase from 292 million in 1995 to about 460 million in 2025, with the largest increase in the 15-24 age group (Latin American Weekly Report, September 8, 1998, p. 415)

Although the SAPs were considered to be mainly economic policies, they required a profound reform of the state that was another face of the integral reorganization of Mexican society that occurred during the past 25 years. There were different propositions regarding the content of this reform (Vellinga, 1997), but the one widely recognized as instrumental obeyed neoliberal premises (Vilas, 1995). The so called social reform of the state was crucial to social policy, since it redefined in economic terms the conception of how to satisfy social needs and involved all major social welfare institutions. In this particular field, the World Bank played a dominant role which explained the striking uniformity of this reform in the countries of the Americas.

According to the the CIA World Fact Book, Mexico was the 13th largest economy in the world as measured in Gross Domestic Product in purchasing power parity. The World Bank considered the Mexican economy to be an Upper-middle-income economy [rated higher than Brazil and China, which were considered Lower-middle-income economies] and they had the highest per capital income in Latin America. In 2005, inflation reached a record low of 3.3% in Mexico, and foreign debt was decreased to less than 20% of GDP. It had free trade agreements with the United States, Canada, the European Union, Japan, Israel and many other countries. According to the World Bank (2006), income per capita in Mexico was \$6,790, the highest in Latin America. Mexico was firmly established as a middle-income country, but it still faced huge gaps between rich and poor, north and south, urban and rural. According to the recent poverty report prepared by the World Bank (2006), 48% of the population was living in poverty in 2004,

an improvement over the 64% of the total population living in poverty following the 1995 Peso crisis.

In 2005, roughly 25% of the Mexico's workers, many of whom were not participants in the formal economy, were farmers, leading to much human displacement in the countryside due to agricultural “modernization” pushed by reform policies and trade agreements. Mexico produced a diverse group of agricultural products, such as grains, sugar, fruits, vegetables, cotton, coffee, although these are increasingly threatened by cheaper exports from trading partners with highly mechanized agricultural sectors, like the United States (Fuentes, 1996; Krauze, 1998; Meyer, 1995; Preston & Dillon, 2004). Livestock and fishing industries were also important to the economy. Mexico's chief ports were Veracruz, Tampico, and Coatzacoalcos on the Gulf of Mexico, and Mazatlán and Ensenada on the Pacific coast.

Continuing a trend from Spanish colonialism, during which large quantities of precious metals were mined and exploited, Mexico was one the world's leading producers of many minerals (Krauze, 1998; Fuentes, 1996; Meyer, 1995). As mentioned previously, petroleum reserves were one of its most valuable assets, totaling about three quarters of Mexico's exports during the late 1970s and early 1980s (Krauze, 1998; Fuentes, 1996; Meyer, 1995). In the mid-1980s, exports of petroleum fell drastically, but recovered in the 1990s and beyond, although there was growing concern that reserves were being depleted rapidly (Preston & Dillon, 2004).

In recent years, next to oil, the most important source of exports were the assembly plants, called maquiladoras (Krauze, 1998; Meyer, 1995; Preston & Dillon,

2004). Beginning in the early 1980s, there was significant foreign investment in the maquiladora industry, primarily from the United States and Asia (Meyer, 1995; Preston & Dillon, 2004). These assembly plants import, duty free, unassembled parts of various products, then leverage, low-cost, mostly female, labor to assemble “competitive” finished goods for export, primarily to the United States. The economic importance of the maquiladoras was surpassed only by tourism in Mexico (Preston & Dillon, 2004). Because of the fast growth in emigration, monetary remittances from Mexican citizens working in the United States grew tremendously, becoming increasingly more important to the economy (Preston & Dillon, 2004).

Major trading partners were the United States, the European Union, Japan, and Canada (Preston & Dillon, 2004). Mexico was a member of the United Nations, the Organization of American States, the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Latin American Integration Association, and the Latin American Economic System. Mexico was the only Latin American nation belonging to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), joining it in 1994 (Krauze, 1998; Preston & Dillon, 2004). Mexico has more free trade agreements than any country in the world (more than forty). NAFTA remained the country's most important trade agreement because the United States was Mexico's largest trading partner, totaling more than 85% of trade. Trade with the U.S.A. and Canada had tripled since NAFTA was signed in 1994.

Major economic concerns in Mexico included dependence on the U.S.A., low wages, underemployment and unemployment, and few advancement opportunities for the largely indigenous populations in the impoverished southern states (Fuentes, 1996;

Krauze, 1998; Meyer, 1995; Preston & Dillon, 2004). Moreover, inequitable income distribution was a major problem, with the top 20% of income earners accounting for 55% of income. Sharp race, class and gender contrasts in Human Development were also a serious problem in Mexico (United Nations Human Development Report, 2005).

Spanish was spoken by 94% of the population, and used for all official purposes. 6% of the population spoke an indigenous language, and 3% could not speak Spanish (United Nations Human Development Report, 2005). Mexico had created bilingual education programs in many indigenous rural communities. Racially and ethnically Mexico was diverse, with three major ethnic groups (Fuentes, 1996; Krauze, 1998). Mestizos are of mixed Spanish and Amerindian indigenous people, and accounted for 60% of the population. Amerindians indigenous accounted for 30% of the population; and Europeans about 10%. European Mexicans were mostly Spanish; but minorities also included Afro-Mexicans, Middle Easterners and East Asians. Substantial Chinese and Korean communities existed in Mexicali, Baja California, and Mexico City.

The culture of Mexico reflected a complicated history, which fused Mesoamerican civilizations with the Spanish culture, the latter imposed during its 300-year colonization of the country (Fuentes, 1996; Krauze, 1998). Major influences from the United States had shaped Mexican culture, but this is a two-way process, in which, arguably, recent significant influence has traveled from south to north (Preston & Dillon, 2004). Mexico boasted a wealth of regional cultures that is unique in North America (Fuentes, 1996; Krauze, 1998). Every region in Mexico had a distinct culture, languages, and indigenous arts, which were resisting the homogenizing processes of globalization.

Mexico had no official religion, and there was significant persecution and material retribution of its religious institutions following the Mexican Revolution of 1910 (Krauze, 1998; Fuentes, 1996). Regardless, the 2000 census reported 88 percent of Mexicans identified as Catholic, 7 percent Christian, 0.5 percent other religions, and 3.5 percent non-religious (Mexico, 2007). Following Brazil, Mexico had the second largest population of Catholics in the world. Beginning in the 1970's, however, the government supported the use of birth control, despite the country being predominantly Roman Catholic, and the birth rate had fallen by two-thirds (Preston & Dillon, 2004).

Mexico had made substantial advances in education during the past thirty years (Preston & Dillon, 2004). In 2004, the literacy rate was at 92.2%, and the youth literacy rate was 96% (Mexico, 2007). Nine years of primary and secondary education were mandatory. Bilingual education programs had existed for indigenous populations since the 1960s, and text books were produced in at least a dozen languages (Preston & Dillon, 2004).

During the past thirty years enrollment in higher education increased substantially in Mexico (Preston & Dillon, 2004). With 289,000 students, the public National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) was the largest and most prestigious university in Mexico, founded in 1551 (Krauze, 1998). Three Nobel laureates and the vast majority of Mexico's presidents were among its alumni. UNAM conducted 50% of the scientific research in the country, and had satellite campuses (including some in the U.S.A.) and research centers around the country. In 2006, UNAM ranked 74th of the Top 200 World University Ranking according to The Times Higher Education Supplement,

the highest ranked Spanish-speaking university in the world. The second largest university was the public National Polytechnic Institute (IPN). In addition, most states in Mexico had at least two public universities

There has been rapid growth of private universities in Mexico, including the Monterrey Technological and Higher Education Institute (ITESM), which was ranked by the Wall Street Journal (2005) as the 7th top International Business School worldwide. ITESM had thirty-two secondary campuses, apart from the Monterrey Campus. Another major private university was Mexico's Autonomous Technological Institute (ITAM), which in recent years had prepared many leaders in government, business, and academia. Two other important private schools were the University of Puebla (UDLAP), and the Ibero-American University.

There were three major political parties in Mexico (Preston & Dillon, 2004). The National Action Party (PAN) was a center-right, conservative party, in which former President Vicente Fox and current President Felipe Calderón were members. The Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), which was founded as a socialist party after the revolution, was struggling to transform itself into a centrist party since its historic defeat in 2000. The Party of the Democratic Revolution (PRD), is a center-left, socialist party.

Following the Mexican revolution of 1910, the Mexican Constitution was approved in 1917, which constructed a federal republic (Krauze 1998). Similar to the United States, the Mexican constitution called for separation of powers into executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Historically, the executive was the most powerful, with substantial presidential power, who decreed and executed the laws of the Congress. The

President was both the head of state and head of government, and served as the commander-in-chief of the military. Although election fraud had been prevalent throughout Mexican history, the president was elected directly by voters and was limited to one term only, for six years, called a Sexenio. During the past ten years, Congress played an increasingly important role, because in 1997, for the first time in nearly a century, opposition parties formed a majority over the PRI in the legislature (Preston & Dillon, 2004). Legislative power was vested in both the government and the two chambers of the Congress of the Union (Krauze, 1998). These were the Congress, the Senate, and the Chamber of Deputies. The Judiciary was independent of the executive and the legislature.

Federal elections held in July, 2000, marked the first time in 71 years that an opposition party Presidential candidate defeated a candidate of the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), which had held power since 1929 (Preston & Dillon, 2004). As a result, Vicente Fox of the National Action Party (PAN) was sworn in as President of Mexico on December 1, 2000, serving until 2006. On December 1, 2006, Felipe Calderón Rhinoceros, also from the PAN party, was sworn in as President (Mexico, 2007).

State of Veracruz

Veracruz State was located in east-central Mexico on the Gulf of Mexico. In 2005, Veracruz had an official population of 7,110,214, although due to high migration to the area and rapid growth of undocumented communities, the actual figure was likely significantly higher (Veracruz, 2007). Nonetheless, official figures ranked Veracruz as the third largest Mexican state, following only the Federal District and the state of

Mexico. The capital city of Veracruz was Xalapa. Veracruz had more than 210 municipalities. The area of Veracruz was inhabited by pre-Columbian cultures, including one of the oldest, the Olmec (Krauze, 1998; Meyer, 1995). The first European landing was made by the Spanish conquistador Hernia Cortes in 1519, and Veracruz became a Mexican state in 1824. During the Mexican-American War, the United States, led by General Winfield Scott, landed forces by sea in Veracruz, who then continued overland to assault and capture Mexico City. The subsequent treaty provided that Mexico give up one-third of its national territory to the United States.

Besides the capital of Xalapa, major cities in Veracruz state included Mexico's largest port in Mexico, the city of Veracruz (Krauze, 1998). Other important cities were Cordoba, Coatzacoalcos/Minatitlán, and Poza Rica. Veracruz bordered the Mexican states of Tamaulipas to the north, Oaxaca and Chiapas to the south, Tabasco to the southeast, Puebla, Hidalgo, and San Luis Potosi to the west, and the Gulf of Mexico to the east. Veracruz territory occupied 27,683 sq miles (71,699 sq km), stretching 430 miles (690 km) along the Gulf of Mexico, and reaching from 30 to 100 miles (48–161 km) inland (Veracruz, 2007). Veracruz rose from its tropical coastal plain into its more temperate valleys and highlands of the Sierra Madre Oriental. The state shared with neighboring Puebla the highest mountain in Mexico, Citlaltépetl.

On its coastal plains and throughout most of the state the climate in Veracruz was hot and humid. Most of central Veracruz was mountainous, and on their foothills, the climate was cool and humid. At higher altitudes in the mountain region, the climate became colder, and often it rained heavily, especially from June to October, when

Veracruz was threatened by hurricanes. Abundant rainfall and extremely fertile soil provided nearly perfect conditions for the cultivation of numerous crops. Veracruz state was a leading national producer of coffee, sugarcane, corn, and rice, and produced a wide variety of other crops, including substantial production of tobacco (Krauze, 1998; Meyer, 1995). The production of citrus was voluminous in Veracruz, which was one of the largest producers in the world. Cattle raising was practiced in the semitropical and temperate zones, and from the tropical forests, hardwoods, chicle, and rubber were harvested.

The state's principal natural resource and dominant industry was oil, and Veracruz had more than one-fourth of Mexico's petroleum reserves, along with several of the country's refineries (Krauze, 1998; Meyer, 1995). The mountains contained relatively unexploited deposits of gold, silver, iron, and coal. Veracruz ranked high in Mexican production of foods and beverages, as well as chemical manufacturing and metalworking. Mexico's only nuclear power plant, Laguna Verde, was located in Veracruz, on its northern coast of the Gulf of Mexico.

Xalapa

Xalapa (Xalapa Enriquez, or Jalapa) city was capital of Veracruz state, located on the slopes of the Sierra Madre Oriental (Meyer, 1995). In the year 2005 census, it reported a population of 413,196, although due to high migration to the area and rapid growth of undocumented communities, the actual figure was likely significantly higher (Xalapa, 2007). Xalapa was located in a productive agricultural region of fertile valleys and had a cool climate. Beautiful parks and artificial lakes, and the proximity of

interesting villages and ruins, and of scenic Mt. Orizaba, made Xalapa a popular destination for Mexican tourists (Meyer, 1995). The site of a pre-Columbian city, Xalapa was captured by Hernán Cortés in 1519, and was a strategic commercial center for goods heading for the port of Veracruz during the Spanish colonial era, but began to decline in commercial importance in the late 18th century (Krauze, 1998). The city was the seat of the University of Veracruz.

Xalapa was also referred to as the "Athens of Veracruz" because of the strong cultural influence of its three major universities, the University of Veracruz, University of Xalapa and University Anáhuaca of Xalapa, and also for the wide variety of cultural events in Xalapa, like its museums, and its musical, theatrical, and street arts (Meyer, 1995). Xalapa had the largest collection of Diego Rivera's paintings in Mexico. Jalapeño chile peppers originated in the area..

Minatitlán

Minatitlán was a city located in the southeastern region of the Mexican state of Veracruz (Meyer, 1995). The 2005 official population was just below 400,000, although due to high migration to the area and rapid growth of undocumented communities, the actual figure was likely higher (Minatitlán, 2007). As in many Mexican towns and cities, recent growth had continued at a rapid pace due to internal migration from more rural areas because of negative impacts on the agricultural sector from cheaper imports from trading partners (Preston & Dillon, 2004). Minatitlán was the municipal seat for the surrounding municipality of the same name, which included Las Choapas, Coatzacoalcos, and Jáltipan (Meyer, 1995). Minatitlán city and its river port were located on the Isthmus

of Tehuantepec, on the Río Coatzacoalcos, 20 miles (32 km) from its mouth on the Gulf of Mexico.

When founded in 1822 as Paso de la Fabrica, the settlement's inhabitants included North Americans, French, and Germans, but the area did not prosper until oil was discovered in the region in the 1940s (Meyer, 1995). A petrochemical center, Minatitlán refined and distributed oil found on the isthmus. One of Mexico's six major oil-refining facilities was located there, and depending on market conditions, the complex processed approximately 300,000 barrels a day, and refined diesel, fuel oil, and gasoline (Minatitlán, 2007). Mexico's first refinery was built in Minatitlán, and there was a network of gas and oil pipelines, the most important of which crossed the isthmus to the port of Salina Cruz, on the Gulf of Tehuantepec (Meyer, 1995). Because of the importance of PEMEX to the local economy, the overall quality of life in Minatitlán was extremely dependent on trends in the petroleum and petrochemical industries. As in most PEMEX dominated areas, ongoing issues such as fluctuating oil markets worldwide, environmental pollution, and privatization of state industries (such as PEMEX) have had significant negative impacts on Minatitlán (Preston & Dillon, 2004; Meyer, 1995). Although the local economy was heavily depended on the petroleum industry, lumber, corn, fruits, sugar, rice, and tobacco were also cultivated in the area (Meyer, 1995).

Poza Rica

Poza Rica (or Poza Rica de Hidalgo) city and its surrounding municipality was located in the northern region of the Mexican state of Veracruz (Meyer, 1995). The official population was around 300,000 inhabitants, although due to high migration to the

area and rapid growth of undocumented communities, the actual figure was likely significantly higher (Poza Rica, 2007). The area was intensely tropical with popular beaches within one hour. Poza Rica was about 220 km from Mexico City. Unlike most Mexican cities, Poza Rica was relatively new, founded in 1951, and had contemporary architecture with a modern look.

The petroleum industry (PEMEX) was the main feature of the industrial landscape in Poza Rica, and early rapid growth of the region had come primarily from the lure of employment in oil well exploration and drilling, and petrochemical operations, which had fallen dramatically in recent years. As in many Mexican towns and cities, recent growth had continued at a rapid pace due to internal migration from more rural areas because of negative impacts on the agricultural sector from cheaper imports from trading partners (Preston & Dillon, 2004). Because of the importance of PEMEX to the local economy, the overall quality of life in Poza Rica was extremely dependent on trends in the petroleum and petrochemical industries. As in most PEMEX dominated areas, ongoing issues such as fluctuating oil markets worldwide, environmental pollution, and privatization of state industries (such as PEMEX) have had significant negative impacts on Minatitlán (Preston & Dillon, 2004; Meyer, 1995).

As one of the largest and most populous cities in Veracruz, Poza Rica was an important industrial and commercial center, and a central hub for several road transportation (Meyer, 1995). "El Tajin," a world famous archaeological zone containing large pyramids, was only 15 km away. Mexico's only nuclear power plant, Laguna

Verde, was south of Poza Rica, situated on the Gulf of Mexico. A branch of the University of Veracruz was located in Poza Rica.

The United States of America

The United States of America (USA or U.S.A.) was often referred to colloquially as “America”, and this was especially true in Mexico. Moreover, in Mexico, the term “American” was used almost always to refer to a person from the USA -- although, of course, all persons from the countries of the Americas are “Americans”. Consequently, to reflect accurate usage of these two terms in context of the study, they were used often in these ways throughout this text.

The USA is part of North America (excluding overseas territories), extending from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, and sharing land borders with Canada and Mexico (Johnson, 1999). The United States was a federal constitutional republic, with its capital in Washington, D.C., and consisted of fifty individual states, and a number of outlying territories and other federally administered areas.

At over 3.7 million square miles (9.6 million km), the United States was the third largest country in the world in total area, the majority in the lower 48 states (Johnson, 1999). The largest state, Alaska, was in the far northwest region of the North American continent, and Hawaii was in the mid-Pacific. The United States was the third most populous nation, with over 300 million people (United States, 2007).

The economic system of the United States was capitalist, in which corporations, other private firms, and individuals made most microeconomic decisions, while governments took a smaller role in the domestic economy, although the combined role of

all levels of government was 36% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Beeghley, 2004). The U.S.A. had a smaller social safety net than that of other developed countries, and regulation of businesses was less than the average. The largest sector in the United States economy was services, which employed about three quarters of its work force (Johnson, 1999). The economy was fueled by an abundance of natural resources such as coal, petroleum, and metals. However, the country depended on other oil producing countries, including Mexico, for much of its energy. In agriculture, the U.S.A. was a major producer of corn, soy beans, rice, and wheat. The U.S.A. was a major exporter of goods such as airplanes, steel, weapons, and electronics. Canada accounted for 19% of the United States' foreign trade, followed by China, Mexico, and Japan (United States, 2007).

The United States was constructed by large-scale historical immigration and had a complex social structure as well as a wide array of household arrangements, making the U.S.A. one of the most ethnically and socially diverse nations (Beeghley, 2004). Among racial demographics, Whites, remained the largest racial group, although the percentages of whites among the general population was declining (Beeghley, 2004; Susser & Patterson, 2000). African Americans, who were largely the descendants of former slaves, constituted the nation's largest racial and third largest ethnic minority. Demographic trends included the immigration of Hispanics from Latin America, with approximately 35 million Hispanics in the United States (United States, 2007). Immigrants from Mexico made up about 66% of the Hispanic community, making them second largest ethnic group in the country.

The per capita income of the United States was among the highest in the world, at \$21,587 for individuals (U.S.A. Census Bureau, 1999), and \$43,318 for households (U.S.A. Census Bureau, 2003). While income was higher than in western Europe, it was distributed less equally (United Nations Human Development Report, 2006; Beeghley, 2004). Since 1975, the U.S.A. had a "two-tier" labor market in which virtually all income gains had gone to the top 20% of households, with most of those gains accruing to the very highest earners within that category.

Education in the United States was a combination of public and private institutions. Public education was supported by state and local governments, rather than the federal government.. Donations from alumni, and increasingly private corporations, contributed large amounts of funding to both public and private universities, and most of the top university endowments in the world were owned by universities in the United States (Beeghley, 2004). Tuition at private universities was generally much higher than at public universities. The United States had 168 universities in the world's top 500, 17 of which were in the top 20 (Times Higher Education Supplement, 2006). The United Nations assigned an Education Index of 99.9 to the United States, ranking it number 1 in the world (2006). The United States had a basic literacy rate at 98% to 99% of the population over age 15. As for educational attainment, 27.2% of the population aged 25 and above had earned a bachelor's degree or higher, and 84.6% had graduated high school, although there were major disparities based on race and class..

State of Georgia

As the year 2000 census attests, Georgians are living in a very different state today than ten years ago. In fact, with the nation's third-fastest growing Hispanic population (rising officially by 362 percent in the 1990s), Georgia's Hispanic growth, the vast majority of Mexican heritage, is beginning to resemble traditional point-of-entry states California, Texas, and Florida (U.S.A. Census Bureau, March 3, 2002). But just as important as numbers, the rapid immigration of Hispanics during the 1990s is impacting not just Georgia's demographic composition, but also changing social relations and cultural practices in its institutions. For example, in 1990 only 3.9 percent of the Dalton, Georgia, public school children were Hispanic, but by 2001 that figure had skyrocketed to 51.5 percent (Georgia Magazine, 2001). Consequently the Dalton schools have begun to "import" Spanish-speaking teachers from Mexico to work as paraprofessionals in the school system. While the Dalton experience may be more dramatic than most, similar happenings in Georgia's communities indicate that "globalization" is not just trendy jargon, but a real phenomenon increasingly impacting life at the local level.

The state of Georgia was in the southern United States. Georgia represented an area of 59,441 square miles (153,951 km) ranking the state 24th in size among the 50 U.S.A. States (States Ranked for Total Area, 2006). The capital and largest city was Atlanta.

As one of the Thirteen Colonies during the American Revolution, Georgia revolted against British rule by signing the 1776 Declaration of Independence. After the War of Independence, Georgia ratified the United States Constitution on January 2, 1788,

and became the fourth state of the United States of America. The first state constitution in Georgia was established in 1777.

Georgia joined the Confederacy on January 18, 1861. The state was a major battleground of the American Civil War. A large part of the state from Atlanta to Savannah was destroyed in December 1864 during General William Tecumseh Sherman's March to the Sea. Following Reconstruction, Georgia was the last former Confederate state to be readmitted to the Union on July 15, 1870.

In 2006, the estimated population of Georgia was 9,363,941, an increase of 231,388 from the previous year, and an increase of 1,177,125 since 2000. As of 2006, Georgia was the 9th most populous state in the nation. As one of the fastest-growing states in the country, the population of Georgia had grown 44.5% (2,885,725) since 1990. More than half of the state's population lives in the Atlanta metro area. Nineteen Georgia counties were among the 100 fastest growing counties from 2004 to 2005 (Population Centers by State, 2006).

African-American, British, German, and Irish are the five largest ancestries reported in Georgia. As of 2000 in Georgia, 90.1% of residents age 5 and older speak English at home and 5.6% speak Spanish. French is the third most spoken language (0.9%), followed by German (0.8%) and Vietnamese (0.6%). As of 2004, 7.7% of the population of Georgia was under 5 years of age, 26.4% under 18, and 9.6% were 65 or older. As of 2004, females made up 50.6% of the population, and African-Americans made up 29.6% (Georgia, 2007; Netstate, 2006).

Throughout history in Georgia, roughly half of the population was African-American. Prior to the Civil War, they were almost exclusively enslaved. From 1914 to 1970, the Great Migration of African-Americans from the rural South to the industrial North occurred, followed by significant migration of other races into Georgia after 1970. The combined effect of these migrations was to reduce the black proportion of the population. Nonetheless, African-Americans remained the most populous race in many rural counties in middle, east-central, southwestern, and low-country Georgia, as well as in the city of Atlanta and its core southern suburbs. In addition to substantial Hispanic immigration, primarily Mexican, immigration from Asian nations added to the population diversity of Georgia, with Laotian, Thai, Chinese, Vietnamese and Indians leading the increase. As of 2004, approximately 2.6% of the residents of Georgia were Asian American (Netstate, 2006).

In 2005, the total gross state product in Georgia was \$364 billion (U.S.A. Census Bureau, 2005). The per capita personal income in Georgia for 2005 ranked it 10th in the nation at \$40,155. If Georgia were a stand-alone country, it would have ranked as the 18th largest economy in the world. The growth of the Atlanta economy had a very large effect on the state of Georgia and the Southeastern United States.

Many United States military installations were situated in Georgia. These included Fort Stewart, Hunter Army Airfield, Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay, Fort Benning, Moody Air Force Base, Robins Air Force Base, Naval Air Station Atlanta, Fort McPherson, Fort Gillem, Fort Gordon, Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany and Dobbins Air Reserve Base.

For 130 years, Georgia's state government had an unbroken record of single-party dominance, longer than any other state in the Union. Georgians elected Democratic governors continuously from 1872 to 2003 and, during this same period, Democrats held a majority of seats in the Georgia General Assembly. A majority of Democrats elected throughout these years were Southern Democrats (Dixiecrats) who were very conservative, and often conciliatory, to the segregationist sentiments in the state. As of the 2001 reapportionment, the state had 13 seats in the U.S.A. House of Representatives, which were held by 7 Republicans and 6 Democrats.

Georgia made advances during the 1960s and 1970s in civil rights and governance, especially benefiting Atlanta, and was recognized as representative of the "New South." This image was reinforced by the election of former Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter as U.S.A. President in 1976. Although during the following decades Atlanta continued to be the epitome of the New South, according to Dr. Larry Keating (2007),

The reality is that the exceptional growth of the region over the last twenty years has exacerbated inequality, particularly for African Americans. Atlanta, the city of Martin Luther King, Jr., remains one of the most segregated cities in the United States. Despite African American success in winning the mayor's office and control of the City Council, development plans have remained in the control of private business interests.

Athens

The area represented by Athens-Clarke County was comprised of 125 square miles, which was the smallest in land area of Georgia's 159 counties (Athens, 2007). Athens-Clarke County was the twenty-fifth county created in Georgia, and it was situated 65 miles northeast of Atlanta. According to the 2000 census, Clarke County was the fourteenth most populous county in the state of Georgia, with 101,489 residents, 39,239 households, and 19,344 families. The racial makeup of Athens in 2000 was 64.71% White, 27.37% African American, 0.21% Native American, 3.15% Asian, 0.04% Pacific Islander, 3.11% from other races, and 1.41% from two or more races. Hispanic or Latino of any race were 6.39% of the population (U.S.A. Census Bureau, 2000).

Of the 39,239 households in Athens in 2000, 22.3% included children under the age of 18; 32.3% were married couples; 13.3% were female only; and 50.7% were non-families. 29.9% of households consisted of one person only, and 5.8% had one person living alone who was 65 years of age or older. The average household size was 2.35, and the average family size was 2.95 (U.S.A. Census Bureau, 2000).

In the city of Athens, 17.8% of the population was under the age of 18; 31.6% were 18 to 24 years old; 27.3% were 25 to 44 years old; 15.3% were 45 to 64 years old; and 8.0% were 65 years of age or older. The median age was 25 years old. For every 100 females there were 95.4 males.

The median income for a household in Athens was \$28,118, and the median income for a family was \$41,407. Males had a median income of \$30,359 versus \$23,039 for females. About 15.0% of families and 28.6% of the population were below

the poverty line, including 25.2% of those under age 18 and 13.5% of those age 65 or over.

The government of Athens-Clarke County was headed by an elected mayor, and 10 elected commissioners, from 8 geographical districts, and 2 super-districts. The Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County's day to day operations were overseen by a manager appointed by the Mayor and Commission. There were 26 main departments, divisions and offices under the managerial group. Athens-Clarke County housed Magistrate, Juvenile, Municipal, Probate, State and Superior Courts. The Superior Court covered the Western Judicial Circuit, which also included Oconee County.

The Clarke County School District was a separate entity with nine elected members on the Board of Education and an appointed superintendent. The School District ran 13 elementary, 4 middle and 3 high schools. Additionally, there were 5 private schools in the area. Athens-Clarke County was the home of the University of Georgia, Athens Area Technical College, and the Navy Supply Corps School, as well as four other higher education institution extensions.

Stakeholders were situated in planning tables located in diverse planning spaces of the international academic exchange program in Georgia and Veracruz. The purpose of this section was to describe contextual factors and features affecting planning practices that occurred in the places located within and between Georgia and Veracruz.

Stakeholders

The purpose of this section is to describe selected stakeholders occupying planning tables in the academic exchange program. In this chapter, they are organized first by the places in which they practiced, then by stakeholder groups. For the University of Veracruz, there are three places in the schema: 1) Xalapa, central administration for UV; 2) Minatitlán, School of Social Work; and 3) Poza Rica, School of Social Work. Within each of these three locations there are three stakeholder groups: 1) administrators; 2) faculty (or Teachers); and, 3) students.

The University of Georgia has only one place identified, Athens, Georgia, where the School of Social Work was located. For UGA, Athens, there are three stakeholder groups: 1) administrators; 2) faculty; and, 3) students.

Finally, there is one other grouping called “other”. It contains brief descriptions of stakeholders external to the universities.

The University of Veracruz

Founded in 1944, the University of Veracruz was one of Mexico's leading state universities. A wide array of academic options were available to the university's 60,000 students, including 53 undergraduate majors and 70 graduate programs. Among the university's particular strengths were philosophy, anthropology, law, literature, and the

arts. Students could also study engineering, science, business, economics, politics, medicine, and the humanities, including social work. The Xalapa campus prided itself on its cultural life. The university offered workshops in dance, graphic arts, and theater, and supported the Xalapa Symphony Orchestra, the Folkloric Ballet, and the Popular Music Orchestra.

Administration, University of Veracruz, Xalapa

Area of Humanities, University of Veracruz, Xalapa

Dr. Miguel Alba, Director

After traveling by taxi to the highest point in the main campus of the University of Veracruz in Xalapa, the UGA researcher was greeted in the office by Jose Cuevas, who was the main point of contact in the exchange for persons from UGA. Jose displayed a serious manner, more than usual, and he quickly described his plan for the meeting with Dr. Miguel Alba, handing over a copy of the printed agenda for the interview about to be conducted with Dr. Alba. Jose was very well organized, and gave details with a military-like precision, reflecting the ridged, top-down organizational hierarchy of UV, in which these relationships were situated. He had prepared a very accurate description of the study and its objectives for data collection trips to Xalapa, and the Schools of Social Work in Minatitlán, and Poza Rica. He also had written copies for the UGA researcher, Dr. Alba, and the Deans of the schools in both locations.

Upon entering Dr. Alba's office, Jose addressed him as “Jefe!” (boss or chief in Spanish). Every exchange between the two contained from Jose the reference to the Director of the Area of Humanities as “Jefe!”, “Yes, Jefe!”, or “right away, Jefe!”, and it

seemed that one had just entered into a military office. Their exchange made the outside observer feel uneasy, giving some reticence about the challenge ahead in dealing with Dr. Alba. Indeed, this was one most important interviews of the study, so one had to persevere. The evaluation of the situation, and Dr. Alba, however, was inaccurate.

After Jose left the room, the UGA researcher was greeted by Dr. Alba in an extremely warm and charming manner. He gave a friendly, gentile handshake, and with a kind, genuine looking smile, he made an immediate request to his visitor to “please take a cup of coffee”, which he had freshly ground and brewed on his desk top. He presented gifts of scholarly books on history and literature, written by UV faculty. His authentic manner quickly put one at ease.

Dr. Miguel Alba was born in Tapachula, the capital city of the state of Chiapas, a Mexican state that borders Veracruz and Oaxaca on its north, and Guatemala on its south. Chiapas is the poorest state in Mexico and is situated in a region with the largest indigenous population in the country. Dr. Alba, however, did not appear to be Amerindian, but instead appeared to be of Mestizo heritage, not just because of his light skin and European facial features, but also by his professional position and manner, which was very much like that of a European formed intellectual. Given the social history of Mexico, it was very probable that Dr. Alba had been enabled early in life by social privilege, which didn't often present for indigenous in Chiapas. Through the autobiographical description he was about to give during the interview, he began to confirm these assumptions,

My family originated in Chiapas. I did my bachelor's study, the licenciatura, at the Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), in the field of political science and public administration. In the year 1972-73, I was contacted by the University of Veracruz to come and further develop a degree track that they had in social science and politics. And so at that time, very young, I came, and I began to enter into work here in many diverse academic programs – in the law school, in anthropology, in architecture. After that, the university helped me to do graduate study. And so in the year 73-74, I left Mexico to study a masters degree in France, at the University of Paris, in the field of sociology.

Dr. Alba appeared to be around 60 years old, and like so many of his generation, for whom academic formation occurred at the height of the cold war, common destinations for Mexican scholars and intellectual often were Europe, Eastern Europe, or the former Soviet Union. During the interview, he described his academic history in the following way:

In the year 77-78, UV transferred me to the Center for Historical Research, and this made it convenient for me to study a doctorate in history, specializing in regional political history....I also completed a post-doctorate in Berlin. My studies in Berlin centered around basically comparative history....My publication work has focused on the history of Veracruz, and its political history from distinct focal points, which attend to conflicts and problems of indecision in the contemporary history of Veracruz.

After returning from postdoctoral study in East Germany, Dr. Alba was made Director of the Area of Humanities at the University of Veracruz, Xalapa. The Area of Humanities had direct organizational authority over operations of the departments of Social Work in Minatitlán and Poza Rica, and over the School for Foreign students in Xalapa.

Dr. Alba reported directly to Dr. Marco Pardo, Rector (President), University of Veracruz, Xalapa.

School for Foreign Students, University of Veracruz, Xalapa

Matilde Cabrera, Director

Waiting for Matilde Cabrera to arrive at her office for the interview, from an American perspective, one was struck by how similar the environment at the School for Foreign Students was compared to what one might see in similar places in Georgia's universities . For one, there were many American students milling around speaking English. But it was more than that which made the impression. Although located in an historical colonial building, the offices inside were modern, well staffed, and equipped, with new computers on every desk, each connected to a university wide internal network, and to the Internet.

When Matilde finally arrived, we entered her office, which was very large and well appointed, with beautiful antique furniture, soft incandescent and natural lighting, and finely crafted, very expensive looking Mexican textiles on the walls. Her European or American appearance was striking; not appearing in the least indigenous or Mestizo, she presented with light hair, not quite blond, green eyes, and extremely fashionable

dress..Indeed, she would have looked at home and in proper place in mid-town Manhattan, a location of which one held little doubt she had frequented. Matilde's professional manner was very formal, cool, almost cold, and a little condescending, seeming almost rehearsed with responses that sounded scripted. Certainly she had answered similar questions many times before. Moreover, one had to remember that this was Mexico, and the relationship was administrator and student, regardless of the fact that the researcher was probably 15 years older.

Matilde was the Director of the School for Foreign Students at the University of Veracruz, Xalapa. The school, founded in 1957 at UV, had responsibility to organize programs for foreign academic institutions, including the University of Georgia. With the exception of academic dignitaries, all foreign visitors were channeled through there on the front end of their time spent at UV. Although without the official title, and lacking some authority relative to a few other higher ranking offices and administrators on campus (though still possessing substantial), one had the impression that Matilde's office, in addition to being a bustling language school, effectively represented the UV office of international affairs, studies, and development, all rolled into one location. In addition, there were other organizational responsibilities, such as occasionally facilitating a practicum for a visiting student, or finding locations for research projects for visiting students and faculty. The majority revenue producing role of the school was to provide Spanish language instruction, and it appeared that business was good. Summarizing the role of the school in a sentence, Matilde explained during the interview, “our objective is

not just to organize courses in Spanish and culture, but through all of our activities to further the process of internationalization at UV”.

As part of the academic exchange, Matilde was invited by the Department of International Development at UGA to visit and work in their office in Athens for one month. Although now closed, for one year she oversaw the operation of a UGA Office of International Education located in the UV School for Foreign Students in Xalapa. Matilde also collaborated with Dr. Daniel Brown, from the UGA School of Social Work, to write a scholarly article about the exchange program, published in the Mexican journal *Educacion Global*. She has a masters degree in linguistics from University of California, Los Angeles, and was raised on a large coffee plantation near Xalapa.

Matilde reported to Dr. Miguel Alma, Director, Area of Humanities, University of Veracruz, Xalapa.

Area of Humanities, Institute of Social Historical Research, University of Veracruz,
Xalapa

Jose Cuevas, Professor (School of Social Work , Poza Rica)

Jose Cuevas completed his Licenciatura at the UV School of Social Work in Poza Rica. He completed a Master's in Social Work at the Autonomous University of Nuevo Leon, Monterrey, Mexico. During that time he received a scholarship in the small amount of \$100 per month, which actually paid for his room and board. Jose was young, large and imposing, and very strong, and his father had been a well known soccer player in Mexico, then a well known military figure. Consequently, while a student in Monterrey,

in order to help support himself financially, Jose worked as a body guard for a powerful merchant there.

Jose was working on a PhD from the University of Puebla. While a full-time Teacher of social work in Poza Rica, in 1997 he was selected by Dr. Miguel Alba to be commissioned to the Area of Humanities, where he was situated in the Institute of Social Historical Research in Xalapa. His office was in a beautiful restored colonial building, and he had a personal secretary.

Since 1997, Jose was the main point of contact with the UGA School of Social Work in the Academic Exchange, and preferred that all communications attempted by UGA with UV, especially with the satellite campuses, go through him personally. As the researcher conducted data collection in Veracruz, making trips for interviews in Minatitlán and Poza Rica, it became increasingly clear that Jose wielded a great deal of power and authority at UV, especially within the social work administrative structures.

Like Francisco and Berta, and with the same goal of graduate study at UGA, Jose spent one month in Athens studying English. Unfortunately, he was unable to score high enough on the TOEFL to be admitted to the UGA Graduate School.

Jose reported to Dr. Miguel Alma, Director, Area of Humanities, University of Veracruz, Xalapa.

University of Veracruz, Xalapa

Dr. Marco Pardo, Rector (President)

Dr. Marco Pardo was President of the University of Veracruz. To illustrate the strict, hierarchical, extremely lean, top-down, institutional administrative structures at

UV, when one clicked on the “contact us” link on the large and impressive UV website, Dr. Pardo's personal “Sir Speedy” email popped up.

As Rector (President), Dr. Marco Pardo held the top position of authority at the University of Veracruz. Dr. Pardo was born in Cordoba, Veracruz, Mexico in 1949. He completed his Licenciatura degree in psychology in 1973 at the University of Veracruz. He completed a Master's degree in 1974 in educational technology at Western Michigan University. He completed his PhD in Instructional Systems Technology in 1978 at West Virginia University.

From 1973 to 1991, Dr. Pardo taught at UV, UNAM, and the National Institute of Public Administration (INAP). From 1978 to 1981, he was Chair of the Department of Psychology and Head of the Social Sciences College at UNAM. From 1981 to 1985, Dr. Pardo was Chairman of Academic Programs at Mexico's National Association of Universities and Higher Education Institutions (ANUIES). From 1988 to 1997, Dr. Pardo was Head of the University Development Office and General Director for Higher Education at Mexico's Ministry of Public Education, (SEP), the most powerful educational institution in Mexico. In 1997, he was appointed Rector of the University of Veracruz.

From 1992 to 1997, Dr. Pardo represented the Mexican government at the Trilateral Steering Committee for Collaboration in North American Higher Education. In 1998, he was appointed President of the Education and Culture Commission of the Gulf of Mexico States Accord. Dr. Pardo is a member of the Executive Council of the Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC). He is

Vice President of the Mexican Region of the Interamerican University Organization (OUI). Dr. Pardo is founding member of the Global Alliance for Transnational Education (GATE).

Dr. Pardo did not respond to a request for an interview for the study.

Dr. Pardo left UGA in 2003.

Faculty, School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Minatitlán

School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Minatitlán

Maria Davila, Director and Dean

Maria Davila entered the University of Veracruz, Minatitlán in 1980 as a student. During her first year as a student, she entered into a diagnostic program from which career interests and inclinations were determined for an individual among various disciplinary options. As a result, in 1981 she began study in social work, continuing until 1985, when she obtained her degree. In 1986 she was asked to go through an interview process for an internship in social work in the department at the school. For that she took a curricular exam, presented various documents, gave group presentations and underwent a group interview for which she was selected to be an intern. From 1986 through 1999, she grew and advanced in that position and became a teacher in the school. During this time, taking courses for 2 years in the evenings and weekends in Minatitlán, in 1996 she obtained a masters degree in higher education from the IberianAmerican University. She took a professional exam in social work in 2000, earning her full-time status, and was made Director and Dean of the school, which in Veracruz are the same position.

As part of the exchange program with UGA, she traveled to Athens. During the interview, Maria explained,

I was very grateful when I traveled to Georgia because honestly, with my resources, I had never been able to travel anywhere, and UV doesn't have the strings to pull to allow us to leave the country....What was so satisfying for me was that UGA was able to facilitate this, and paid for everything. For me, the trip was very enriching, I learned many things, and I realized the importance of social work in the United States.

Maria reported to Dr. Miguel Alma, Director, Area of Humanities, University of Veracruz, Xalapa.

School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Minatitlán

Francisco Fernandez, Teacher (full-time)

I met with Francisco Fernandez outside the social work building, sitting on a bench on the walkway, because the the School of Social Work teachers all shared just two offices, and at that moment none were available. His manner was relaxed, partly because I had been a guest in his home the previous evening for dinner. Francisco drove me to his home in his private car, which was relatively new, and while the house was much smaller than the average home in the U.S.A., it was adequate and comfortable for him and his family of four.

Francisco had been invited by UGA Social Work to Athens to study English, and had spent six months there. Like Jose and Berta, Francisco had gone to study English at UGA in 2000, with the objective of passing the TOEFL, so that he could do doctoral

study in social work at UGA. Ultimately, he was unable to qualify, like all others from UV Social Work who came with this goal. Prior to that, he had completed a masters in Social Work from University of Toronto, via distance learning one week per month in Mexico City. Subsequently, he went to the University of Toronto in Canada to work on a doctorate in Social Work. During the academic exchange with UGA, he co-published a paper with Dr. Daniel Brown in a Mexican journal.

As a full-time teacher, Francisco taught 40 hours per week, and he had taught there for 20 years. During the interview, he explained the teaching system in UV Minatitlán:

I'm a teacher of complete (or full) time, a level that one obtains in a UV contract scale. It's a question of teaching by the hour, you are measured (in the system) by the number of hours you teach. A half time teacher means that the teacher is obligated to work 20 hours at the university weekly; and full time is a teacher that is totally dedicated to the work of the university.

Francisco reported to Lic. Maria Davila, Dean, School of Social Work, Minatitlán.

School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Minatitlán

Berta Nieto, Teacher (full-time), School of Social Work, Minatitlán

Berta Nieto was full-time teacher. in Minatitlán, and had worked there for 22 years. She explained during the interview, “I taught a year in Poza Rica, and I'm a graduate of the School of Social Work in Poza Rica. I'm from the north of Veracruz, and it's their that I have my whole family. I only taught a year there, ... Then I came here, and I was the Director and Dean of the school in '87, '88, and '89.

Like Francisco and Jose, and with the same goal of graduate study at UGA, in 1999 Berta spent four months in Athens studying English. The outcome was also the same, however, and she was unable to obtain a high enough score on the TOEFL for admission to the Graduate School at UGA.

As a teacher at UV Minatitlán with substantial seniority and rank, her salary was high relative to other social work teachers there and practitioners in the field, although not necessarily relative to the other professions in Mexico. She earned a monthly salary of 16,000 pesos monthly, or 192,000 per year, depending on the fluctuating exchange rate in dollars then, approximately \$19,000 annually. She explained its relationship to her husband's firm, Petroleos Mexicanos (PEMEX): “an average worker at Petroleos Mexicanos, like my husband for example, can earn a salary on the low end of 150,000 (\$15,000) pesos per year, or on the high end of 300,000 (\$30,000) per year”. According to a recent survey Berta conducted among 20 firms in the region, graduates of social work earned between \$400 and \$600 monthly. Tuition for students was approximately \$30 per semester. Not only was the pay low compared to other professions, the opportunities for employment were few, as she explained,

(The profession of) Social work has very few opportunities for employment, the consequence being (graduates) accept employment outside the field, which doesn't contribute to the development of the profession. I'm telling you that we are sub-employed. (Graduates) end up being receptionists, secretaries, selling shoes, whatever they can do...Even if they do work in social work, the salary is not compared to the other professions.

During my trip to Minatitlán, Berta invited me to her home in Coatzacoalcos. We traveled there in her new private car, passing through sugar cane fields until we reached the city on the Gulf. Her home was small by U.S.A. standards, but nicely decorated. She explained that she was separated from her husband, and therefore was renting the main bedroom. During my visit there, she treated me to a delicious seafood meal (about \$4) at a waterfront restaurant, and in the evening we met her friends for desert at a shiny cafe in an upscale shopping mall in the city.

Berta reported to Lic. Maria Davila, Dean, School of Social Work, Minatitlán
Students, School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Minatitlán
School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Minatitlán
Patricia Romero, Student, School of Social Work, Minatitlán

Patricia Romero had finished courses at the school of social work in Minatitlán, and was serving her mandatory social service internship, which she was doing in one of the best locations for a student to open up space for future career opportunities, the Vice-Rectory, Department of Social Communication, at the University of Veracruz in Coatzacoalcos. Although a handful of students from social work in UV applied to participate in the exchange with the hope of traveling to Georgia, Patricia was the only student selected to make the trip during the entire 10 year exchange. In the year 2000, she traveled to Athens where she stayed for 20 days.

Unlike most of the students in Veracruz who were born and raised in the state, Patricia comes from the state of Sonora, where her father is an important business person. Rare among her student colleagues, Patricia had enjoyed the privilege of traveling

extensively in Mexico, and had also made previous trips to the United States. Moreover, it was probably because of her previous trips to the U.S.A. that she was able to go to Athens. She was already in possession of a Mexican passport when she applied to go to Georgia, and she had been approved for and obtained a U.S.A. Visa in the past. During the interview, she explained,

I was able to go (to Georgia) because I was the only person able to obtain a U.S.A. visa....It's a fact the U.S.A. Embassy has strict requirements: you must have a bank account with a lot of money; own your own home; have a round trip plane ticket to help prove you'll return to Mexico; and in the case of academic exchanges, it's even more difficult.

Patricia is optimistic for her future in social work and its potential contribution to Mexico. She has attended various National Congresses for social work around the country, and she sees a vision for her field to help enrich her country, and raise the wellbeing of society.

Faculty, School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Poza Rica

School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Poza Rica

Monica Zamora, Director and Dean

Licenciada Monica Zamora was a big, jolly, well-organized, well-respected woman, who was the Dean of Social Work in Poza Rica. On her watch, morale was good. Monica had books on her shelves and her desk had piles of symmetrically arranged, neatly stacked papers, but not too many, thus avoiding giving the visitor an impression of lack of urgency.

Monica had worked at the School of Social Work in Poza Rica for 13 years, nine as the Academic Secretary in the department, three as the Executive Secretary, and one as Director and Dean. She had graduated from the school in 1989, when Ruth Palmero had been Director and Dean. She was given the opportunity to do her period of pre-graduation Mexican Social Service in the school. In 1990, she finished her thesis and achieved the rank of Licenciatura, then immediately became Academic Secretary in the department. In 1998-99, Monica completed a Masters degree at the Mexican Autonomous University, in the Federal District (DF or Mexico City). After receiving her first Masters from UNAM, she then completed a second Masters Degree, studying social work with the University of Toronto, delivered via distance learning in Mexico City.

As a participant in the UGA – UV exchange program, in 2000 Monica spent 15 days in Athens, GA on an academic visit. About her experience in the exchange, she said, I enjoyed the exchange work. I enjoy making new friends, like I have encountered with you all, through the University of Georgia of Georgia.... (While in Georgia) I had the opportunity to learn about the university; I had the opportunity to learn about all the coursework (in the School of Social Work); all the work that they have with the community; the work of the institutions. And they permitted me to work in Garnett Ridge Community, which I appreciated, and, which enchanted me because its a project that allowed me to be able to make relationships with the immigrant people in your country. It was enchanting to be there and to know your culture, to know the old climate when it was cold, to understand how it rains in Georgia.

Monica reported to Dr. Miguel Alma, Director, Area of Humanities, University of Veracruz, Xalapa.

School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Poza Rica

Ruth Palmero, Teacher (full-time)

Ruth Palmero was a full-time teacher in the School of Social Work in Poza Rica, where she had worked for 28 years as a full-time teacher. Until the previous year she had been Dean for nine consecutive years.. At the time of the interview, she was also commissioned to the Vice-Rectory of UV in Poza Rica. Priority to entering social work, Ruth was a graduate of the first generation of education students in Poza Rica.

As part of the academic exchange, she made a brief trip to Georgia of 15 days. Not so much resource differences, but cultural differences between the campuses and students in Mexico and Georgia stood out for Ruth, as she explained during the interview,

Your way of being strongly caught my attention,, for example, there weren't many students lingering outside on the patios, but they were in the classrooms, even more, they were in the libraries. In our country, in my state, in my city of Poza Rica, the majority of students, when they don't have class, they just go outside and do nothing.

Ruth reported to Lic. Monica Zamora, Dean, School of Social Work, Poza Rica.

Students, School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Poza Rica

School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Poza Rica

Luz Sanchez, Student

Luz Sanchez was married and had a young daughter. She came from a nuclear family with mother and father living together in the household and, along with her, two younger brothers, and a younger sister. Like Luz, her siblings had benefited from the tremendous strides that Mexico had made in 30 years in providing higher education opportunities for all but those clinging to the bottom rung of social class. Both of her brothers, Roberto and Rodrigo, were Electro-Mechanical Engineers working for PEMEX. Her sister Rosaria was an Attorney.

Luz's father finished his schooling in the 3rd grade of elementary school. She explained the generational differences between her and her parents, and the Great Transformation that occurred in Mexican society when it began to urbanize at the time Poza Rica arose as a city fifty years ago. She said,

What was most important for the families, like my father's, that moved to Poza Rica from the countryside, was that for the first time children were able to leave the home for work, and to establish their families independently. Although my father didn't study past the 3rd grade, that didn't limit him much, and I remember very vividly such good memories of my childhood when my father helped me so much with my schoolwork. He taught me the letters and numbers, then the minutes and seconds of the clock using just an old box with hands he had attached using matches. He taught us the calendar. Well, he was a man who came from a

family with no economic resources, and he had no formal educational opportunities, no professional career, but that didn't prevent him from learning. He loved so much to read, he knew so much about Mexican history, about mathematics. He even tutored me in college.

Apart from benefiting from some curricular changes adopted by UV from UGA, the only participation Luz had in the academic exchange was to attend the researcher's presentation about this study made to faculty and students in Poza Rica (and Minatitlán). In fact, she and most of the other students were unaware that there had ever been an exchange program with UGA. Nevertheless, she had strong feelings about potential benefits of this kind of partnership. She said,

To have an academic exchange with a foreign school is interesting, because it's an exchange of ideas, it would be an exchange of ideas. Because of the economic difficulties here, it's difficult for a social work student to obtain work here. If we could have this kind of exchange, this exchange of ideas, we could learn what form of work you do there, and this would benefit us not only to transform our profession, but to help solve the tremendous problems we have here. This could open up a path to see how to move forward.

School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Poza Rica

Gloria Gutierrez, Student

Gloria was born in San Jose Buena Vista, near the town of Altotongo, in the mountain region of central Veracruz. She was one of eight brothers and sisters, of whom seven were still living, four girls and three boys. In addition to Luz, two of her sisters

had received higher education, both in technical schools. Her brothers were involved in various sorts of work, and one had left for the United States, as she described, “He's been wet now for almost twenty years.” She described how her wise old grandfather had used local knowledge to enable his crossing,

When (my brother) was a sixteen year-old, Grandfather came down from Matamoros and took him North to the border. As he tells the story, he had lovingly “tucked him in” - putting him under the front hood of his truck to hold onto the motor.... Grandfather has permission (temporary work visa), and he is able to make the crossing legally.

This is an old rite of passage in Mexico, a passage through which many like Gloria's brother had made before him, and many more had made since.

Her parents still worked as subsistence farmers, cultivating corn and vegetables. She described her most recent trip there, I took a taxi to 20th Avenue, and there I waited for the micro-bus that dropped me in front of the Poza Rica electric company building. Then I took a bus to the town of Martinez, and from there took another bus. It was two and a half hours to Martinez. The bus from there took me to Altotongo, two and a half hours more. Then I caught another bus that passed along the Tezuitlan route, because the Atzalan route was impassable. It was five more hours, then I arrived, and I enjoyed, because I was home.

Because of the growth of the drug cartels in Mexico, she said she worried constantly about the safety of her parents, and began to cry as she described the situation back home in the mountains,

Look, the problems make me emotional..., they exist in this zone..., it's because of the unemployment. In these (rural) areas there is so much drug addiction, way too much. And prostitution of the very young. These are zones controlled almost completely by the drug cartels. And so they expect the farmers to grow the “natural” (marijuana), and in the mountains of Altotongo there is a lot. There are serious problems of feuds between families, which are like gangs. There is so much marginalization in this area. That is why there is so much emigration (to the U.S.A.) out. From my description you see there is little transport, few services.... As social workers we need to put a lot more attention to these areas.

Administrators, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

University System of Georgia, Board of Regents

The University System of Georgia's Board of Regents was created in 1931. The governor appointed members to the Board, who each served seven years. The Board of Regents was composed of 18 members, five of whom were appointed from the state-at-large, and one from each of the 13 congressional districts. The Board elected a chancellor who served as its chief executive officer and the chief administrative officer of the University System. The Board oversaw 35 colleges and universities: four research universities, 2 regional universities, 13 state universities, 3 state colleges, and 13 two-year colleges. These institutions enrolled more than 233,000 students and employed more than 9,000 faculty and 35,000 employees to provide teaching and related services to students and the communities in which they were located.

Department of Elementary Education, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. I. Michael Highman, (Former) Associate Professor

Dr. I. Michael Highman was an Associate Professor of Elementary Education and Head of the Middle School Education Program. In 2003, Dr. Highman received the Roscoe Riding Internationalization Award from the UGA Office of International Education for his work in Veracruz, Mexico. Dr. Highman served as chair of the UGA Study Abroad Risk Management Review Board for its first two years, helping shape policies and review programs to ensure the safety of students abroad. He also served on the Blue Ribbon Committee on International Affairs in the College of Education.

Dr. Highman helped pioneer the Georgia - Veracruz Partnership. He developed a Maymester and summer study abroad program in Xalapa, Mexico, a student exchange program with the University of Veracruz, and a general agreement with the Secretary of Education and Culture for the state of Veracruz. In 2002, Dr. Highman received a Fulbright Grant that allowed him to spend spring semester at teaching and pursuing research at the University of Veracruz.

Dr. Highman agreed to be interviewed for the study, but failed to appear for several appointments.

Dr. Highman left UGA in 2004.

Office of International Development, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Q. Harold Drucker, (Retired) Director, (and Former Associate Vice President for Public Service and Outreach)

Dr. Q. Harold Drucker retired in 1999 as Associate Vice President for Public Service and Outreach and Director of International Development at the University of Georgia. Dr. Drucker also held a faculty position in the agriculture and applied economics department. While at UGA, Dr. Drucker directed the UGA international development efforts, using his international experience to identify international development projects, assist students sponsored by federal and international agencies and coordinate the university's international agreements. He also was a key stakeholder in developing the UGA – UV academic exchange program with Veracruz, Mexico.

During his tenure as Director, the International Development Office, he also administered the UGA Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, and the European Center of Georgia. Administering language courses for faculty and staff and assisting in the preparation of proposals to international donor organizations were among the other responsibilities of the unit Dr. Drucker oversaw for seven years.

According to Dr. Mark Zunk, "Dr. Drucker made numerous contributions to the international activities and programs at the University of Georgia. He provided outstanding leadership and opportunities for the office of International Development. His advice, counsel and direct assistance were invaluable to a variety of international initiatives across campus."

Dr. Drucker, fluent in Spanish, Portuguese and English, retired after more than 30

years of hands-on international economics and development experience. Dr. Drucker's recent tenure at the university was not his first job at UGA. In 1968, he left the U.S.A. State Department's Bureau of Latin America in the Office of Caribbean Affairs after eight years as an Economist to become an Assistant Professor in the UGA Department of Agriculture Economics. Two years later he left UGA to serve as Chief of the Rural Development Division of the U.S.A. Agency for International Development, specifically working on projects in Brazil and El Salvador.

After a brief stint with the Rockefeller Foundation, Dr. Drucker came back to the state of Georgia to serve as Director of International Studies and Programs for the University System of Georgia, which he did from 1975 to 1979. While there, he assisted the then 32 state colleges and universities in developing and operating student and faculty exchange programs in Europe and Latin America and helped stimulate international grant opportunities for the schools. He also was instrumental in the development of the World Congress Institute, which is associated with the Georgia World Congress Center.

In 1979, Dr. Drucker returned to USAID to head the Agriculture and Business Development Division in Panama. While there he served as executive director of the Joint Commission on the Environment, which was established under the 1978 U.S.A. - Panama Canal Treaties. Dr. Drucker helped develop policies and work-programs there and was the U.S.A. Liaison to high-level Panamanian government officials. While in this post, Dr. Drucker received the Manuel Amador Medal, the highest official honor offered by the Panamanian government to a foreigner for outstanding contributions to that country's economic development efforts.

Dr. Drucker remained with USAID until 1986 when he left to become Deputy Director General of the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture. He remained there until 1992, which is when he rejoined the faculty at the University of Georgia.

During his distinguished career in this field, Dr. Drucker served as a Consultant for many countries, agencies and organizations in Brazil, Panama, Cape Verde, Nepal, El Salvador and the Philippines. He consulted with the World Bank, the U.S.A. Department of Agriculture and the National Academy of Sciences. He received international awards and recognition including the Medal of Distinction from the Federal Rural University of Pernambuco, Brazil, commendations from USAID for his work in Columbia, Panama and the Dominican Republic and scholarly honors from Phi Beta Delta, Gamma Sigma Delta and Phi Lambda Beta.

Dr. Drucker earned a Bachelor's degree from Virginia Tech in 1956 and a Master's degree from the University of Maryland in 1959. In January 1968, Dr. Drucker earned his PhD in agriculture economics with a minor in Latin American Studies from the University of Wisconsin.

During an interview by telephone, Dr. Drucker described his initial involvement with the UGA – UV exchange program,

When I went to UGA in roughly 1992, interestingly they were contacted at the university by a chap by the name of William Arcado who had graduated earlier from the University of Georgia in social work. And William had spent a good part of his career in Mexico as the USAID person. So he made this contact and

wanted to know if the university would be interested in establishing some kind of relationship (with Veracruz). Jerry Schultz, who was then Vice-President of Public Service and Outreach, made the initial contact with Arcado.

Describing how initial relationships among and between he and stakeholders at UGA and UV were established, Dr. Drucker explained,

Now I became deeply involved in the program. Then I got to know Daniel (Brown) very, very well, and we almost immediately invited the delegation up from the University of Veracruz....We had a very good visit. Well, they returned to Veracruz having gotten to know our senior staff....And shortly thereafter a delegation from UGA went down there...And all the while Arcado was working on the inside as a facilitator.

As Director of International Development at UGA, Dr. Drucker had many international development program and project responsibilities, apart from the UGA – UV exchange. Within the exchange program, Dr. Drucker was a key point of contact for UV administration.

Dr. Drucker reported first to Dr. Gerold Schultz, then to his successor, Dr. Benjamin Williams, both Vice President for Public Service and Outreach at UGA.

Dr. Drucker retired from UGA in 1999.

Office of International Development, University of Georgia, Athens

Jane Francis, Assistant Director

Jane Francis was pleasant, inviting, and extremely informative during an interview conducted in her office on the UGA campus. Jane had excellent knowledge of the history of the exchange, acquired from an administrative context situated outside the School of Social Work. Jane was a UGA stakeholder who maintained important administrative and planning responsibilities continuously through a series of key administrative stakeholder changes within UGA, which affected the exchange program in various ways over time. During her time in the Office of International Development, she participated in the early development of the program, which was led by, and focused entirely upon, the School of Social Work. She continued in her position throughout the evolution of the Veracruz program, which slowly began to include additional UGA academic departments' participation. Jane continued as a Veracruz exchange program stakeholder even after the School of Social Work ended its participation in the exchange.

Jane Francis described the responsibilities of the Office of International Development in a face-to-face interview,

We are a public service and outreach unit and so we report to the Vice-President for Public Service and Outreach....And we work on international programs project development. And what we do is kind of different from other offices in that were primarily looking at kind of developing countries, and trying to put together faculty-driven, faculty- and staff-driven projects, usually with collaborating institutions in those countries....I think what we do is more fluid (than other UGA

offices with international responsibilities) in that we sort of respond to faculty interests and desires.

Jane described the challenge faced in the evolution of responsibilities in her office, which became the major administrative coordinative unit of UGA in negotiating with the formal administrative hierarchy at UV. She said,

(Dr. Alba and Jose Cuevas) got upset because there was a social work student...(who) went down to Xalapa to do dissertation research, and none of them knew he was there. And I mean they couldn't fathom how the student was down there and we hadn't bothered to tell them when, you know, we really didn't know he was down there. And you know, people from Social Work probably did, but didn't give it a second thought. But it was a big issue down there. And there were just some issues with UGA faculty members making commitments that UGA could not follow up on. And so our office started on a kind of coordinative role, which I don't think worked out very well.

Jane further described the challenges she faced given the complicated mix of stakeholders and contexts in which she operated,

Relationships got very complicated because there were lots of people involved, lots of personalities. And I think some faculty members who thought they really understood the culture and the system there, clearly did not....Well, I felt like, I mean it really put me in the uncomfortable position here of seemingly policing UGA faculty members.

Jane Francis reported to Dr. Harold Drucker, Director, Office of International Development, University of Georgia, Athens.

Office of International Development, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. George O. Z. Zykes, Director

Dr. George Zykes was appointed the new director of the new Office of International Public Service and Outreach (IPSO). The appointment was effective September 15, 2001. Administered by the UGA Office of the Vice President for Public Service and Outreach, IPSO aimed to further the internationalization of the University of Georgia by developing applied research projects, technology assistance, training and capacity-building programs. Replacing the former Office of International Development, the new IPSO identified funding opportunities for faculty, staff and students to participate in international collaborative research, technology transfer and exchange programs and worked across disciplines to serve as a resource to academic and public service units throughout the University.

Dr. Zykes was instrumental in obtaining \$298,00 in funding from USAID as part of the U.S.A. – Mexico Training Internships, Education and Scholarship Partnership (TIES). Dr. Zykes was Along with Dr. Monica Smith, Associate Professor, Elementary and Social Studies Education, Dr. Dorbin Krunch and Marc Dink, Professors of Horticulture, Dr. Zykes is the co-principal investigator of the TIES Veracruz project at UGA. The Mexican partnership directors are Dr. Marco Sanchez, and Profra. Edith Hermoza..

According to Dr. Benjamin Williams, Vice President for Public Service and Outreach and Associate Provost, “Dr. Zykes exhibits a tireless devotion to international outreach. His extensive experience and expertise in the international arena makes him ideal for the position. He emphasizes enthusiasm, teamwork and a strong administration to accomplish his goals for IPSO.”

Throughout his career at UGA, Dr. Zykes exhibited leadership in the field of international development. He had been awarded many external contracts and grants supporting research, project development and exchange programs in such developing countries as the Dominican Republic, the Congo (formerly Zaire), Burkina Faso, the Republic of Georgia, Russia and Tajikistan. As part of the broad UGA – UV academic exchange, Dr. Zykes co-taught a course on international marketing and management with a focus on Mexico. He was also the Co-Director of the UGA College and University Affiliation Program with the University of the West Indies in Trinidad and a founding member of the Global Policy Studies Certificate Program.

Dr. Zykes joined the UGA faculty in 1973, after receiving a doctorate from the University of Tennessee and an M.A. from Northern Illinois University. His distinguished teaching and research record earned him the D.W. Brooks Faculty Award for Excellence in International Agriculture; the Outstanding Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching awards; and, in 1987, a promotion to professor in the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics.

During his 28 years at the university, Dr. Zykes had published an extensive number of articles on international development. He had also been a consultant to the

U.S.A. Department of Agriculture; the Agency for International Development; the South East Consortium for International Development; Ohio State University; Purdue University; and the Academy for Educational Development.

Prior to his work at UGA, Dr. Zykes was a Peace Corps volunteer in Venezuela.

Dr. Zykes was not interviewed for the study.

Dr. Zykes reported to Dr. Benjamin Williams, Vice-President for Public Service and Outreach, University of Georgia, Athens.

Office of International Education, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Michael Lawrence, (Former) Associate Provost

Before coming to UGA, Dr. Michael Lawrence was Assistant Vice President for Research and Director of International Programs at the University of Montana. In 2001, Dr. Lawrence was named Associate Provost for International Affairs at the University of Georgia. The Associate Provost position was intended to provide leadership for the university's institution-wide focus on international faculty research activity and student study-abroad and exchange programs. As director of the Office of International Affairs, the Associate Provost was responsible for maintaining a comprehensive knowledge of the UGA international efforts, coordinating the institutional programs associated with international education, and serving as the principle link for UGA with the University System of Georgia's Office of International Education. At the time of Lawrence's appointment, the UGA Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost said, "This is a very important position at the university, and I'm pleased we were able to attract a person with the broad international experience that Dr. Lawrence brings. He has

already served as the central coordinator for wide-ranging international research and exchange programs and has a solid track record in increasing the number of students studying abroad, which is one of our institutional priorities.”

Dr. Lawrence had been actively involved in international education and international development for many years. He had worked in more than 40 countries and had resided outside the United States for more than 13 years. He had held two Fulbright Fellowships - one in Peru and another in Brazil - as well as visiting professorships at a number of institutions.

Most of his academic research had been in Latin America, but he also had done fieldwork and research in south and central Asia, Africa, Europe and the Newly Independent States. He has worked on numerous externally funded contracts with agencies such as the U.S.A. Agency for International Development, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the Ford Foundation.

At UGA, Dr. Lawrence worked with administrators, faculty, students and an International Affairs Advisory Council to enhance international academic programs, manage international faculty and student scholar services, and facilitate intern, volunteer and employment opportunities abroad.

When Dr. Lawrence was appointed, nearly 15 percent of the UGA undergraduate students graduated with an international experience through participation in 42 study-abroad programs in 23 countries, and 46 exchanges in 15 countries. In addition, UGA was a participant in more than 140 formal agreements with universities worldwide involving faculty research collaborations and exchanges. The UGA President said, “We

have been expanding opportunities for students and faculty to study and work abroad, which is so important in today's global society. I'm confident that Dr. Lawrence will help the University of Georgia continue to advance in this area."

Prior to his appointment at the University of Montana, Dr. Lawrence was Director of the School of Social Work at Boise State University. He also held faculty and administrative appointments in social work at the University of Wyoming and Utah State University. At UGA, he was given an academic appointment as a Professor in the School of Social Work.

Dr. Lawrence earned a Master's in Social Work and a Doctorate in Higher Education from the University of Kentucky. He received his undergraduate degree from New Mexico State University.

Dr. Lawrence did not respond to a request for an interview for the study.

Dr. Lawrence reported to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Lawrence left UGA in 2004

Office of International Education, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Roscoe Riding, (Retired) Director

Dr. Roscoe Riding retired as Director of the Office of International Education in 2002.

Dr. Riding had served as President and Vice President of the Association of International Educators (NAFSA), Executive Director of Phi Beta Delta International Honor Society for the University of Georgia and the Georgia State System of Higher Education. One

year after coming to UGA in 1971 as a foreign student adviser, Dr. Riding was appointed Director of the Office of International Services and Programs. As Director of the Office of International Education, Dr. Riding provided direction and supervision to the staff of 14 in International Education who were responsible for study abroad programs and immigration services for the university's approximately 1,400 international students and scholars.

During Dr. Riding's tenure at UGA, the level of study abroad students increased from about 250 students per year to between five and six times that number. During this time, UGA reached 15th among U.S.A. institutions in numbers of students abroad. During his first few years at the university, Dr. Riding implemented several programs and services that gained national recognition: International Day at the Capital, the Campus Friends Program, International Exhibit Day and the International Speakers Bureau. He also began the International Coffee Hour, where 200 to 300 international and American students met every Friday in Memorial Hall to mingle and have lunch together. Dr. Riding also began the annual Study Abroad Fair, considered one of the largest, most well attended and best organized events of its kind in the country. Nearly 2,000 students attended the fair in 2001.

Dr. Riding had received two Fulbright awards for international educators and had received other grants to assist him in conducting numerous cross-cultural communication workshops. He also had served in several leadership roles. For 15 years, Dr. Riding chaired the University System of Georgia Study Abroad Advisory Committee, and between 1996 and 2001, he had worked with the 34 system institutions in the state to

increase the number of students participating in study abroad programs. Dr. Riding also served from 1990 to 1991 as president of NAFSA, the largest professional organization for international educators in the world with approximately 8,000 members.

Dr. Riding was not interviewed for the study.

Dr. Riding reported to the Vice-President for Public Service and Outreach,
University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Riding retired in 2002.

Office of International Education, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Franco Villareal, (Former) Director

Dr. Franco Villareal's manner and language were like those of a diplomat during an interview conducted in the conference room located in the UGA Department of International Education in Athens. The road to the interview had been bumpy, but that afternoon Dr. Villareal was polite, yet decidedly formal during the meeting. Initially, a request had been made to interview Dr. Michael Lawrence, Associate Provost of International Affairs. At first, Dr. Lawrence agreed to an interview, but then mysteriously stopped responding to inquiries made by telephone and email. Finally, Dr. Villareal responded, and he agreed to represent International Education (as its Director) for an interview, which was conducted in Spanish. Fortunately, his viewpoint, and his legal-like discourse, were very useful in describing his office's activities, especially the relationship it maintained with UGA faculty, who he described as stakeholders wielding substantial power in determining international study programs in which UGA participated.

Dr. Villareal was born in Quito, Ecuador, where he was trained as a biologist, and later worked as Director of the National Museum of Natural History in Ecuador. He received a Master's degree in Ecology from the Ohio State University. Dr. Villareal completed his PhD in Ecology at the University of Georgia, Athens. After completing his PhD, he worked as Program Coordinator in the UGA Center for Latin American Studies, eventually becoming the Co-Director. In 2002, Dr. Villareal was appointed Director of the UGA Office of International Education.

As Director of International Education, Dr. Villareal managed two fronts of international education at UGA. Responsibilities of his office included managing processes for students leaving UGA to study abroad, and for foreign students coming to study at UGA, including all processes related to immigration. He described his role of Director as one that approaches international studies at UGA “from a new direction...to establish a new culture with respect to multiculturalism and multilingualism, getting us closer to what the field of international studies should represent at UGA.”

Describing institutional processes and governance structures in exchange programs at UGA, Dr. Villareal said,

The process to establish an exchange is fundamentally an initiative of the professors. The Faculty Government structure at UGA prevents our office from determining or accepting a particular program. On the contrary, this process is an initiative of the professor, based on the help that person receives from their department head, then assisted by International Education in the form of administrative or monetary support.

Echoing statements from other stakeholders in regard to the evolution of control, governance, and support structures for academic exchange and study abroad programs at UGA, many of which have arisen from International Education, Dr. Villareal commented that,

In the past, there wasn't an established protocol.... Over time, a line of authority and reportage was established, and this office began to catalog all international study initiatives indicating who had started a particular program. We established the requirement that the process move toward the signing of a formal contract (by parties from participating universities) stating that faculty in the department had voted in favor of the program.... This contract also contains the legal requirements in both countries to engage in such activity, and so it guides and grants permission for the two university presidents to collaborate in various activities.... Importantly, this agreement for establishing exchange of students and faculty is established and maintained under the premise of reciprocity, with equal exchange of participants, costs, and benefits, one for one.

In addition to providing his excellent knowledge of exchange structures, processes, and mechanisms at UGA, Dr. Villareal also presented a couple of astounding basic facts about who at UGA participates in study abroad, and where. He said,

Interestingly, the majority of (UGA) students who travel (for study abroad) aren't from social work, or education, or liberal arts, but are from the School of Business. And it's interesting that the manifestation of more and more economic tourism is favored now in place of real field practice as an exchange experience.

The ones who go now are the students who have money, who have resources able to pay \$7,000 or \$8,000 per semester in order to study in Europe. 87% of those who participate go to Western Europe. And of them, 80% are business students. Dr. Villareal reported to Dr. Michael Lawrence, Associate Provost, Office of International Affairs, University of Georgia, Athens.

Dr. Villareal left the Department of International Education in 2004, but remains at UGA.

Office of International Education, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Mark Zunk, (Retired) Associate Provost

Dr. Mark Zunk retired in 2000 as Associate Provost for International Studies. Previously he was Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Director for International Education. Dr. Zunk joined UGA in 1988 as Executive Assistant to the President, and in 1991 was assigned responsibility for policies and procedures concerning international activities. He was overall Director of the university's involvement in the 1996 Olympic Games.

As Associate Provost, Dr. Zunk was responsible for coordinating more than 70 study-abroad programs. When he retired, more than 1,000 UGA undergraduates were involved in some form of international education each year. He also oversaw international academic development projects and services and international research initiatives.

Before joining UGA, Dr. Zunk was at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Adjunct Professor of

Higher Education. Previously he held a number of positions at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, including Assistant Chancellor for Student Affairs and Director of the Counseling Center.

Dr. Zunk was not interviewed for the study.

Dr. Zunk reported to the UGA Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, University of Georgia, Athens.

Dr Zunk retired in 2000.

Office of the President, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Michael Dawn

By the year 2010, 25% of graduating class will have participated in study abroad: equivalent to top 5 ranking among research institutions (UGA international affairs newsletter, fall 2002).

Adams: "...we need to provide an increasingly global dimension to everything that we do... I believe it is the responsibility of every program, every dean, and every academic leader to raise questions today about interrelatedness of the world at large" (State of the University Address, 1998).

Office of Public Service and Outreach, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Gerald (Jerry) Schultz, (Retired) Vice-President

Prior to his retirement, Dr. Gerald Schultz was UGA Vice President for Public Service and Outreach for 28 years. Dr. Schultz was also Associate Provost at UGA. Dr. Schultz was a former soil scientist, and built the UGA public-service program into the largest campus-based outreach program in the nation. The program included 14 service

units plus outreach activities in all the university's academic schools and colleges. Units in the service program included the Georgia Center for Continuing Education, which served more than 200,000 people annually; the State Botanical Garden, visited by more than 150,000 people annually; the Cooperative Extension Service, which had an office in every Georgia county; the Carl Vinson Institute of Government; the Marine Extension Service; and the J.W. Fanning Institute for Leadership and Community Development. Other service units included the Georgia Museum of Natural History, the Office of International Development, Business Outreach Services/Small Business Development Center, and Information Technology Outreach Services.

Dr. Schultz was responsible for the UGA international development program and was instrumental in establishing cooperative research and teaching programs with universities around the world. When Dr. Schultz retired, the UGA President said, "During his long and distinguished tenure with the University of Georgia, Jerry has greatly influenced the impact this campus has had on millions of Georgia citizens and countless individuals elsewhere in our nation and abroad. When future assessments are made regarding the public-service mission of the university, the names of Jerry Schultz will be cited as a pioneers in this area, and as a visionary who made the UGA outreach program the model for this country."

After retirement, Dr. Schultz served as a UGA Distinguished Public Service Scholar, and continued to work on international matters, serving as a liaison with the consular corps in Atlanta, assisting campus international offices and maintaining overseas contacts.

Dr. Schultz joined UGA in 1969 as Associate Dean of the College of Agriculture and Director of the Rural Development Center in Tifton. He previously was Vice President of the Potash Institute of North America and was a faculty member at the University of Maryland and at North Carolina State University, where he received Bachelor's and Master's degrees in agronomy. He held a Doctorate from Cornell in soil chemistry and plant nutrition.

Dr. Schultz was not interviewed for the study due to illness.

Dr. Schultz reported to the President of the University of Georgia, Athens.

Dr. Schultz retired in 1999.

Office of Public Service and Outreach, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Benjamin (Ben) Williams, Vice-President

Dr. Benjamin Williams was the UGA Vice President for Public Service and Outreach and Associate Provost. Dr. Williams succeeded Dr. Gerold Schultz. From 1995 to 1999, Dr. Williams was the Senior Vice Chancellor for human and external resources for the University System, responsible for legal affairs, human resources, economic development, legislative affairs, and external affairs. Dr. Williams was a key aide to the System Chancellor in strategic planning and policy development.

Before that position, Dr. Williams served as Acting Executive Vice Chancellor of the System for a year, and from 1987-1992, was Vice Chancellor for services with responsibility for all matters related to public service, outreach, and international programs at the System's 34 institutions. He also managed the System's 18 study-abroad programs in 10 countries. He served three years as Chief Executive Officer of the

Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education, Inc., and was on the executive committee of the Georgia Council on Economic Education, the boards of directors of the Center for Trade and Technology Transfer and the African Business Development Center, and the board of advisers of the European Center of Georgia. Dr. Williams also served as a member of the advisory committee for the University System Center for Global Education. Dr. Williams had held academic posts at Kennesaw State University and the University of Alabama, where he earned a Bachelor's degree in cultural anthropology, a Master's in counseling, and a Doctorate in higher education administration.

Dr. Williams was not interviewed for the study.

Dr. Williams reported to the President of the University of Georgia, Athens.

Faculty, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Gertrude Young, (Former) Dean

Glancing at her watch frequently, and mentioning twice during the meeting that available time for an interview was very short, Dr. Gertrude Young was somewhat condescending when she was interviewed in her office in Athens. The manner in which Dr. Young responded was also contradictory, at times seeming to intentionally maintain a course within parameters of acceptable “party-line” responses to the questions posed, while at other times seeming very candid, even a bit hostile in reference to the Veracruz exchange program. For example, in describing her first involvement with the exchange,

Dr. Young seemed almost indifferent to the Veracruz exchange, but also expressed her belief that only after her arrival as Dean, had the program thrived. She said,

I inherited the program. It was a project that was established by Alice Thomas, Daniel Brown, and Dean Emeritus Craig Sampson. What I don't remember is if anything ever happened beyond the first, beyond the establishment of the program. It seems to me Alice and Craig went down, with or without Daniel. This predates my being here. When I came we actually made it a student and faculty kind of exchange program. It had not been that prior. It had been something, but I don't know what.

During her interview, three times Dr. Young's responses were made through comparisons with the Social Work foreign study program (not an academic exchange) in Argentina. For example, she said in reference to the Veracruz exchange that. "It's a successful program in many ways," but added that, "It is overshadowed currently by our Argentina program". In continuing the comparison, she added that,

The Argentina program is new....We have thirty people who are already (registered) in it. It's a much more expensive program (for students)....Veracruz has been done and done and done....And actually we have some students who are going to stay (in Buenos Aires, Argentina) for eight weeks, who will stay beyond the initial three.

Dr. Young made one trip to Xalapa during the exchange, and although she enjoyed the campus facilities at UV, she complained about the discomfort of having to make a grueling four hour bus trip from Mexico City to Xalapa, after a long three hour

flight from Atlanta. Obviously that gave her reservations about returning. “I’ll never do that again,” she said.

Dr. Young reported to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Georgia, Athens.

Dr. Young left UGA in 2004.

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Craig Sampson, (Retired) Dean Emeritus

Dr. Craig Sampson was a Professor and Dean in Social Work who was instrumental to beginning the UGA – UV academic exchange program. He made trips to Veracruz early in the program to establish relationships with stakeholders in Xalapa.

Dr. Sampson was not interviewed for the study.

Dr. Sampson reported to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Georgia, Athens.

Dr. Sampson retired in 1996.

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Jon Walters, (Former) Consultant

Dr. Jon Walters graduated from the MSW program in 1976 at the UGA School of Social Work in Athens. Following his Master's study, he worked in various positions at the School of Social Work for five years in Athens. During that time, he received a Doctorate in Public Administration from the Department of Political Science at UGA. Prior to coming to Athens, Dr. Walters received a BA in 1970 from Davidson College, and then worked in the Peace Corps for two years in El Salvador. After receiving his

doctorate, Dr. Walters moved to the University of Wisconsin Clearwater, where he became a faculty member in the School of Social Work.

Because of his past connection with the School of Social Work, his fluency in Spanish, and Peace Corps work in Latin America, Dr. Walters was hired as a Consultant in 1994 by Dr. Craig Sampson, then Dean of the School of Social Work. The purpose of his work was to travel to Veracruz to further develop relationships with administrators and faculty at UV, and to further the development of the envisioned academic exchange program between the schools. During an interview by telephone, he explained,

I'm just home one day, it's in the Summer. I was doing something with one of my kids. The phone rings, and I pick it up, and it's this fellow. And he says, "Jon?" I said, "Craig?" Because he's got a really, he's got this unmistakable deep South Georgian voice. And he said, "Do you want to go to Mexico?" Well, duh, that's a no-brainer. At that point they had just started, he had been down there once. Alice Thomas had been down there a couple of times. I think people had come up. And they wanted someone who could teach (in Spanish to UV faculty) two, one week seminars on social work practice....a week in Minatitlán and a week in Poza Rica.

After traveling to Veracruz, Dr. Walters returned to Wisconsin and prepared a six page report of his activities for UGA. Although other UGA administrators and faculty had traveled to Xalapa prior to Dr. Walters, in the Schools of Social Work in Minatitlán and Poza Rica, he was remembered by faculty and administrators as having been the first visitor from UGA in the exchange program.

Dr. Walters reported to the Dr. Craig Sampson, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens.

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Daniel Brown, (Former) Associate Professor

Before becoming Director of the Social Work Program at Dalton State University in Dalton, Georgia, Dr. Daniel Brown was an Associate Professor in the UGA School of Social Work. Dr. Brown was born and continued to live in the Dalton, Georgia area, which had a 20% density of Latino population, one of the highest in the southeastern U.S.A.. During his time at UGA, he was in charge of international programs in the School of Social Work. Dr. Brown was one of the first persons from the School of Social Work to be involved in planning the academic exchange. Until his departure from UGA, Dr. Brown, who was fluent in Spanish, was the primary person from social work at UGA to shepherd the program, with part of his teaching and research time dedicated for that purpose. For this he made many trips to Veracruz: leading and teaching groups of UGA social work students in summer programs; maintaining lines of communications with Veracruz faculty and administrators; delivering training to faculty in Minatitlán and Poza Rica; serving as a curriculum development consultant; and conducting his own research in cultural competency. Explaining his involvement and early growth of the program, during the interview he said,

(I)t was the summer of '95, I believe, when Dr. Alice Thomas, Dr. Gilroy Nance, and I applied to the Dr. Zunk, then the Vice-President of Academic Affairs, for a small grant, which we got, about \$4,500. And it funded our trip (to Veracruz) for

over three weeks...with three (UGA) students. And we started in Xalapa, got the orientation at the language school...then we split into two groups, and one went to Poza Rica, and one went to Minatitlán.... We used that money up, and the next summer wrote a new grant, which was funded for \$15,000. So it gave us funds for another four years...from Dr. Zunk, the Vice-President of Academic Affairs, which was to initiate new international programs.

With input from stakeholders in Athens and Veracruz, Dr. Brown's role included the identification of candidates from UV to receive funding for language study, in preparation for the TOEFL exam, required of foreign students for admission for graduate study at UGA. He also negotiated with program stakeholders to select candidates from both institutions to make faculty and administrative visits as part of exchange activities.

The funding during the first four years of study and visits came from the early grants mentioned above, then later, from a \$97,000 three year grant by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The USAID grant was facilitated by the efforts of Dr. Gerald Schultz, Director of the UGA Office of Public Service and Outreach, and Dr. Harold Drucker, Director of the UGA Office of International Development. Targeting international development objectives, the USAID funds were intended to be used especially for human capacity development in Veracruz, to be achieved through graduate study by UV social work faculty at UGA. As time passed, however, it became increasingly clear that no Veracruz faculty would be able to score high enough on the TOEFL exam to qualify for admission to the UGA Graduate School. Consequently, in order to utilize the remainder of USAID funds, Dr. Brown and his

colleagues decided to stop funding language study by Veracruz faculty at UGA (which was a feature of the early exchange), and instead use the rest of the grant money to fund academic visits by faculty and administrators from both institutions (the main feature of late social work involvement in the exchange). The year after Dr. Brown left UGA, the UGA School of Social Work stopped participating in the UGA-UV academic exchange program.

Dr. Brown was instrumental in opening doors for this study, both in Athens, at the School of Social Work, and with Jose Cuevas at the University of Veracruz in Xalapa.

Dr. Brown reported to Dr. Bernice Young, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens.

Dr. Brown left UGA in 2002.

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Zachary Cohen, (Former) Associate Professor

Before leaving UGA for the University of Texas, Austin, Dr. Zachary Cohen was an Associate Professor in the School of Social Work. After the departure of Dr. Brown for Dalton State University, Dr. Cohen assumed the role of Director of International Programs in the School of Social Work. Dr. Cohen had an interest in Latin America, and made one visit to Veracruz to take part in a UGA faculty workshop that delivered training in clinical case work methods to the UV social work faculty in Minatitlán and Poza Rica.

After assuming the role of Director of International Programs in the School of Social Work, Dr. Cohen immediately developed a program for students and faculty to visit Quito, Ecuador. Due to problems with food, housing, and living conditions, the

Ecuador program lasted just one summer. Consequently, Dr. Cohen developed a summer program for social work students in Buenos Aires, Argentina. According to participants, Buenos Aires was a very clean, European like city, with a high standard of living, and many excellent restaurants, cafes, and nightclubs. Soon the popularity of the Veracruz program began to decline rapidly, and the Argentina program quickly became the destination of choice for UGA social work students. After participation by the UGA School of Social Work in the UGA-UV exchange program ended, participation in the Argentina program continued, and remained a very popular destination for students.

Dr. Cohen did not respond to a request for an interview for the study.

Dr. Cohen reported to Dr. Bernice Young, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens.

Dr. Cohen left UGA in 2005

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Douglas Golay, (Retired) Professor Emeritus

Dr. Douglas Golay was a Professor Emeritus in the School of Social Work. Many year back, prior to Dr. Golay attending graduate school, he had entered a Catholic Seminary, with the intention of becoming a Priest. He left, however, and went to the University of Washington where he received a Master's degree in Social Work, and then worked for many years in a large United Way agency in Atlanta, Georgia. In 1965, Dr. Golay received funding to attend the Florida State University, where he received his doctorate, focusing his work in the area of child welfare.

Dr. Golay was one of the interested faculty at UGA who collaborated with the Georgia Department of Family and Children's Services (DFCS) to establish the Garnett Ridge Neighborhood Program in Athens. As he described during the interview,

About that time in Athens the in-migration of people with families from Mexico and Latin America was growing, growing, growing...(DFCS) directed us to this Garnett Ridge neighborhood, which at that time was about half Hispanic and half African-American. And so we ended up setting up a program there with the help of a doctoral student who was very interested in the area but spoke no Spanish.

With the development of the UGA-UV exchange program in social work, the Garnett Ridge neighborhood became a destination for visitors from Veracruz. All of the social work faculty from Veracruz who visited UGA contributed their time and expertise at Garnett Ridge.

Dr. Golay, who was fluent in Spanish, made three faculty trips to Veracruz as part of the academic exchange. While there he studied Spanish at the School for Foreign Students in Xalapa, and collaborated with other UGA social work faculty on training seminars for the UV faculty in Minatitlán. He viewed his primary role in Veracruz, however, as “an auxiliary faculty member to help Dan with the group of students”.

Although retired, Dr. Golay maintained an office in the School of Social Work, and was consistently there two or three days a week. He also was very active in his church, and commented that after retiring from UGA, it was at church that he had the most contact with the Mexican immigrant community in Athens.

Dr. Golay reported to Dr. Bernice Young, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens.

Dr. Golay retired in 2001.

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Robert Hendricks, Professor

Dr. Robert Hendricks completed his MSW at Florida State University in 1966. After graduation, he practiced social work for four years in a hospital in Miami. He received his doctorate from Brandice University in the School of Public Policy and Management. After completing his doctorate, Dr. Hendricks worked at the Mandel Center for Applied Social Sciences at Case Western Reserve University, where he became Associate Dean. While there he created a nationally-recognized program on non-profit management. In 1986, Dr. Hendricks moved to the UGA School of Social Work, where he led the development of the PhD program in Social Work, which began in 1990. In 1996, Dr. Hendricks developed yet another new program in non-profit management at UGA. His scholarly work in non-profit management has taken him to many countries as a visiting faculty, and he frequently hosts visiting foreign scholars at UGA.

Early in the UGA – UV exchange program, Dr. Hendricks was part of the second faculty group from UGA Social Work to travel to UV. While excited about going, once there he found the experience extremely challenging because of institutional differences and communication difficulties. During an interview in his office located in the School of Social Work in Athens, he explained,

Daniel Brown came to me and said, “We've had most of our people (visiting UV) so far that have been sort of clinical practitioner types. We'd like somebody focused on non-profit administration and policy management to join us, and offer a presentation there.” I was kind of flattered, you know. Nice invitation. The Dean's going to pay the expenses, what the hell, why not? So I went. It was far more difficult in communication than I expected. I had to stop every sentence for translation. And I just didn't sense that the assumptions that I was making about the policy foundation and administrative structure of human services was anything like the U.S.A..

Beyond differences in language and institutional structures, Dr. Hendricks encountered what he perceived were profound social differences between he and his hosts. He believed these differences were grounded in distinct U.S.A. and Mexican histories, and their impact on evolution of cultures and social contexts had created gaps in personal, organizational, and social values that he found difficult to bridge for teaching effectiveness. Importantly, Dr. Hendricks believed that these differences prevented him from communicating basic conceptual messages with regard to philanthropy. He lamented that,

I came away feeling defeated. Not just because of the language.... But conceptually. I didn't know enough about the history and culture to say meaningful things in that context, and draw comparisons for them.... I remember talking about getting donations to start a program. “Donation? Where do you get that?” And I said, “Well, you get wealthy people to give money.” “What?

Wealthy people are not going to give money for this.” And I said, “Well, don't they care about the quality of life in the community?” “Oh sure, they care. That's not the way they show it.” “Well, what would happen if you asked people for money?” “Well, they would think you're trying to steal from them, that you were taking it to line your own pocket.” Well, there went my whole unit on fund raising. Just gone.... It was humbling.

Later in Dr. Hendrick's visit to Veracruz, in desperation to find some connection to bridge the gap in articulating concern for the community, he tried linking to church, then to business, but without success. Eventually, however, he believed that he found the linkage of family. Although his reflection about these axiological differences didn't begin to bear fruit until he was on the airplane traveling back to Georgia, he eventually developed pragmatic actions to bridge these different contexts, which he planned to use in future trips to Mexico. He explained,

I finally realized it's extended family, that's the glue....What centered their values was their extended families, “and if you're not part of my family, then to hell with you!” So there's nobody that I could find who really is interested in the community for its own sake. Well, I can sit in judgment on that or I can say, let's start with what we have, the extended family. Now how do we strengthen that?

How do we build ties across families so that we get to a community commitment?

Dr. Hendricks said the major lesson he learned was that the assumptions he had made about reality were based on his experiences and context. He said about his assumptions, “they're simply not reality, they're local practice.”

Dr. Hendricks reported to Dr. Gertrude Young, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens.

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Gilroy Nance, Associate Professor

Dr. Gilroy Nance received his MSW from Tulane University in 1977, specializing in direct service and mental health. He practiced as a social worker in mental health and child welfare in Montana and Alaska. Dr Nance completed his PhD at Cornell University in Social Policy Analysis. At UGA, he had spent nearly a decade teaching in the School of Social Work, and had served as Associate Dean. When interviewed in a conference room at the School of Social Work in Athens, he was engaging, candid, and, at times, outspoken.

In addition to making multiple trips to Veracruz to participate in academic exchange activities, Dr. Nance also had traveled to Xalapa under a Kellogg funded grant to conduct an evaluation project. Describing the evolutionary history of UGA international work, he said,

Jerry Schultz was Vice-President for Public Service for thirty years here, and really played a big part in the development of international work (at UGA). In fact, I would guess Jane Francis will say that it was Jerry Schultz who asked Harold Drucker to come back to the University of Georgia.

Dr. Nance was one of the first faculty from the UGA School of Social Work to become involved in exchange program planning. Remembering the very day that it had happened, he said,

I remember quite vividly, my office used to be on the third floor, 301. I was a first-year, first-semester, faculty at the University of Georgia. Probably three weeks into the first semester I was here when Alice Thomas, who is now retired, and she was a full-Professor in our school at that time, in 1994, had her office on the third floor, way down at the other end of the wing. But I remember Alice coming into my office and saying, “Would you like to help write a grant proposal to get some money so that we can have this exchange program with a university in Mexico?” And I remember being at my computer and just looking up and saying, “sure.”... And so Daniel Brown, and myself, and Alice Thomas wrote a twenty page proposal....And for me, that's how it got started.

In addition to being a key faculty stakeholder in the planning process, Dr. Nance said his most important role in the exchange program was to generate interest among UGA Social Work students to participate, and to accompany them on trips to Veracruz. Dr. Nance, Dr. Brown, and Dr. Thomas also collaborated on publication of a research study of a cross-cultural model of international exchange for social work, often referred to in interviews with UGA Social Work faculty as the “Brown Model”.

Dr Nance reported to Dr. Gertrude Young, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens.

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Michelle Sanders, (Former) Assistant Professor

Dr. Michelle Sanders received her PhD in Social Work at the University of Georgia, Athens. As a doctoral student, Dr. Sanders conducted research situated in the

indigenous refugee community in the state of Chiapas, in southern Mexico. After graduation, Dr. Sanders joined the Social Work faculty, and was the Director of the Mexico Study Abroad Program for the School of Social Work, replacing Daniel Brown after he left UGA. Dr. Sanders was a member of the Veracruz Initiative, or Veracruz Working Group, co-chaired by Dr. Michael Lawrence, Associate Provost, Office of International Affairs, and Dr. Benjamin Williams, Vice-President for Public Service and Outreach. Regarding her work with the Veracruz Initiative, and indicating the growth of departmental participation in the academic exchange, she said during the interview,

We have met a couple of times in the last year.... We've had members from the College of Education and the other departments who are currently going down to Veracruz. And Ben William's office...is very interested now in getting the university...working with Mexico, especially health issues, training extension work, because he's in charge of the whole extension service in the State of Georgia.

With regard to the Department of Social Work's participation in the exchange, Dr. Sanders role, as she explained it, was labor intensive, involving planning, implementation, and evaluation. Indeed, she had been involved in the program prior to her becoming its Director. She explained,

Four years ago, when I was still a doctoral student, I led a group of BSW students, and Daniel Brown led an MSW – Continuing Education (for social work practitioners) combined group. And so we did well, the two years we did that..... So last year, I was really Director for the first time, and I couldn't believe the

amount of work that was involved. I must have been spending close to twenty hours a week preparing for Xalapa.... It's just a long, incredibly long drawn out process of...(negotiating costs with UV)...for course work, transportation fees, housing and food, for a variety of things. There was a whole haggling process that was involved.... That's really what takes the most time.... (And) last year (after becoming Director) was a little bit different because I could not go down due to...pregnancy.

Dr. Sanders also described the evolution of administrative structures and requirements within UGA during her involvement in the exchange program. She explained that most of the new planning procedures and requirements within UGA had come from the Department of International Education, with their revolving door of Directors. Changes and controls arising from International Education began during Mark Zunk's tenure as Director; there was further development of these mechanisms during Director Roscoe Riding's tenure (after Dr. Zunk retired); further development continued with the appointment of Franco Villareal as Director (replacing Dr. Riding after retirement); finally, leadership in International Education rose to the Provost level, with the creation of Associate Provost, Office of International Affairs, appointed to Dr.

Michael Lawrence. She explained,

Since my time here in the last several years (administration of the program) has changed radically, from having almost no paperwork or things required, to being very regimented for every (study abroad) program.... I know that everything is being done that needs to be done. Everything is being covered. It's very time

consuming, but you know it's necessary.... It comes from (the UGA Department of) International Education. There's a checklist of things now to do, and you do them and send paperwork over there, and they approve it

Near the end of her interview, Dr. Sanders spoke frankly and candidly about the status of Social Work's participation in the Veracruz exchange, which had declined since Daniel Brown left UGA. She also expressed her frustration with the challenges inherent in balancing the administrative responsibilities for the exchange program with those required of a young Assistant Professor to survive at UGA. She said,

My honest feeling is there is not as much support (within Social Work) as there should be.... But I don't see the interest here as much (as before), and so I really feel like I'm kind of over my head with this. I want to do more, but I'm the only one. I can't. I'm working towards tenure.

Dr. Sanders reported to Dr. Gertrude Young, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens.

Dr. Sanders left UGA in 2003.

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Alice Thomas, (Retired) Professor Emeritus

Dr. Thomas was a Professor in Social Work who was instrumental to beginning the UGA – UV academic exchange program. She made trips to Veracruz early in the program to establish relationships with stakeholders in Xalapa.

Dr. Thomas did not respond to a request for an interview for the study.

Dr. Thomas reported to Dr. Craig Sampson, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens.

Dr. Thomas retired in 1996.

Students, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Jenifer (Jenny) Chambers, Student

Jenny Chambers was born and raised on a farm outside of Albany, Georgia. As a child she participated in the 4-H program, and won ribbons showing her hogs at the Georgia State Fair. Beginning as a child, Jenny began to witness more and more Hispanics in Albany, including adults working on farms, and children in her school.

Jenny completed a Bachelor's Degree in Education in 1996 at Valdosta State University, After graduation she returned to Albany where she taught fourth grade for four years. In 2000, Jenny returned to school, entering the MSW program at UGA. She explained her reasons for the move,

My grandmother was a teacher, and my mother was a teacher, so I was raised to believe that was the right course for me. But it wasn't, and now, with the huge Latino population in Georgia, I just think I can make more of a difference working with them as a Social Worker.... I've learned a lot of Spanish.... My fiance was born in Mexico.

Jenny participated in the exchange in summer of 2001, studying Spanish and Mexican culture at the UV School for Foreign Students in Xalapa. She graduated in 2002 and works as a social worker in Lawrenceville, Georgia

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Anthony (Tony) Erving, Student

Tony Erving was born in Nashville, Tennessee, and received his BA in Psychology in 1998 from Morehouse University in Atlanta. As a child Tony learned to play many musical instruments, and was a cellist in his high school orchestra. After graduating from Morehouse, Tony became a musician, working in Atlanta, but settling in Athens, Georgia. After moving to Athens, Tony was diagnosed as HIV-positive. During his course of treatment, Tony acquired a further interest in psychology and counseling, and began the MSW program in Athens in 2000. His goal is to do clinical social work for HIV-positive and AIDS infected persons.

Tony participated in the Veracruz exchange in 2001, studying Spanish and Mexican culture at the UV School for Foreign Students in Xalapa. He graduated in 2002 and works as a social worker in Atlanta, Georgia.

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Deborah (Deb) Adair, Student

Deb Adair received her BA in Psychology in 1999 at the University of Georgia, Athens. As an undergraduate Deb was very involved in her Sorority, and after graduating from UGA, she worked for the institution full-time in Athens. Deb entered the MSW program in 2000 with the goal of becoming a Licensed Clinical Social Worker in a substance abuse setting. Deb participated in the Veracruz exchange in 2001, studying Spanish and Mexican culture at the UV School for Foreign Students in Xalapa. She graduated in 2002 and works as a social worker in Sandy Springs, Georgia

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Maria (Mary) Torres, Student

Mary Torres was born in Durango, Mexico, and came to the U.S.A. in 1979, when she was two years-old. Her parents have always said that they floated her across the Rio Grand from Juarez to El Paso in an inner tube from a car. The family settled immediately in Dalton due to an enclave of Durango immigrants living there. During the late 1980s, her family applied to the Department of Justice Amnesty Program, becoming U.S.A. citizens in 1994. Mary was raised in a Spanish-speaking household in Dalton, Georgia, and acquired fluency in Spanish as her first language. Although permanently disabled, her father had worked in the carpet mills in Dalton, while her mother worked as a bilingual teacher's aide in the elementary schools.

Mary attended Dalton State University, then the University of Georgia, Athens, graduating with a BA in Spanish in 1999. In 2001 she began the MSW program in Athens. She explained her calling to social work,

When I was a child, I was ashamed of my Latino heritage. We came early, before the big movements in the 80s, 90s, and now. And so I was truly a minority, and just wanted to fit in with the other children. I wouldn't be called Maria (her given name) or speak Spanish in public. I fought about it with my parents a lot. They almost disowned me! It wasn't until college, and studying Spanish literature, that I began to appreciate and love my culture.... Now, with so many Latinos at risk here, I know that I have God-given tools to make a difference in my community.

Mary participated in the Veracruz exchange in 2002, studying Spanish and Mexican culture at the UV School for Foreign Students in Xalapa. She graduated in 2003 and works as a social worker in Dalton, Georgia

External Stakeholders

United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

William Arcado, (Retired), Project Officer

William Arcado was a retired in-country Project Officer of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and a former Consultant for the Mexican Department of Human Services in Mexico City. Mr. Arcado was often cited by stakeholders for being the initiator of contact, and facilitator of early communications, between UGA and UV. Dr. Arcado held a Master's of Social Work.

Dr. Arcado was not interviewed for the study.

United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

James (Jimmy) Yang, Senior Program Associate

James Yang was a Senior Program Associate with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) responsible for the administrative oversight of more than 20 institutional partnership projects targeting developing countries throughout the world, including the USAID grant of \$97,000 awarded to the UGA – UV academic exchange program.

Mr. Yang held a B.A. in biology with a concentration in neurobiology and an M.S. in nutritional sciences from Cornell University, and an M.S. in foreign service from Georgetown University. Born in Seoul, Korea, he lived for 15 years in Fairbanks, Alaska,

and has traveled, studied, and worked in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East. He speaks English, French, German, Italian, Korean, and Spanish, and is learning Japanese.

The USAID mission included assisting in the development of higher education in aid-recipient countries. USAID devoted substantial resources to creating university and college facilities and technical and vocational training institutions charged with developing host country capacity to support development objectives. The USAID included the Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO). This ALO mission was to promote global development through higher education. ALO assisted the six major higher education associations in the U.S.A. to build partnership with USAID and help their member institutions foster cooperative development partnerships with colleges and universities abroad.

As part of the UGA – UV academic exchange program, from 1998 through 2001, ALO administered, “The University of Georgia – Universidad Veracruzana: A Teaching, Research, and Public Service Synergy for Social Development in the United States and Mexico.” ALO project funding was \$97,000

The USAID/ALO funding for the broader UGA – UC exchange program included monies from the U.S.A. – Mexico Training Internships, Education and Scholarship Partnership (TIES). The TIES was an 8-year, \$50 million public-private alliance designed to spur social and economic growth in Mexico by supporting institutional strengthening in higher education via education programs, scholarships and university linkages. The TIES initiative allowed universities in the United States and Mexico to

form educational partnerships for the purpose of creating and enhancing economic and social growth in Mexico. The program provided scholarships and exchange opportunities for Mexican graduate students to study development issues at American universities, as well as providing continuing education opportunities for teachers and educational administrators. Areas of study included education, agriculture, communications technology, health and nutrition, and workforce and business development. According to USAID (2007), "United States and Mexico: University Partnerships for Prosperity,"

TIES educational partnerships are mutually beneficial to both Mexico and the United States. U.S.A. faculty and students develop a better understanding of global issues through educational partnerships and collaboration with Mexican institutions of higher education, contributing to global stability, while Mexican educators benefit from the experience gained in agriculture, environmental management, micro enterprise development, public education, and teacher preparation through faculty exchanges, collaborative research, and internships. Meanwhile, government funding for TIES is matched dollar for dollar by participating universities and private sector partners .

As part of the broader UGA – UV academic exchange program, from 2004 – 2007 TIES established the project, "Universidad Veracruzana - University of Georgia: A partnership for Rural Economic, Educational and Human Capital Development." The UGA International Public Service and Outreach administered the project. The project goal was "strengthening the competitiveness of Mexico's trade-led rural economy through product diversification and agricultural niche marketing". According to the

ALO Training, Internships, Exchanges & Scholarships (TIES) Program, Progress Report (10/31/2005),

The partnership between UGA and UV will enhance UV's institutional capacity to strengthen the competitiveness of Mexico's trade-led rural economy through capacity building in rural education, international food quality and safety standards, agricultural product diversification, and niche marketing for both domestic and international markets. The partnership will enhance UV's academic curricula and faculty expertise to work with and empower low-income communities through educational and agricultural outreach programs for Mexican farmers in rural Veracruz.

The TIES project funding was \$298,000.

Mr. Yang was not interviewed for the study.

Mexican Association for International Education, (AMPEI)

The Mexican Association for International Education (AMPEI) was founded in July 1992 as a non-profit organization whose mission was to contribute to strengthening the academic quality of Mexican educational institutions through international cooperation. Sponsored by funds from different organizations that support institutions of higher education worldwide, as well as annual membership fees, AMPEI carried out numerous different activities. AMPEI activities included: 1) training professionals in academic exchange by means of specialized workshops; 2) promoting academic exchange and collaboration among institutions of higher education in Mexico and abroad; 3) research and analysis of the processes involved in preparing academic exchange

activities; 4) providing ongoing information of the association's activities; 5) promoting professional improvement of its members; 6) recommending policies and practices that promote the development of educational programs and research projects in which academics, students and university officials from Mexico and other countries participate; 7) gathering, systematizing, and disseminating information relevant to the Association's mission; 8) representing the membership's interests before national and international agencies; 9) promoting academic and professional meetings and events dealing with international education and international cooperation; and 10) organizing its Annual Meeting.

Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC)

The mission of the Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC) was to enhance the mutual understanding and cooperation in the North American community by fostering collaboration between institutions of higher education in Canada, Mexico, and the United States. On behalf of its membership, CONAHEC also worked with North American federal and state/provincial governments on issues relating to higher education.

CONAHEC goals were to expand the direct interaction between institutions of higher education in these three nations, thus promoting the common interests of the North American community. CONAHEC attempted to achieve its goals through student and faculty exchange, regular dialogue and discussion, inter-institutional academic program development, collaborative efforts with the business sector, cooperative research projects, and international comparative research analysis.

Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education, (PROMESAN)

The mission of PROMESAN was to promote a student-centered, North American dimension to education and training in a wide range of academic and professional disciplines that complemented existing forms of bilateral and trilateral exchange programs among Mexico, Canada, and the United States. Consortia were funded for four years with the first year of funding dedicated to establishing consortium agreements or memoranda of understanding among institutions in the participating countries.

Government of Mexico, Secretary of Public Education, (SEP)

The SEP mission was to improve the quality of higher education in Mexico by means of intensive inter-institutional collaboration through regional, national and international networks, and programs of student and staff mobility (SEP 2001, p.198). SEP was far more powerful than the U.S.A. Department of Education, and did not really have a counterpart in the U.S.A. (Andere M., 2006).

SEP encouraged Mexican institutions of higher education to, 1) make systematic schemes of international cooperation in order to increase the exploitation of such activities and take advantage of resources from abroad to strengthen the development of education in Mexico; and 2) create schemes to facilitate the accreditation and certification of study programs, and to establish equivalent units of academic credit for transfer across international systems of education (SEP 2001, pp215-216).

History of the UGA-UV Academic Exchange

The UGA – UV social work education academic exchange evolved through stages of development through time typical of such programs (Gael-Avila, 1999). The purpose of this section is to describe five distinct phases of development in the UGA – UV social work academic exchange program (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000).

Phase one occurred from 1990 through 1993 and consisted of many conversations, mutual visits, and negotiation of an exchange agreement between the partner institutions. During this initial phase, the presence of two individuals was crucial. The first, William Arcado, was a social worker, and a retired USAID official and consultant for the Department of Human Services in Mexico City, who also served on the University Foundation Board at UV in 1990. The other, Dr. Harold Drucker, was Director of the Office of International Development at UGA with a particular interest in Latin America. During phase one, these two individuals maintained warm personal relationships with key stakeholders in both partner institutions, and added an important cultural element, personalized, the Mexican value on personal relationships, which is crucial for any successful personal relationship in that country (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000, p. 14, italics in original).

The second phase of the UGA – UV partnership occurred in 1994 and 1995, and consisted of identification of academic partners in each institution and negotiation of discipline specific agreements. During this phase the UGA School of Social Work began relationships with the two social work campuses of UV, one in the northern region of the state at Poza Rica, and the other in the southern region at Minatitlán, Veracruz.

The third phase of the exchange took place in 1995 and 1996, and consisted of identification of both human resources and financial support at both institutions. This phase consisted of formal invitations from UV stakeholders and extended visits by UGA stakeholders to the main campus in Xalapa, and the schools of social work in Poza Rica and Minatitlán.

Phase four took place from 1996 through 1998 and included the implementation of a range of activities by the partner schools of social work. During this phase UGA stakeholders applied for and won three competitive internal grants from Dr. Gerald Schultz, Vice President for Public Service and Outreach, totaling more than \$25,000 over three years, and representing a high level of institutional commitment. In Veracruz, the UV VPAA continued to provide financial support for UGA stakeholder visits as well as lecture series and curriculum consultations by UGA faculty at the Poza Rica and Minatitlán campuses.

Phase five occurred from 1997 through 2003, and included the expansion of the exchange to other disciplines at both UGA and UV. During this phase, several disciplines at UGA organized student and faculty exchanges with partner disciplines at UV. Financial self-sufficiency began to occur in the student exchanges through fee payment for classes, while departmental funds and the UGA VPAA financed faculty visits.

In 1998, The UGA School of Social work, the College of Education, and the Office of International Development of UGA, in partnership with the UV Area of Humanizes, received a \$97,000 grant from the United States Agency for International

Development (USAID) Association Liaison Office for two years of funding for the exchange activities. Focused on education within the professional disciplines of social work and teacher education, activities ranged from cultural immersion classes at the EEE to continuing education seminars, including distance learning broadcast by satellite television from Georgia to Veracruz, social work field practicum experiences, and semester faculty visits at both universities intended to inspire joint research and publication.

A major milestone occurred in 2003, with the decision by the UGA School of Social Work to end its participation in the exchange.

The purpose of this chapter was to situate the planning tables in this case study for the reader by describing their key contextual factors. This chapter contained five parts: 1) review of the theoretical framework of the study; 2) description of contextual factors of the institutions in the UGA – UV social work education exchange program; 3) description of contextual factors in the places in the UGA – UV social work education exchange; 4) biographies of people in the exchange program, and, 5) stages of development in the exchange program. The aim of this chapter was to provide foundation for the reader to assist in understanding the analysis and interpretation contained in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER FIVE

STAKEHOLDER INTERESTS

The purpose of this chapter is to answer research question one: What were the stakeholder interests in the UGA – UV social work education exchange? The aim of this chapter is to provide a description of stakeholders interests, which will then be used to answer research question two in chapter six. Limitation of space prevents describing all stakeholder interests in the exchange program. Consequently, only a critical subset of interests necessary to answer the research questions are described. All of these interests, and many more, combined to shape multiple, historically developing, and intersecting planning tables in the UGA-UV academic exchange.

Construction of Planning Tables

Power relations shaped multiple planning tables in various contexts by enabling or constraining the capacity to act on the part of program planning stakeholders. Therefore, stakeholders sought to achieve their represented interests through their capacity to exercise their power at these tables (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, 1994a, 1994b). In the UGA – UV academic exchange program, stakeholders represented and negotiated complex sets of interests at planning tables situated in the various contexts described in Chapter Four. As Cervero & Wilson (2006, p. 88) explained, these interests were “predispositions, embracing goals, values, desires, and other orientations and inclinations that lead a person to act in one direction or another.”

For the many academic exchange stakeholders described in Chapter Four, the interests they represented provided them with motivations and purposes, which led them to act, or not act, depending on their capacities to have done so. Moreover, the resulting outcomes were differentially dependent upon the challenges they faced relative to the diverse contexts in which they were situated. The resulting planning actions of stakeholders were dependent on their ongoing judgments made in response to the challenging dynamics that presented in their various contexts. The stakeholders involved in the UGA - UV planning process exercised their power relative to their own interests, the interests of other stakeholders, and the interests of those of whom they represented at the multiple planning tables. Collectively, their actions, or lack thereof, represented the social heart of the program planning process in the UGA – UV social work academic exchange.

Through their representation and negotiation of these complex sets of interests, the actions of program planning stakeholders defined the features of the academic exchange. Consequently, the features that cumulatively represented the UGA – UV social work academic exchange program were causally related to specific interests of the persons who planned them (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, 1994a). As Cervero & Wilson indicated (2006), “people with interests plan programs.” Their ongoing judgments, and their capacities to act, however, were not predetermined. Instead, the judgments and actions of program planning stakeholders were dependent upon: 1) which of them were at the table; 2) the places in which these tables were located; 3) which and whose interests they represented, and; 4) how each of them chose to exercise (or not) their power at the

table. Because of these contingencies, and the many ways in which they could have played out at the planning tables, the features represented by the UGA – UV exchange program could have turned out significantly different. Regardless of the possible outcomes, the exchange program would have resulted from the power relations that shaped the planning tables, the multiple, historically developing, and intersecting interests represented by stakeholders at various tables, and the particular negotiations that occurred there.

Of the complex sets of interests represented by stakeholders in the UGA – UV exchange, some were related to educational outcomes for the program, while others were related to social and political outcomes, or “hidden agendas”. Although the stated purpose and objectives of the exchange program were academically oriented, social and political interests were as integral a part of the planning process as educational interests, if not more. Because of the contradictory way in which stakeholders represented divergent interests at the planning tables, the process often appeared confusing, even confounding. Therefore, whether planning practitioner or researcher of the study, it was crucial never to lose sight of the following questions: Whose interests were at stake in the program? And, what were those interests? It is precisely these questions which are addressed in the remainder of this chapter.

Identification of Stakeholder Interests

To describe, compare and contrast the interests of the six stakeholder groups, the chapter sequentially answers the following research question for each group: What were the interests of the major stakeholders and stakeholder groups for the academic exchange

program? For each group, their section begins by describing the members and the role of the group, and then describes the collective interests of that group's members. As an organizing schema, group interests are numbered, with the first interest labeled "Interest 1.1," the next labeled "Interest 1.2," and so on. Table 5 summarizes the stakeholder interests described in this section.

As stated previously, this study defined interests as "predispositions, embracing goals, values, desires, and other orientations and inclinations that lead a person to act in one direction or another," (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, p. 88). Interests were attributed to groups on the basis of 1) direct statements of values, goals, or expectations; 2) statements of concerns, claims, and issues about the program; and 3) actions (or inaction) of stakeholders with respect to the program. In addition, stakeholders often attributed interests to other stakeholders and stakeholder groups. For example, UGA faculty said students acquired community practice theories, models, and methods for social work education as a result of the exchange program. In those instances, data gathered directly from one stakeholder group were validated with interests attributed to them by other stakeholders. Usually there was close agreement between directly stated interests by one stakeholder and attributed interests by another. This chapter presents these kinds of data for a few groups.

Occasionally, a particular interest was indicated by every member of a stakeholder group. At other times, one or more individuals from a group expressed an interest while others did not. This chapter presents both consensual and individual positions. To review, this case study defined a concern as "any assertion that a stakeholder may

introduce that is unfavorable to the evaluand” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 40). A claim was defined as “any assertion that a stakeholder may introduce that is favorable to the evaluand” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 40). And an issue was defined as “any state of affairs about which reasonable persons may disagree” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 40).

As mentioned previously, stakeholder interests in the case were distinguished as “personal,” “organizational,” or “societal,” sometimes termed “public” interests. A personal interest was one that directly benefited the person or persons from whom it was expressed. For example, some stakeholders expressed a personal interest in acquiring cultural competency through exchange participation in order to further their career options as social workers. By contrast, an organizational interest was one that directly benefited one or more of the many departments or organizations in the exchange. For example, because of the acquisition of cultural competency by social work practitioners in the exchange, they may have better served their Latino clients, therefore their organizational interests were likely served. Societal or public interests held by stakeholders were those most directly related to benefiting society at large. For example, because of the acquisition of cultural competency by social work practitioners in the exchange, they may have better served their Latino clients, who in turn may have been able to achieve a higher quality of life, therefore serving societal interests. Again, stakeholders often simultaneously held personal, organizational, and societal interests. This chapter describes these interests for each stakeholder group.

As described in chapter four, each of the six groups in the case study consists of stakeholders situated in varying contexts and at multiple planning tables in the UGA – UV academic exchange program.

Table 5
Stakeholder Interests

	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Stakeholder Group</i>						
	1 = UV Students					
	2 = UGA Students					
	3 = UV Faculty					
	4 = UGA Faculty					
	5 = UV Administration					
	6 = UGA Administration					
 <i>Interests</i>						
Acquire clinical case methods, models and theories for social work education					3	
Acquire community practice theories, models, and methods for social work education						4
Develop faculty through cooperative research, joint publications, and technical cooperation programs				3	4	
Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners in foreign language knowledge, skills, and ability		2	3	4		
Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners to be culturally competent		2		4		
Establish an international social work research agenda					4	
Increase the contribution of social work education to solve current problems in families and society	1	2	3	4		
Increase the level of academic preparation for social work faculty				3		5
Diversify funding sources for international academic exchange					4	5 6
Extend university services and outreach internationally						5 6
Increase employment opportunities for social work students, faculty, and practitioners	1		3			
Increase the contributions of the university to neoliberal globalization						5 6
Manage tasks, functions, processes, and operations of academic exchange				3	4	5 6
Move the university to the next stage of internationalization						5 6
Enhance communication, cultural understanding, and cultural exchange	1		3	4	5	5
Expand exchange programs to other academic departments and educational institutions						5 6
Increase administration, faculty and student participation in study abroad programs					4	6
Provide equal opportunities for participation by students and faculty in the exchange program	1		3	4		6
Raise levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach			3	4	5	6

Stakeholder Group One: Students, School of Social Work, University of Veracruz

For the purpose of narrating the case study, the first stakeholder group consisted of three anonymous characters, all current or former students of the University of Veracruz, Schools of Social Work, in the Minatitlán and Poza Rica campuses. Data about UV social work students, and their stakeholder interests, were collected through formal interviews with real UGA-UV exchange stakeholders conducted in Georgia and Veracruz, Mexico. UV social work student stakeholder characters were:

1. Patricia Romero, Student, School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Minatitlán;
2. Luz Sanchez, Student, School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Poza Rica;
3. Gloria Gutierrez, Student, School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Poza Rica.

Interest 1.1. Increase the contribution of social work education to solve current problems in families and society

Evidence strongly indicated UV social work students represented societal interests in increasing the contribution of social work education to solve current problems in families and society. For the UV students, this interest was shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA faculty, UGA students, and UV faculty. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Luz Sanchez was a social work student at the Minatitlán campus. She was married and had a young daughter, and she and her husband lived with her parents. Like

most UV students, Luz was raised in a nuclear family, living together with her mother and father, two younger brothers, and a younger sister. She explained how she and her siblings had benefited from the progress that Mexico had made during the last three decades of the twentieth century in providing higher education opportunities for growing numbers of students from all social classes. Luz was proud that both of her brothers, Roberto and Rodrigo, were electro-mechanical engineers working for PEMEX, the state oil company. Likewise, she felt the same about her sister, Rosaria, who was an attorney in private practice.

Similar to family histories given by many UV students, Luz explained that her father, like many in his generation, had finished his formal schooling after only the 3rd grade of elementary school. Regardless of his formal educational attainment, she claimed his love for learning had a great influence on her. She described the generational differences between she and her parents, and the great transformation that had occurred in Mexican society when it began to modernize, about the time Poza Rica arose as a city fifty years ago. Luz explained some of the social changes occurring at that time in regard to values and expectations about family, living arrangements, education and work. She said,

What was most important for the families, like my father's, that moved to Poza Rica from the countryside, was that for the first time children were able to leave the home for work, and to establish their families independently. Although my father didn't study past the 3rd grade, that didn't limit him much, and I remember very vividly such good memories of my childhood when my father helped me so

much with my schoolwork. He taught me the letters and numbers, then the minutes and seconds of the clock using just an old box with hands he had attached using matches. He taught us the calendar. Well, he was a man who came from a family with no economic resources, and he had no formal educational opportunities, no professional career, but that didn't prevent him from learning. He loved so much to read, he knew so much about Mexican history, about mathematics. He even tutored me in college.

Like almost all UV students interviewed for the study, Luz said she had never felt any real concrete expectation that the UGA-UV exchange would contribute to her personally during her education at UV. In fact, apart from some social work curricular changes adopted by UV from UGA, the only “participation” benefit Luz recognized she had in the academic exchange was her attendance at a presentation to faculty and students in Minatitlán made by the researcher of this study. In fact, she and most of the other students interviewed in Minatitlán (and later in Poza Rica) claimed they had been unaware there had ever been an academic exchange program with UGA. Nevertheless, regardless of the lack of real participation for her and others in the UGA-UV exchange, Luz expressed strong expectations about how this kind of partnership could make a valuable contributions to both social work education in Veracruz, and the transformation of social work practice in Mexico, leading to effective problem solving in society. She said,

To have an academic exchange with a foreign school is interesting, because it's an exchange of ideas, it would be an exchange of ideas. Because of the economic

difficulties here, it's difficult for a social work student to obtain work here. If we could have this kind of exchange, this exchange of ideas, we could learn what form of work you do there, and this would benefit us not only to transform our profession, but to help solve the tremendous problems we have here. This could open up a path to see how to move forward.

Gloria Gutierrez was a social work student at the Poza Rica campus. Somewhat unusual for a UV student, she came from the lowest socioeconomic class in Mexico, having been born in the very impoverished mountain region of central Veracruz, in San Jose Buena Vista, near the town of Altotongo. Gloria was one of eight brothers and sisters, of whom seven were still living, four girls and three boys. Similar to the Sanchez family, Gloria explained that two of her sisters had received higher education, not in the more prestigious UV, but in technical schools. She was disappointed that her brothers, however, had not benefited from increased educational opportunities in Mexico during their school years. She said they were involved in “various kinds of work”, and one had left for the United States. Gloria said with a sly look on her face, “He's been wet now for almost twenty years.” With some pride she explained how her grandfather had used local knowledge and wisdom to enable her brother's border crossing north,

When he was a sixteen year-old, Grandfather came down from Matamoros and took him north to the Border.... This is an old rite of passage in Mexico.... As Grandfather tells the story, he (my brother) was still a baby (with regard to crossing), so he (grandfather) had to “tuck him in” -- putting him under the front hood of his truck to hold onto the motor as he (grandfather) drove across the

Border.... Grandfather has “permission” (daily work visa), and he is able to make the crossing legally.

In spite of the rapid restructuring of the agricultural sector in Mexico, fueled by neoliberal free trade agreements like the NAFTA accord, Gloria explained that her parents still clung to work as subsistence farmers near Altotongo, cultivating corn and vegetables. She was concerned that huge numbers of farmers like them had already been forced to give up their livelihoods and migrate to towns and cities, and how a rapidly growing number of the young, like her brother, had left for the United States. When asked about a typical trip home from Poza Rica to visit family in San Jose Buena Vista, she described a journey of unknown hardship for most UGA students.

I took a taxi for twenty minutes to 20th Avenue, and there I waited fifteen minutes for the micro-bus that dropped me in front of the Poza Rica electric company building. There I waited thirty minutes, then I took a bus to the town of Martinez, and from there took another bus. It was two and a half hours to Martinez. The bus from there took me to Altotongo, two and a half hours more. Then I caught another bus that passed along the Tezuitlan route, because the Atzalan route was impassable due to the rains. It was five more hours, then I arrived in San Jose Buena Vista, and I enjoyed, because I was home.

Because of the growth of the drug cartels in Veracruz – a significant response by the Mexican economy to processes of globalization -- Gloria said she worried constantly about the safety of her parents. She began to cry as she lamented the situation back home in the mountains of Altotongo. Concerned about the growing social problems in Mexico,

Gloria emphasized the need for Mexican social work to address the problems negatively impacting traditional social, civil, and family structures. She recognized that a program like the UGA-UV academic exchange could contribute to this end, and she expressed an expectation that it should have done so. She said,

Look, the problems make me emotional...they exist in this zone...it's because of the unemployment. In these areas there is so much drug addiction, way too much. And prostitution of the very young. These are zones controlled almost completely by the drug cartels. And so they expect the farmers to grow the “natural” (marijuana), and in the mountains of Altotongo there is a lot. There are serious problems of feuds between families, which are like gangs. There is so much marginalization in this area. That is why there is so much emigration out. From my description you see there is little transport, few services.... As social workers we need to put a lot more attention to these areas. This kind of an exchange with you should help us do that.

Interest 1.2. Increase employment opportunities for social work students, faculty, and practitioners

Evidence indicated UV social work students represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in increasing employment opportunities for social work students, faculty, and practitioners. For the UV students, these interests were shared with one other stakeholder group: UV faculty. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Exchange stakeholders from UGA and UV repeatedly expressed concerns during interviews about how dismal employment opportunities were for workers in Veracruz, including those in the social work professions. Consequently, UV students made repeated statements indicating strong personal, organizational, and societal interests in increasing employment opportunities for social work students, faculty, and practitioners in Veracruz. With virtual unanimity, they claimed this to be for the good of not just themselves, but equally for their schools, profession, and society.

Monica Zamora, Director and Dean of the School of Social Work in Poza Rica, provided strong attribution of the many claims made by UV students of their interests in this area. She described the economic situation in Veracruz in 2002, which had deteriorated employment opportunities for social workers in the decade since the signing of NAFTA. With grave concern, she said,

There are many needs that derive precisely from the question of unemployment, which is so prevalent in Poza Rica, and in our profession in recent years. If there is no work, there are no economic earnings, and if there are no economic earnings, then the people cannot satisfy their basic needs. It's as if there's a cycle, and if I am not buying, then the people who have a certain means of money to invest, well, what they invest becomes static, there is no movement, no flow, in terms of the economic questions. No? There are many needs in the region, from nourishment to recreation. Here the people, including those attempting to work in our profession, have a basic choice: eat or go the movies. We are talking about a family that has three or four children. With much difficulty they must address

these questions. The people here no longer go out.... All of these questions revolve around the monetary question.

Interest 1.3. Enhance communication, cultural understanding, and cultural exchange

Evidence indicated UV social work students represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in enhancing communication, cultural understanding, and cultural exchange. For the UV students, these interests were shared with five other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, UGA faculty, UGA students, UV administration, and UV faculty. Together these six stakeholder groups negotiated these interests for other stakeholders in the program.

With the exception of a handful of UV faculty and administration elites, and one privileged UV student, participation opportunities in the UGA-UV academic exchange were few for those in the Schools of Social Work at UV. This was especially true for students. Nevertheless, UV social work students expressed desires of making the most of any participation opportunity in this kind of exchange. For example, a few UV students expressed a desire to “share ideas” with foreign visitors. Because their chances of participating as a foreign student in Georgia were extremely low, UV student participation was limited to the times when UGA participants made visits to the Schools of Social in Veracruz.

Gloria Gutierrez, a student in Poza Rica, had no real personal opportunity to participate in foreign study or as an academic visitor to Georgia. Regardless, she and others recognized the possibility of participating personally, and organizationally as a student body, in the exchange by developing relationships with visiting students from

Georgia. Unfortunately, Gloria perceived little expressed interest on the part of some of her Veracruz student colleagues in getting to know visitors from Georgia. Some actually claimed no personal interest in this regard, but Gloria questioned their statements, and suspected many of them harbored the interest inside of themselves, but verbally rejected it as simply an impossible expectation to attain. She explained,

Well you have to understand something about it, about having an exchange here because we see it as something surreal, for us it is something unreal, how to know other people like a person from another country who arrives here at the school. Everybody gathers together, talks together, they talk bad about this Gringo because they believe he's (sic) come with a plan of superiority. Perhaps all don't talk this way, but many do.

Reinforcing the negative stereotype of the United States visitor, Gloria explained that during the rare times when a UGA social work student had left the “restaurants, clubs and cafes of Xalapa” to visit her dusty campus, seldom or never had she entered a classroom or socialized with Poza Rican students. Reiterating a common complaint made by students and faculty in Veracruz, Gloria said it seemed like the benefits of the exchange had all gone to Georgia. She expressed frustration in this, and explained that her understanding of exchange was that of a sharing and reciprocal process, one that should benefit students, schools, and the greater good on both sides. She explained her concern,

Two years ago, two students from UGA came, but they were only out in the community doing research. At no time did they enter a classroom, so the

enrichment they were learning, they carried away, guarded only for them. They learned it, and they carried it away. For us, they left nothing behind. And so this is the way it goes for us, they benefit, and they leave us nothing. Shouldn't the process of the exchange be give and take? I want you to come, but you also should give me an experience. I give to you, and you give to me. This is what really lacks in this exchange program.

Interest 1.4. Provide equal opportunities for participation by students and faculty in the exchange program

Evidence strongly indicated UV social work students represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in providing equal opportunities for participation by students and faculty in the exchange program, for the benefit of self, school, and country. For the UV students, these interests were shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, UGA faculty, and UV faculty. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests for other stakeholders in the program.

As about half of the UV social work students would eventually do, Patricia Romero had finished coursework in her academic program at the school in Minatitlán. Fortunately for her, she was serving her mandatory social service internship in one of the best locations for social work career opportunities in the state, the Vice-Rectorcy, Department of Social Communication, at the University of Veracruz in Coatzacoalcos.

Patricia's good fortune, however, extended far beyond her internship location. Although a handful of students from the UV Schools of Social Work had applied to participate in the exchange with the personal hope of traveling to Georgia, Patricia was

the only UV social work student selected to make the trip during the entire 10 year history of the social work exchange. In the year 2000, she traveled to Athens where she stayed for 20 days.

Unlike the vast majority of UV students who hailed from the eastern state of Veracruz on the Gulf of Mexico, Patricia came from western Pacific coast state of Sonora, on the opposite side of Mexico. She had come to study in Veracruz primarily for reasons of personal safety. In Sonora her father was an influential business person in the “export business,” and local politician. Because of the escalating violent crime in recent years in northern Mexico, particularly kidnappings targeting children of the elite, her father had insisted that Patricia leave the family hacienda in Sonora.

Rare among her student and faculty colleagues who shared interests in equal participation opportunities in the exchange, Patricia had enjoyed the privilege of traveling extensively in Mexico, and had also made trips to the United States. Along with her desire, it was almost certainly due to her previous travel to the U.S.A. that enabled her to become the only UV social work student who traveled to Georgia. Because she already possessed a Mexican passport, and had been approved previously for a U.S.A. Visa, Patricia was able to satisfy the strict requirements for U.S.A. visa approval for Mexican students. During the interview, she explained,

I was able to go (to Georgia) because I was the only person able to obtain a U.S.A. visa.... For any Mexican it's a fact the U.S.A. Embassy has strict requirements: you must have a bank account with a lot of money; own your own

home; have a round trip plane ticket to help prove you'll return to Mexico. And in the case of academic exchanges for students, it's even more difficult.

Patricia was optimistic that her unique exchange participation would contribute to her future in social work, but also enhance her potential contribution to the future of Mexico. Questions of personal privilege aside, along with students and faculty she shared the desire for equitable participation among her colleagues. Moreover, like many other UV students interviewed for the study, she expressed a genuine commitment to profession and country. And she backed her rhetoric with action: she had attended various National Congresses for social work around the country; and she had a vision of her profession helping to enrich her country, raising the wellbeing of society. After finishing her mandatory social service, she she said her next goal was to have an opportunity to pursue foreign residential study in social work at a university in the United States.

Stakeholder Group Two: Students, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

For the purpose of narrating the case study, the second stakeholder group consisted of four anonymous characters, all former students of the School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens. Data about UGA students, and their stakeholder interests, were collected through formal interviews with real UGA-UV exchange stakeholders conducted in Georgia and Veracruz, Mexico. UGA social work student stakeholder characters were:

1. Jenifer (Jenny) Chambers, Student, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens;

2. Anthony (Tony) Erving, Student, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens;
3. Deborah (Deb) Adair, Student, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens; and
4. Maria (Mary) Torres, Student, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens.

Interest 2.1. Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners in foreign language knowledge, skills, and ability

Evidence indicated UGA social work students represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in educating social work students, faculty, and practitioners in foreign language knowledge, skills, and ability. For the UGA students, these interests were shared with two other stakeholder groups: UGA faculty, and UV faculty. Together these three stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Like over a hundred of her alumni, Jenny Chambers, a UGA social work student, participated in summer study in Veracruz. As all UGA social work students said when interviewed for the study, she claimed it was a valuable personal experience for learning Spanish, which was a strong goal of hers. She explained that because of her proficiency in Spanish, aided by her language study in Xalapa, local social service organizations recognized the value she could bring to them and their clients, and this led to more employment opportunities as a bilingual social worker in Georgia.

Jenny was born and raised on a farm outside of Albany, Georgia. As a child she participated in the 4-H program, and won ribbons showing her hogs at the Georgia State Fair. When she was very young Jenny began to see more and more Latinos arriving in Albany, including migrant workers on local farms. In school she sat next to their children in class, and she witnessed first hand the difficulties they had in adjusting to learning in English. In college Jenny completed a Bachelor's Degree in Education at Valdosta State University. After graduation, but before she mastered Spanish, she returned to Albany where she taught fourth grade for four years in the public school system there. With a rapid influx of Spanish speaking children in the Albany schools, during her years as a teacher she really began to see how valuable it would be to speak Spanish. Acting on her belief, in 2000, Jenny began graduate school, entering the MSW program at UGA, which contained a mandatory Spanish language component.

Jenny explained that during her time as a teacher she realized that it wasn't the right career fit for her. She chose social work as a new career path because it gave her the opportunity to engage with the whole family, and address deeper issues that had prevented her Latino students from adjusting to their new lives in Georgia. As a bilingual social worker, she was certain that she could make a positive contribution to newly arriving individuals and their families, and also to her employer, and society at large. She explained,

My grandmother was a teacher, and my mother was a teacher, so I was raised to believe that was the right course for me. But it wasn't, and now, with the huge Latino population in Georgia, I just think I can make more of a difference

working with them as a Social Worker.... I've learned a lot of Spanish, it's great.... My finance was born in Mexico, and we speak it all the time... I speak it constantly in my job (as a bilingual social worker).

Jenny participated in the Veracruz exchange in summer of 2001, when she studied Spanish and Mexican culture at the UV School for Foreign Students in Xalapa. She graduated with an MSW from UGA in 2002 and now works as a social worker in Lawrenceville, Georgia.

Interest 2.2. Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners to be culturally competent

Evidence indicated UGA social work students represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in educating social work students, faculty, and practitioners to be culturally competent. For the UGA students, these interests were shared with one other stakeholder group: UGA faculty. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

All of the UGA social work students interviewed made claims about how participation in the Veracruz exchange, and the subsequent acquisition of cultural competency, served their personal and professional interests, including their work organizations, but also made positive contributions to their communities. Dan Brown, a UGA Social Work Faculty, provided strong attribution for their claims by described how valuable exchange participation and achieving cultural competency had been for his UGA social work students. He said that,

The students that I had contact with over the years who had been in the Veracruz exchange, the Georgia students, have 100% considered it one of the most meaningful parts of their education. A number of them got jobs purely on (this basis)... Sure they had their social work degree, but they had international experience and exposure to Spanish...and they were snapped up by Georgia agencies over someone who didn't have it.

Like every UGA Social Work faculty interviewed for the study, Gilroy Nance also attributed student claims of the value imparted to them as UGA students in exchange participation, especially in its effectiveness in establishing cultural competency as entry level practitioners working with Latino clients. He claimed that,

I mean the major success, I think, is that you've had undergraduate and graduate students who've gone to Mexico, lived in people's homes, even just as short a period as three weeks. And I think it changes people's perspective about the world. You can hear students say that, they talk about it. So I mean I think that's the major accomplishment.

Interest 2.3. Increase the contribution of social work education to solve current problems in families and society

Evidence indicated UGA social work students represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in increasing the contribution of social work education to solve current problems in families and society. For the UGA students, these interests were shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA faculty, UV faculty, and

UV students. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Rare among her UGA social work student colleagues, Mary Torres, was born in Mexico. She came to the United States from the western mountain state of Durango in 1979 when she was two years-old. Her family settled immediately in Dalton, Georgia, due to a large enclave of Durango immigrants living there. During the late 1980s, her family applied to the Department of Justice Amnesty Program, becoming U.S.A. citizens in 1994. Mary was raised in a Spanish-speaking household in Dalton, and acquired fluency in Spanish as her first language. Although now permanently disabled, her father had worked in the carpet mills in Dalton, while her mother worked as a bilingual teacher's aide in the elementary schools.

Mary attended Dalton State University, then the University of Georgia, Athens, graduating with a BA in Spanish in 1999. In 2001 she began the MSW program in Athens. She explained her calling to social work, and how by studying at UGA, and in the summer program in Veracruz, she had acquired unique tools that made a difference with her clients, in her workplace, and in her community.

When I was a child, I was ashamed of my Latino heritage. We came early, before the big movements in the 90s, and now. And so I was truly a minority, and just wanted to fit in with the other children. I wouldn't be called Maria (her given name) or speak Spanish in public. I fought about it with my parents a lot. They almost disowned me! It wasn't until college, and studying Spanish literature, that I began to appreciate and love my culture.... Now, with so many Latinos at risk

here, I'm so blessed to have had the opportunity to become a social worker. An important part of my studies was the summer trip to Veracruz. I learned so much about where my family and community had come from.... Now I know that I have God-given tools to make a difference in my community as a social worker.

Mary participated in the Veracruz exchange in 2002, studying Spanish and Mexican culture at the UV School for Foreign Students in Xalapa. She graduated the UGA MSW program in 2003 and now works as a social worker in Dalton, Georgia

Stakeholder Group Three: University of Veracruz, Minatitlán, Faculty

For the purpose of narrating the case study, the third stakeholder group consisted of five anonymous characters, current and former faculty of the Schools of Social Work, University of Veracruz, at the Minatitlán and Poza Rica campuses. Data about UV faculty, and their stakeholder interests, were collected through formal interviews with real UGA-UV exchange stakeholders conducted in Georgia and Veracruz, Mexico.

Additional data came from analysis of departmental documents, written communications, articles about particular stakeholders and their departments, and department websites. UV social work faculty stakeholder characters were:

1. Maria Davila, Director and Dean, School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Minatitlán;
2. Francisco Fernandez, Teacher (full-time), School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Minatitlán;
3. Berta Nieto, Teacher (full-time), School of Social Work, Minatitlán;

4. Monica Zamora, Director and Dean, School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Poza Rica; and
5. Ruth Palmero, Teacher (full-time), School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Poza Rica.

Interest 3.1. Acquire clinical case methods, models and theories for social work education

Evidence indicated UV social work faculty represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in acquiring clinical case methods, models and theories for social work education. For the UV faculty, these interests were shared with no other stakeholder group. They alone negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Like every UV faculty person interviewed for the study, Francisco Fernandez, a full-time Teacher of Social Work in Minatitlán, expressed strong personal, organizational, and societal interests in acquiring clinical case methods, models and theories for social work education. Expressing the goal he shared with his UV faculty colleagues to learn clinical methods from UGA, he said,

Social work faculty here in Minatitlán should have academic visits...to see how social work is done in...agencies, how they supervise their classrooms, how they train faculty in the face of real problems in their communities and contexts.....

These visits would permit learning about how they do their case work, how they do interventions, how a social worker links to their problematic, how they carry it to the classroom, discuss it, how they propose new alternatives, how they utilize

theoretical frames, like systems, ecological (theory), and how they use models to help direct work more specifically.

Monica Zamora, Director and Dean of the School of Social Work in Poza Rica, also claimed personal, organizational, and societal interests in acquiring clinical case methods, models and theories. She expressed concern about the unwillingness of Mexican academics to accept new theories and methods, and she pinpointed the need for Mexican social work scholars and practitioners to set aside Marxist theories at least long enough to examine philosophies of science very different from what they've traditionally been taught, She said,

We Mexicans have to make a big effort in this.... I have had opportunities to observe Canadian social work, and social work in the United States, which has permitted me to see that there are other ways very different to do social work, and they are able to be very effective, and they don't stop contemplating reality, and they show that we have to intervene directly. So I believe that is what we are lacking just a little.... Our plans of study are more contemplative, theoretical; we are trained to give a lecture about a phenomenon, but not to say how we can intervene in it. So this is the part that we are lacking in our plan of studies, and where this linkage and exchange would be able to help us resolve these gaps, which exist between theory and reality, the real practice of direct intervention, with real individuals, real persons.

Interest 3.2. Develop faculty through cooperative research, joint publications, and technical cooperation programs

Evidence indicated UV social work faculty represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in developing faculty through cooperative research, joint publications, and technical cooperation programs. For the UV faculty, these interests were shared with one other stakeholder group: UGA faculty. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Building on the many claims made about the need to learn clinical and case methods, most UV faculty, like Maria Davila, Director and Dean of School of Social Work in Minatitlán, also claimed personal, organizational, and societal interests in better overall faculty formation specifically aided by cooperative efforts with UGA in the exchange. Her claims moved beyond needing just new models and methods, focusing instead directly on the need for more holistic faculty formation and development through joint cooperation with UGA. For example, she said,

As social workers...we know of the presence of these problems but we haven't been trained to revise our plans of study (to address them). We make revisions, we have new thematic content, but we don't reach the needed level. This is to say, how can we form ourselves in order to intervene directly (in these phenomena). We don't have the tools or techniques that permit us to work towards the problem. Working together with you we could do this.

Maria offered specific case examples of how these cooperative efforts could assist her and the faculty collective in better serving the social good. She presented the example of alcoholism, and said,

We have alcoholism and, well, theoretically, we know that it is not just alcoholism, but all types of alcoholism, many levels of alcoholism, but we don't know how to intervene in the problem of alcoholism. We know the ecological problem, but we do not know like you do how to form an agency, or how to form groups that permit questioning and trying to invigorate better levels of health.... This is the part of our professional academic formation in the educational realm that we lack.

A few UV faculty, like Francisco Fernandez, offered personal evidence of UV faculty interests in learning through exchange collaboration about how to publish the results of their academic activities in the Schools of Public Health in Veracruz. Francisco said,

Dan Brown helped me to write an article that was published in a social work journal (joint publication) from Universidad Autonoma de Nuevo Leon and the University of Texas in Austin. This was a very beneficial personal situation, a personal expectation. If I wouldn't have gotten to know him (through the exchange), I wouldn't have had the opportunity to publish an article.... Moreover, I didn't know how to do it, but now I know a little bit about the path (to publication). And even better, well, very soon after that I sent out another article that I was able to publish. This expectation is personal, no?

Indicating her interest in this issue, Monica Zamora, expressed significant concerns about the UV social work faculty lacking in two important areas of preparation that prevented them from being effective educational organizations, but also in making the best of the collaborative exchange experience. First, she believed UV lacked the ability to effectively adopt and diffuse knowledge and skills available from UGA in the exchange. Second, she claimed that UV lacked the ability to effectively share their own valuable knowledge and skills with UGA. She said that,

At the local level (Poza Rica and Minatitlán)...we don't know how to engage in an exchange, how to make it happen. We want to link ourselves with this (university) or that (one), in a very strong way, and with much effort, but in the end we lose... We have a lot (to offer) in terms of our community work... But we don't know...how to write up our experiences. We are rich in rural social work knowledge, incredibly rich, but we don't know how to present it, how to give form to it, to systematize it and write a book, or an article about it.... We don't have it written because we don't know how to do it. And this is because of three concrete points: the economic reality here, the lack of training, and if we were able to do it, the lack of value for our methods from your side.

Interest 3.3. Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners in foreign language knowledge, skills, and ability

Evidence indicated UV social work faculty represented personal and organizational interests in educating social work students, faculty, and practitioners in foreign language knowledge, skills, and ability. For the UV faculty, these interests were

shared with two other stakeholder groups: UGA faculty, and UGA students. Together these three stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Knowledge, skill, and ability in English language for UV stakeholders was a huge issue for everyone involved in the UGA-UV social work exchange. Most stakeholders interviewed for the study claimed that proficiency in English language by UV exchange participants was both a desired personal goal, and the major barrier to effective participation and sustainability of the exchange program. Most UV faculty interviewed expressed the goal of learning English. For example, Berta Nieto, a full-time Teacher in Minatitlán, said that,

In a personal sense, I wanted to go to broaden (myself) and to search (for personal development). I didn't know exactly what I was going to do, but I knew that I must learn English. This was so that I would be able to read...research articles in English because I am very interested in North American social work.... It interests me a lot because I want to move into the field of work involving direct practice with clients. My primary objective is to learn English, and later, my second objective, is to learn technical English. Because if I want to read in English, and do research in social work in English, I'm going to have to know technical words and their pronunciation, too.

As described in Interest 3.2, although the experience of learning the process of publication satisfied a personal interest for Francisco Fernandez, because of the hegemony of English, a huge barrier to UV participation in exchange activities, he was

concerned about how far the benefits of his newfound personal achievement would trickle down through the school. His comments reinforce the degree to which English language proficiency served as a barrier for most UV stakeholders, whether as planner or participant in the UGA-UV exchange. He said that,

I don't know how much this (my publication) is able to benefit our school of social work, right? Because this was in English, and the students cannot read it.

And so there they are embedded in the (hegemonic) process.

Interest 3.4. Increase the contribution of social work education to solve current problems in families and society

Evidence indicated UV social work faculty represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in increasing the contribution of social work education to solve current problems in families and society. For the UV faculty, these interests were shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA faculty, UGA students, and UV students. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Like all UV students and faculty interviewed for the study, Berta Nieto described the need for social programs to deal more effectively in intervening in the many intractable social problems in Mexico. Nieto viewed traditional Mexican organizational behaviors, often wrought with political corruption, as barriers to effective program development for social interventions. She expressed hope that progress in this area could come from the new focus in UV social work education on social work practitioners serving as facilitators of change in their institutional settings. Nieto described the

problems at hand, and her vision for a new generation of social workers creating spaces in which effective programs could be developed to institute social change. She said,

There aren't programs...and there things stay, and you do what little you can, while political authorities give what little money there is to the parents of the family, for (their own) political purposes. Therefore, I feel that these same authorities are not capable of understanding these phenomena, and they do not permit us to undertake works that could be effective.... Our authorities do not see clearly the phenomena, or how to intervene in them, or how to improve them....

The official says, or speaks about social themes, but the reality is that our authorities are not very interested in the solution to problems.... It is up to the new generation to open spaces for a new politics for social good.

Ruth Palmero, a full-time Teacher in Poza Rica, expressed hope that institutions in Mexico would adopt some of the structures and roles for the social worker like those she witnessed during her academic visit to UGA. While there, the power and authority of the U.S.A. social workers to effectively take action for change, whether individually or collectively within their institutions, made a strong impression on her. She described her experience of witnessing the role of a U.S.A. social worker as an advocate in a criminal justice setting. She said that,

(In the U.S.A.) the social workers have so much power, there we were able to see it. We were in a court, where there is a case, a problem with the court -- before I have only seen this in a movie. There was a judge, a jury, and one who was accused. The social worker had investigated, made the issue, and involved themselves in all of these contexts. They

were considered very important. What they said, what they did, had a big effect in what was going to be determined, and the verdict that they were going to give.

Palmero described other experiences she had in seeing U.S.A. social workers directly intervening in institutional contexts to address social problems and effect social changes. She remarked that,

We also went to an adolescent prison, and there the social workers were practically the leader. We went to an institution where they treated drug addicts, and alcoholics, and it was the same experience. What caused the most attention to me was that the (UGA) students were also involved in working in these institutions, under the responsibility of a social worker, which was very different from what was going on here.

Interest 3.5. Increase the level of academic preparation for social work faculty

Evidence indicated UV social work faculty represented personal and organizational interests in increasing the level of academic preparation for social work faculty. For the UV faculty, these interests were shared with one other stakeholder group: UV administration. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Further elaborating on issues of faculty formation and collaborative development as a means to achieve it (addressed in Interests 3.1 and 3.2), most UV faculty stakeholders made two additional claims, both in regard to academic preparation: first, they claimed the need to restructure current degree types in Mexican social work education, and; second, they claimed a need to acquire advanced degrees in social work.

For example, Maria Davila expressed her interest in increasing the level of academic preparation for social work faculty by describing systemic changes in degree structures that she believed needed to be made in social work education in Mexico. Most social work faculty in Veracruz held a Licenciatura, or first degree, which was based almost entirely on theoretical knowledge. Maria and others believed a need to restructure this degree, with more of a focus on application of knowledge and skills. They claimed this would form students with a better mix of knowledge, skills, and abilities, enabling them to serve as entry level teachers in Mexican schools of social work. Nonetheless, like almost all of her colleagues interviewed, she clearly saw this as just a first step to better prepare faculty. It was clear in the expressions of Maria and others that their preferred means to better prepare themselves and others to be social work faculty lay in the acquisition of an advanced degree, such as an MSW or PhD from UGA. Many interviewees said this would soon be necessary to stay competitive in a globalized era of labor mobility. She explained that,

The Licenciatura, which is the first academic degree granted by any university in Mexico, and the Licenciatura in social work, such as here in Minatitlán, does not form nor train.... We need to change and improve this degree to make it more like your master's degree... But as a faculty person in social work, that isn't enough, especially in the future.... Right now we need masters degrees, better yet, doctorates, from schools like yours, to be prepared in these times.

Interest 3.6. Increase employment opportunities for social work students, faculty, and practitioners

Evidence indicated UV social work faculty represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in increasing employment opportunities for social work students, faculty, and practitioners. For the UV faculty, these interests were shared with one other stakeholder group: UV students. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

A strong expressed concern of all UV stakeholders interviewed was employment and economic conditions in Veracruz. Along with all of her colleagues, Berta Nieta claimed a strong interest in increasing employment conditions for everyone in the social work profession in Veracruz. Further, she expressed concerns about conditions of underemployment and relatively lower professional status for social workers in Mexico.

Berta provided factual evidence about salary levels obtained in a study she performed about social workers in Veracruz. The results demonstrated features of under-compensation and sub-employment prevalent in the social work profession there. As a teacher at UV Minatitlán, with substantial seniority and rank, Berta claimed her salary was high relative to other social work teachers there, and compared to other practitioners in the field. Relative to the other professions in Mexico, however, she was claimed that her salary was substantially lower.

Berta claimed a monthly salary of 16,000 pesos, or 192,000 per year. Depending on the fluctuating exchange rate in dollars, this would have been approximately \$19,000 annually. She compared her salary to those of her husband's firm, Petroleos Mexicanos

(PEMEX), where she said, “an average worker at Petroleos Mexicanos, like my husband for example, can earn a salary on the low end of 150,000 (\$15,000) pesos per year, or on the high end of 300,000 (\$30,000) per year.”

According to the recent survey Berta conducted among 20 firms in the region, graduates of social work in Veracruz earned between \$400 and \$600 monthly. Tuition for students was \$30 per semester. Moreover, not only was the pay low compared to other professions, the opportunities for employment were few, as she explained,

Social work has very few opportunities for employment, the consequence being (graduates) accept employment outside the field, which doesn't contribute to the development of the profession. I'm telling you that we are sub-employed.

(Graduates) end up being receptionists, secretaries, selling shoes, whatever they can do.... Even if they do work in social work, the salary is not compared to the other professions.

Interest 3.7. Manage tasks, functions, processes, and operations of academic exchange

Evidence indicated UV faculty represented organizational interests in managing tasks, functions, processes, and operations of academic exchange. For the UV faculty, these interests were shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, UGA faculty, and UV administration. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Pronounced asymmetries existed between exchange locations in regard to many issues involving the exchange. Asymmetries occurred between the following important locations: 1) between the two Schools of Social Work in Veracruz; 2) between the

Schools of Social Work in Veracruz, and the UV central administration in Xalapa; and 3) between UGA and UV.

Providing evidence of the importance of exchange management issues for UV faculty, Maria Davila expressed concern about the lack of planning authority among her faculty in Minatitlán, compared to the UGA faculty, and the central administration in Xalapa. She said,

The truth? The truth is we play no role at all. Our role has been totally receptive. We react to the things that the University of Georgia wants us to. We do design the activities that they want to do here, but there is never any question about what they will be. There is no program development, in which we have voice in a reciprocal manner to say what our faculty is going to do, and what your faculty, our visitor, is going to do. Instead there are activities that you want, that conform to the person who arrives (from Georgia), and conform to the needs of that person.

She described the centralized nature of control within UV, and the lack of sharing of information by some stakeholders about planned visits, such as the times they would occur, agendas or content for the meetings. This lack of information sharing often required her group to cease normal operations on short notice in order to accommodate and serve UGA visitors. After being questioned a second time about exchange planning activities performed among her staff, she explained firmly,

I'm telling you that we have no role in the planning! For example, we do not have any role in deciding the timing of the visits, or who is going to come, which drives the outline (of the visit). We don't have a role in the curriculum of the visit.

However, I do not believe that it is just the fault of Georgia, but is a result of our university being completely centralized. The Georgia contacts are made at the central level in Xalapa, and through the Direction of Academic Development, which is in charge of these types of situations. Questions about foreign students, or academic exchanges do not exist (at our level in the UV hierarchy). As I told you, this type of receptivity, this type of negotiation in exchange situations, does not exist for us. Nothing more than they call us and we have to receive these people.

Interest 3.8. Enhance communication, cultural understanding, and cultural exchange

Evidence indicated UV faculty represented personal and organizational interests in enhancing communication, cultural understanding, and cultural exchange. For the UV faculty, these interests were shared with five other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, UGA faculty, UGA students, UV administration, and UV students. Together these six stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Like most of her colleagues, Monica Zamora had worked for many years in her School of Social Work. At the time of her interview, Monica had been working as a teacher in Poza Rica for 13 years, including nine as the Academic Secretary in the department, three as the Executive Secretary, and one as Director and Dean. She had graduated from the school in 1989, when Ruth Palmero had been Director and Dean. As a participant in the UGA – UV exchange program, in 2000 Monica spent 15 days in Athens, GA on an academic visit. Monica expressed strong statements regarding the

value she placed on meeting new people from different cultures, and opportunities for the exchange of teaching and learning with them, as she had done in working with UGA people both in Veracruz, and during her trip to GA. She said,

I enjoyed the exchange work. I enjoy making new friends, like I have encountered with you all, through the University of Georgia of Georgia.... (While in Georgia) I had the opportunity to learn about the university; I had the opportunity to learn about all the coursework (in the UGA School of Social Work); all the work that they have with the community; the work of the institutions. And they permitted me to work in Garnett Ridge Community, which I appreciated, and which enchanted me, because it's a project that allowed me to be able to make relationships with our immigrant people in your country. It was enchanting to be there and to know your culture, to know the old climate when it was cold, to understand how it rains in Georgia.

Ruth Palmero had been working in Poza Rica for 28 years as as a full-time teacher. Until the previous year she had been Dean for nine consecutive years. At the time of her interview, she was commissioned to the Vice-Rectorcy of UV in Poza Rica. Prior to entering social work, Ruth was a graduate of the first generation of education students in Poza Rica. As part of the academic exchange, she made a brief trip to Georgia for 15 days as an academic visitor. Ruth made repeated claims about how she valued the opportunity to participate in the exchange as a visitor to UGA, and how it enabled her to better understand her visitors from Georgia when they came to Veracruz.

Cultural differences and student practices between the campuses and students in Mexico and Georgia especially stood out for Ruth, which she explained during her interview,

Your way of being strongly caught my attention. For example, there weren't many students lingering outside on the patios, but they were in the classrooms, even more, they were in the libraries. In our country, in my state, in my city of Poza Rica, the majority of students, when they don't have class, they just go outside and do nothing.

More than just offering her opportunities for learning English, and about systems of education and practice of social work in the U.S.A., for Ruth, the trip to Georgia offered an opportunity to separate myth from reality concerning conditions of Mexican immigrants in the U.S.A.. She explained,

There has been an enormous enrichment, first to learn a little English, and later to know other experiences, such as being close to my compatriots who have gone to the U.S.A., to see how they live there. Now I don't just read books about migration, or hear about it from other Mexicans who have traveled to the U.S.A.. I went there and got to know Mexicans who are in the U.S.A.. Now I can be clear when some say this is the "truth", and others say that's a "lie", or others claim what is "real" (about Mexican experiences there).

Ruth also described the shattering of common myths about people in the U.S.A., which for her satisfied personal interests of knowing others north of the Border. This provided her the opportunity to share these new understandings with her students in Poza Rica, after returning as a visitor from Georgia. She said,

For me this has permitted a personal growth to occur, to live with (U.S.A.) people of a very high (educational and socioeconomic) level, and I see that it's not from academic formation that they have a different world view. And so I believe that the exchange has benefited me much on the personal level. This is to say that less than the way I enjoyed it, with my students I can try to reproduce a little of the lived experience.

Interest 3.9. Provide equal opportunities for participation by students and faculty in the exchange program

Evidence indicated UV faculty represented personal and organizational interests in providing equal opportunities for participation by students and faculty in the exchange program. For the UV faculty, these interests were shared with with three other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, UGA faculty, and UV students. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Jose Cuevas was a Teacher in the School of Social Work in Poza Rica, but was detailed to the Area of Humanities, Institute of Social Historical Research in Xalapa. Jose gave testimony of his personal interest in equal opportunities for participation by UV stakeholders in exchange activities. While expressing pride about having been selected as the first UV visitor to Georgia, he said that prior to his going, he had to wait through six long years of exchange activities before he was given an opportunity to make an academic visit to Georgia. During those six years, nearly one hundred different UGA participants visited Veracruz. He explained that,

It was in February of 1998. We had to pass through 6 years in the exchange before a professor from Veracruz went to UGA. We signed the exchange in 1992, and in 1998, the first one of us went, and it was me. A big responsibility to be the first.

Highlighting the barrier to exchange participation faced by UV stakeholders due to lack of fluency in English, Cuevas explained that it was his ability to do so that opened the door for him to travel to Georgia. He said,

In 1998, I finished my masters in Monterrey, studied a little English, and Dr. Alba said to me, “well, since you speak a little English, you can go.” And Dr. Brown made an invitation to me, and I went. I was the first. I opened the door. I opened the path for the professors from Veracruz to visit UGA.

In 2000, Maria Davila was made Director and Dean of the School of Social Work in Minatitlán. Like all of the UV social work faculty participants in academic visits to Georgia, she used power and privilege granted through seniority and rank to gain selection as an academic visitor to Athens. Regardless of her privileges, her ability to participate equally was not facilitated through UV resources, but by those of UGA. During her interview, Maria expressed her gratitude for this, providing evidence of how she valued the opportunity. She said,

I was very grateful when I traveled to Georgia because honestly, with my resources, I had never been able to travel anywhere, and UV doesn't have the strings to pull to allow us to leave the country....What was so satisfying for me was that UGA was able to facilitate this, and paid for everything.

Interest 3.10. Raise levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach

Evidence indicated UV faculty represented personal and organizational interests in raising levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach. For the UV faculty, these interests were shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, UGA faculty, and UV administration. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

There was some reluctance by UV faculty to connect exchange participation by their students and faculty to increased levels of recognition for their schools. Regardless of their hesitance, or the reasons they chose not to make explicit claims in this regard, there was ample evidence collected in the study to determine their interests in this area. Part of the evidence was put forth in the form of media coverage about the exchange in Veracruz, all of which was a product of actions by UV faculty in the schools (citation). Further evidence providing attribution in this area was obtained during an interview with Dan Brown, a UGA social work faculty member. Dr. Brown described how the the Schools of Social Work in Minatitlán and Poza Rica effectively used their relationship with UGA to gain visibility and recognition within the UV system, particularly in their own locales. Brown explained that,

Both the schools of social work in Veracruz, but particularly in Minatitlán, which is located on a health campus, used the American visitors to raise the profile of the social work program and the profession. They saw that the newspapers, the

television and the radio covered these visits. That lifted the community's estimation of the social work program because they were worthy of these important international visitors.... The Veracruz faculty were skillfully using it (UGA visitors) to advance their students' knowledge, to raise their profile in the community, and to raise their profile in the university system. It was a political tool for them.

Stakeholder Group Four: University of Georgia, Athens, Faculty

For the purpose of narrating the case study, the fourth stakeholder group consisted of ten anonymous characters, nine current and former faculty, and one former consultant to the faculty, of the School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens. Data about UGA faculty and their stakeholder interests were collected through formal interviews with real UGA-UV exchange stakeholders conducted in Georgia and Veracruz, Mexico.

Additional data came from analysis of departmental documents, written communications, articles about particular stakeholders and their departments, and department websites. UGA social work faculty stakeholder characters were:

1. Dr. Gertrude Young, (Former) Dean, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens;
2. Dr. Craig Sampson, (Retired) Dean Emeritus, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens;
3. Dr. Jon Walters, (Former) Consultant, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens;

4. Dr. Daniel Brown, (Former) Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens;
5. Dr. Zachary Cohen, (Former) Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens;
6. Dr. Douglas Golay, (Retired) Professor Emeritus, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens;
7. Dr. Robert Hendricks, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens;
8. Dr. Gilroy Nance, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens;
9. Dr. Michelle Sanders, (Former) Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens; and
10. Dr. Alice Thomas, (Retired) Professor Emeritus, School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens.

Interest 4.1. Acquire community practice theories, models, and methods for social work education

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in acquiring community practice theories, models, and methods for social work education. For the UGA faculty, these interests were in common with no other stakeholder groups. They alone negotiated these interests for other stakeholders in the program.

Ample evidence was obtained to determine that UGA social work faculty stakeholders held ample interests in acquiring community practice theories, models, and methods for social work education. This interest was a stated goal in early exchange written proposals (citation). Moreover, it was occasionally claimed in interviews with UGA faculty stakeholders to be a core objective of the exchange. For example, Dan Brown said,

The UGA side learned rather slowly that the Veracruz programs had a lot to offer in terms of theory. It finally dawned on the UGA faculty members that they, we, could learn something about social work practice. These people are doing community work, which was reasserting itself in social work curriculum simultaneously after having been abandoned for nearly thirty years under the guise of community empowerment. And they've been doing it in Veracruz all these years, and did it quite well.

Brown explained how the content representing this interest was acquired, becoming an important part of the curriculum of the school's community empowerment track. The UV social work curriculum was going through their seven year revision, and the University of Georgia School of Social Work was going through its strategic planning and its curriculum redevelopment, both occurring within two years of each other. He said,

So I actually transported a number of concepts back and forth. People may never realize where some of it came from. And after I worked with UV social work for a while, I took back some of their concepts into our evolving new curriculum.

And we developed what's called a community empowerment track. It's still in the curriculum.

Aside from Dan Brown, few UGA faculty interviewed emphasized the same degree of importance in acquiring knowledge of community work. Nevertheless, there was substantial attribution of the importance of this interest for UGA faculty provided by UV faculty during their interviews. During these, the importance of this interest at the planning table for UGA was frequently claimed. Moreover, so, too, was the belief among UV faculty that their knowledge of community work carried real value, which some thought should not be shared without compensation. As Jose Cuevas explained,

I've observed that UGA and School of Social Work has a need to know about our academic programs in social work, about Mexican social work because the Hispanic population is growing tremendously in the counties of Georgia. It seems there became a moment when UGA social work decided that practice with individuals or social case work needed to have a guide in order to move towards community work with the neighborhoods. Why? Because it's very different being a North American clinical social worker, where they say, "be calm, you have a problem." This is very different from having a neighborhood full of Mexicans, Guatemalans, Nicaraguans, Peruvians, where the necessary methods have moved, you need something more, new visions, new methods. And so UGA social work now has a need to form a new kind of social worker, with a community vision.

Interest 4.2. Develop faculty through cooperative research, joint publications, and technical cooperation programs

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented personal and organizational interests in developing faculty through cooperative research, joint publications, and technical cooperation programs. For the UGA faculty, these interests were in common with one other stakeholder group: UV faculty. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Like some of the other UGA faculty interests, the interest to developing faculty through cooperative research, joint publications, and technical cooperation programs was expressed in written exchange proposals as a core goal throughout the history of the exchange (citation). During the program's existence, evidence of this interest was demonstrated by the actions of UGA faculty, of whom a majority had traveled to Veracruz to participate in the exchange in cooperative research or technical cooperation. Gilroy Nance described how for a few students and faculty, cooperation with UV in the exchange program was a milestone in their career development. He said,

I think it certainly contributed to the careers of some faculty, myself included, Daniel Brown, Michelle Sanders. I would say it contributed to the careers of a couple PhD students

Interest 4.3. Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners in foreign language knowledge, skills, and ability

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in educating social work students, faculty, and practitioners in foreign language

knowledge, skills, and ability. For the UGA faculty, these interests were in common with two other stakeholder groups: UGA students, and UV faculty. Together these three stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Dean Gertrude Young claimed personal and organizational interests were served through widespread participation in the exchange by UGA social work faculty. She claimed their participation was intended for purposes of positive career development through the acquisition of Spanish language and cultural-competency practice skills and abilities. She said,

(O)ur faculty has changed dramatically over the last five years. We've retired about a quarter to a third of our faculty. But during those years that we were developing (the Veracruz exchange), I would say half of our faculty had gone over time. And that was purposeful. That was a purposeful direction of faculty time in the program so that they could see the benefits and themselves learn Spanish, about research in Mexico, and practicing with Hispanic families. So I think it was a good thing to do.

Dan Brown gave evidence of the importance of learning Spanish for students careers, and the benefit it gave their agencies in serving Spanish speaking clients in society. He said,

Students that I had contact with over the years who had been in the Vera Cruz exchange, the Georgia students, have 100% considered it one of the most meaningful parts of their education. A number of them got jobs purely on the

basis of the fact. Sure they had their social work degree, but they had international experience and exposure to Spanish, and they were snapped up by Georgia agencies over someone who didn't have it.

Interest 4.4. Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners to be culturally competent

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in educating social work students, faculty, and practitioners to be culturally competent. For the UGA faculty, these interests were in common with one other stakeholder group: UGA students. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Early written documents and proposals for the exchange always included this interest as a core objective of the program (citation). Moreover, every UGA social work faculty stakeholder interviewed for the study indicated this interests as a fundamental educational objective of the exchange program. For example, Dan Brown described the importance of participation in the exchange for students, organizations and society. Describing why this interest was the educational foundation of the program for students, Brown emphasized that only the study of Spanish language was insufficient for social workers to become culturally competent with Latino. Rather, relating to a Latino child, or to a family, or to a client in a culturally competent manner requires one to have been situated in their home culture during part of their learning. He said,

Understanding family patterns, understanding the different definition of family, understanding the basic concept of respect and machismo and basic themes of

Mexican culture are crucial. One to establish rapport. And two, in being able to work with the family by understanding their value system. That doesn't come through language studies. And it really doesn't come without being in the home culture for a while. Seeing where these folks come from. How their culture operates and where the tensions that conflict with dominant Anglo culture are. Adding the piece of putting the social worker in the experience of being the outsider, so they have a little sense of the process of psychological stress that immigration involves. So the exchange addresses all those issues. It stresses language, cultural knowledge and the experience piece of having some sense of how an immigrant might feel. And you can't do that sitting in a classroom in Georgia.

Interest 4.5. Establish an international social work research agenda

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented personal and organizational interests in establishing an international social work research agenda. For the UGA faculty, these interests were in common with no other stakeholder groups. They alone held these interests and negotiated them for other stakeholders in the program.

Significant personal and organizational interests existed among faculty and administrators in the UGA School of Social Work to enhance prestige in areas of international research. This was a stated goal for the school in early exchange proposals (citation). Indeed, this interest was held by UGA stakeholders beyond the School of Social Work. Dan Brown described how leadership and faculty across the university

wanted to create the impression that UGA was an international school with international sister schools, “creating publications and research at the international level.” He said,

It was a very strong thing at UGA.... Also, to the administrative academic community, both the Dean and the Vice-President interpreted this UGA/UV exchange as an example of how committed the University of Georgia was to international research.

Interest 4.6. Increase the contribution of social work education to solve current problems in families and society

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in increasing the contribution of social work education to solve current problems in families and society. For the UGA faculty, these interests were shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA students, UV faculty, and UV Students. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

During an interview with Gilroy Nance, he spoke of the values underlying the institutional and societal interests the School of Social Work represented at UGA, which they attempted to follow through their actions in the exchange program. Nance explained that one major reason social work existed at big universities like the University of Georgia was that structurally these departments did something for the university, “they give it a good conscience.” He said,

(We're) doing something for people. And so I think that through things like the Veracruz exchange, we serve the university in a structural way that, in that we

deal with people who are sort of at the lower end of the economic ladder.... And so we extend ourselves into society in a very pronounced way, maybe more than a chemist might do.

Jon Walters was a consultant for the School of Social Work who traveled to Veracruz during the early days of planning the exchange program. He described the dilemma faced by UGA faculty in trying to serve their personal, UGA organizational, and Georgian interests, while simultaneously attempting to serve similar ones held by UV. Walter's challenge and dilemma presented in the form of a question: How could UGA serve both sets of interests through their actions, without crossing the line of cultural imperialism? He said,

You know, the question is what have we got to give UV, what do we know, that can be adapted, that can be exploited to benefit them and their people without it being cultural imperialism? You know, in a way, I think the “ideal” reciprocal process would probably be a way for all participants to understand social work better, in the sense of knowing what practices or new knowledge works regionally, or specifically in a particular cultural context.. But I really do think that the issue of building on strengths...building on hope, a realistic view of hope, and then helping people work toward that, is something that's with Mexican culture as well as with culture here.

Interest 4.7. Diversify funding sources for international academic exchange

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented organizational interests in diversifying funding sources for international academic exchange. For the UGA faculty,

these interests were shared with two other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, and UV administration. Together these three stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Along with other UGA faculty, Dan Brown made claims about the importance of funding issues for the exchange, and described how funding was an ongoing concern of stakeholders in both universities. Brown said funding challenges highlighted the pronounced asymmetry in resources that existed between UGA and UV, Georgia and Veracruz, and the U.S.A. and Mexico. This lack of resource parity was evident, in part, through the need for UGA to provide money for UV faculty travel to and from Georgia. The ability of UGA to successfully obtain USAID funding was also demonstrative of the resource wealth that existed north of the Border. Brown described how issues of funding quickly became a sensitive area for planners and participants, which impacted stakeholder feelings, attitudes, and actions. He said,

Veracruz was never able to come up with money to send their faculty to Georgia. They had to depend on Georgia money to bring their faculty to Georgia. So there was some sense there, a real sense, of lack of parity and resources.... So just that difference in resources was at times very apparent and created some embarrassment.... So for a while the agreement was that if UGA people paid their way to Veracruz, then the University of Veracruz would take care of the in-state expenses (in Veracruz). And I knew that it was a stretch for them to do it, but we could never say that because it had to do with hospitality. They were going to show that they could do it.

Gilroy Nance expressed concerns about his belief that lack of commitment by exchange stakeholders to adequately fund long term activities compromised the goals of the exchange. According to Nance, an important goal of the exchange was to bring students and faculty from Veracruz to obtain advanced degrees at UGA. It was his opinion that a major reason for failing to achieve this goal was due to lack of a sustained long term commitment by UGA stakeholders to make this happen. He said,

And I think we needed more funding. I think money and sustained money, and sustained interest, if in fact (exchange is) the desired goal. And I think there were students that I encountered during the times I was in Xalapa, who could have come to the United States (and be successful in school), but they would have needed \$30,000.00 a year.... So yeah you've got to spend some money.... To have a true international exchange program, you're going to have people with resources, that's us, who are going to have to spend some money over years.

Interest 4.8. Manage tasks, functions, processes, and operations of academic exchange

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented personal and organizational interests in managing tasks, functions, processes, and operations of academic exchange. For the UGA faculty, these interests were shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, UV administration, and UV faculty. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests for other stakeholders in the program.

Dan Brown testified to the importance of management interests on part of UGA faculty throughout the program, and how they applied models and processes adopted from social work practice to address management needs. He described how they

conceptualized the exchange process as though they were doing social work practice. The first part of the process would be relationship building, exploring mutual needs, and assessing those in the manner as if they were working with a family, community, or client. After assessing what the needs were on both sides, he explained that they would develop a “treatment plan” as their management strategy.

Brown said,

Then (we would) crystallize some approaches as to how to meet those needs.

That meant negotiating across language barriers. And there were only a couple of us on either side who could do that. So it became pretty much a personal relationship thing between me and...the other side. And then I would go to the UGA people and say, this is the communication, here are some options, what do you wish to do? And I would always offer a clear plan. Because if you just gave information it didn't go anywhere. So it's sort of like offering a tentative treatment plan. It was a tentative exchange.

Further evidence indicating UGA social work faculty interests in administrative aspects of the exchange was obtained from Michelle Sanders, who expressed concerns about how labor and time intensive the exchange administration duties were for those responsible for them. She received her PhD in Social Work at the University of Georgia, Athens. After graduation, Michelle joined the Social Work faculty, and became the Director of the Mexico Study Abroad Program for the School of Social Work, replacing Dan Brown after he left UGA. Sanders role, as she explained it, was very time

consuming, involving planning, implementation, and evaluation responsibilities for the program. She said,

Last year I was really Director for the first time, and I couldn't believe the amount of work that was involved. I must have been spending close to twenty hours a week preparing for Xalapa.... It's just a long, incredibly long drawn out process of...negotiating costs with UV...for course work, transportation fees, housing and food, for a variety of things. There was a whole haggling process that was involved.... That's really what takes the most time.

Near the end of her interview, Dr. Sanders spoke frankly about the status of Social Work's participation in the Veracruz exchange, which had declined since Daniel Brown left UGA. She also expressed her frustration with the challenge of balancing the administrative responsibilities for the exchange program, with those required of a young Assistant Professor to survive at UGA. She said,

My honest feeling is there is not as much support (within Social Work) as there should be.... But I don't see the interest here as much (as before), and so I really feel like I'm kind of over my head with this. I want to do more, but I'm the only one. I can't. I'm working towards tenure.

Interest 4.9. Enhance communication, cultural understanding, and cultural exchange

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in enhancing communication, cultural understanding, and cultural exchange. For the UGA faculty, these interests were shared with five other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, UGA students, UV administration, UV faculty, and UV students.

Together these six stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Because of his past connection with the School of Social Work, his fluency in Spanish, and Peace Corps work in Latin America, Jon Walters was hired as a Consultant in 1994 by Craig Sampson, then Dean of the School of Social Work. The purpose of his work was to travel to Veracruz to develop relationships of understanding and cooperation with administrators and faculty at UV to further the vision for an academic exchange program between the schools. During an interview by telephone, he explained that he was contacted by the Dean of Social Work and asked to be the first UGA representative to travel to Veracruz to start relations between the schools. He explained,

I'm just home one day, it's in the summer. I was doing something with one of my kids. The phone rings, and I pick it up, and it's this fellow. And he says, "Jon?" I said, "Craig?" Because he's got a really, he's got this unmistakable deep south Georgian voice. And he said, "Do you want to go to Mexico?" Well, duh, that's a no-brainer. At that point they had just started, he had been down there once. Alice Thomas had been down there a couple of times. I think people had come up. And they wanted someone who could teach (in Spanish to UV faculty) two, one week seminars on social work practice....a week in Minatitlán and a week in Poza Rica.

After traveling to Veracruz, Walters returned to Wisconsin and prepared a six page report of his activities for UGA. Although other UGA administrators and faculty had traveled to Xalapa prior to Walters, most faculty in the Schools of Social Work in Minatitlán and Poza Rica remembered him fondly as having been the first visitor from

UGA in the exchange program. During his interview for the study, Walters talked about how Veracruz was such a unique and effective place to establish an exchange program for faculty and students. He said,

One thing about Veracruz that made it such a rich experience when I was there, and I assume things haven't changed, but you know it's on the coast, but a coast with brown sand. So it's not influenced or contaminated by tourism the way it is on the other side of Mexico. And I think for that reason it makes this exchange much, much more valuable. Because students who are going down are much more likely to get immersion than they would otherwise. Because I think ultimately students who go to Cancun or Acapulco, they don't really go to Mexico. They just go to a beach where a lot of the people speak Spanish. And so I think that has value in it. And it would be nice if UGA or someone would really say what can we do that really would be cooperative with this.

Interest 4.10. Increase administration, faculty and student participation in study abroad programs

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented personal and organizational interests in increasing administration, faculty and student participation in study abroad programs. For the UGA faculty, these interests were shared with one other stakeholder group: UGA administration. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Increasing UGA participation in study abroad in Veracruz was a fundamental educational goal of the program for UGA faculty. Gilroy Nance identified this as his

main purpose for involvement in the exchange by saying, “I mean the strongest role I played was just sort of generating interest among students, accompanying students on trips.” Offering especially strong evidence of his commitment to student participation in the program he claimed that,

I mean the major success, I think, is that you've had under-graduate and graduate students who've gone to Mexico, lived in people's homes, even just as short a period as three weeks. And I think it changes people's perspective about the world. You can hear students say that, they talk about it. So I mean I think that's the major accomplishment.

Dean Young also felt that student study abroad in Veracruz was a key component of the academic exchange. In addition to student participation, she valued UGA faculty participation in teaching and learning in Veracruz. She said,

I think our most important contribution was setting that program up and showing how to be an experience for students. In fact we've had a lot of faculty to go from the school, partially to work and partially to learn the language themselves. So I think that that's been the best achievement of it is that it served as a model for the rest of the university.

Interest 4.11. Provide equal opportunities for participation by students and faculty in the exchange program

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in providing equal opportunities for participation by students and faculty in the exchange program. For the UGA faculty, these interests were shared with three other

stakeholder groups: UGA administration, UV faculty, and UV students. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Gilroy Nance's statements were representative of many who lamented the unequal participation between those in Georgia and Veracruz. The many statements of concern in this regard indicated the high level of interest held by most stakeholders in providing more equitable participation opportunities, particularly for UV students. In very strong terms, Nance passed judgment on the program's failure to provide this. He claimed,

There's no question, I'll be happy to see you come out in front with my name, that (lack of equitable participation) has been a failure. And in fact it's not an international exchange program, not in the truest sense of the term. It's a program of U.S.A. students and faculty going to Mexico. There have been very few people from Veracruz who've come and had a meaningful experience at the University of Georgia.... And the whole idea at the beginning was that (UV) students would be identified who would come and take degree programs.

Moreover, Nance was concerned not just about asymmetrical participation in the exchange between Georgia and Veracruz, but about asymmetries that existed in participation within the UV system, where Xalapa was the primary beneficiary of exchange activities, even though it had no School of Social Work. Describing these differences, Nance said,

Take Minatitlán, which I've been to three or four times, if you truly are interested in poverty, and poverty politics, Minatitlán and Poza Rica are the places to be.

Xalapa is a beautiful city, a wonderful university town.... But it's more like visiting Athens, Georgia in comparison to visiting South Georgia.... And of course there's a bigger, there's another issue here. In terms of international academic exchange between, in the context of social work, Minatitlán and Poza Rica are where it's at. So equitable participation in the exchange, it's clearly, it's asymmetrical.

Interest 4.12. Raise levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach

Evidence indicated UGA faculty represented personal and organizational interests in raising levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach. For the UGA faculty, these interests were shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, UV administration, and UV faculty. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Like many UGA stakeholders, Gilroy Nance expressed an interest in UGA becoming a leader in academic exchange with Mexico, saying it was a logical goal for the university given the geographical proximity of the two countries. He said,

And so I think we could be a leader there. And if there's any country in the world, given the proximity, we have a 2,000 mile continuous Border with Mexico. With the exception of Canada there's no replication of that in the world. You know there's no better place.

Dean Young made similar claims of the importance of recognition for the the School of Social Work due to their pioneering effort in establishing a model of academic exchange for UGA. She asserted that,

Frankly we established the program, so what everybody else is doing is Dan Brown's model. And I think the, I think people recognize that frankly. And I think our most important contribution was setting that program up and showing how to be an experience for students.... So I think that that's been the best achievement of it is that it served as a model for the rest of the university.

Echoing the sentiments of many of his colleagues, Dan Brown claimed that the Veracruz program brought “a great deal of recognition” to UGA, and to himself personally, from other schools of social work. He described his experience in this regard,

Because we presented at conferences, we had published articles, so that when the Dean or people would go to professional conferences they would say, “Oh I heard, weren't you the one that had the exchange program with Mexico?” Very often they'd say, “No, it was Veracruz. I've read the article.” So it created a good deal of awareness that UGA had strong international program.

Stakeholder Group Five: Administration, University of Veracruz, Xalapa

For the purpose of narrating the case study, the fifth stakeholder group consisted of four anonymous characters, all current and former administrators of the University of Veracruz. UV administration stakeholder characters were situated within the main campus of the University of Veracruz in Xalapa, Mexico. Members of this group did not include administrators in the Schools of Social Work in Minatitlán and Poza Rica, who

were grouped as UV social work faculty stakeholder characters. Data about UV administration stakeholder interests were collected through formal interviews conducted in Georgia and Veracruz, Mexico. Additional data came from analysis of professional histories, and through departmental documents, written communications, articles about particular stakeholders and their departments, and departmental websites. UV administration stakeholder characters were:

1. Dr. Miguel Alba, Director, Area of Humanities, University of Veracruz, Xalapa;
2. Matilde Cabrera, Director, School for Foreign Students, University of Veracruz, Xalapa;
3. Jose Cuevas, Professor (School of Social Work , Poza Rica), detailed to the Area of Humanities, Institute of Social Historical Research, University of Veracruz, Xalapa; and
4. Dr. Marco Pardo, Rector (President), University of Veracruz, Xalapa.

Interest 5.1. Increase the level of academic preparation for social work faculty

Evidence indicated the UV administration represented personal and organizational interests in increasing the level of academic preparation for social work faculty. For the UV administration, these interests were shared with two other stakeholder groups: UGA faculty, and UV faculty. Together these three stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Given the effects of globalization on the commodification of higher education knowledge and human resource production worldwide, there was substantial concern expressed by UV administration stakeholders to increase the level of faculty preparation

to make the university more competitive in the global market. Dr. Miguel Alba, Director of the Area of Humanities in the University of Veracruz, described the structural transformation occurring in degree granting programs at UV, a systemic change that he asserted had increased the overall quality of the terminal degree in many UV degree programs. Through his description of the need for this change, he provided evidence of UV administration interest in increasing levels of preparation for UV faculty. Dr. Alba claimed that,

You have obviously seen the structure of our plans of study that we have in Mexico. In Mexico, we have traditionally put much emphasis on the licenciatura degree, it was the maximum level to which most all would rise. But now we understand that the licenciatura is just one step, and that we need to go further, to the masters, then to the doctorate, then to the post-doctorate. This is because now students specialize more.

In his description of how UV planned to accomplish these changes, Alba again made assertions of the importance of increasing the level of faculty preparation at UV. Moreover, he stressed that realizing the UV human resource strategy was dependent upon further political and economic integration of the United States and Mexico. He said,

We need to have a very strict effective plan in accord with our times and resources, and...we are depending on having help come from the United States Embassy, from the Bush-Fox Accord, so that we would be able to pass into a new phase, to send and to form human resources at the level of the doctoral degree that our programs require, that our policies require.

Interest 5.2. Diversify funding sources for international academic exchange

Evidence indicated the UV administration represented organizational interests in diversifying funding sources for international academic exchange. For the UV administration, these interests were shared with two other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, and UGA faculty. Together these three stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Following on his claim of linking UV strategic human resource development plans to monies coming to UV from the United States through the the Bush-Fox Accord, Miguel Alba described his interest in diversification of funding for academic exchange. He said that,

We are hoping for extraordinary help. And in this case of extraordinary help, some say (getting help from the U.S.A.) it is negative. We are convinced that we have to do it.. It is a question of increasing our exchanges, our mobility, not only with Georgia, but with Georgia as the example of how to do it. Now that we have this alliance, we know how to search for extraordinary funds, resources that will permit us to incrementally increase the mobility of students, of researchers, of professors, and of passing into a phase also of collaborative research projects. But we must be very pragmatic in the planning, of the rhythm, depending on the resources that we ultimately have.

Interest 5.3. Increase the contributions of the university to neoliberal globalization

Evidence indicated the UV administration represented organizational and societal interests in increasing the contributions of the university to neoliberal globalization. For

the UV administration, these interests were shared with one other stakeholder group: UGA administration. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Evidence of UV administration interests in increasing the contributions of the university to neoliberal globalization was first seen in the founding of the two schools of social work in Veracruz during the 1970s. The schools originated as institutional responses to economic globalization, arising together to serve the social and collective problems that presented themselves in the special industrial zones that had been established for the petroleum and petrochemical industries in Poza Rica and Minatitlán. Miguel Alba described the conditions in the industrial areas contributed to the establishment of the schools. He said,

They (Poza Rica and Minatitlán) were zones of rapid growth. These industrial zones had problems with distribution, and social disequilibriums resulting from this rapid growth in the petroleum areas. And this was the central nervous system of the economy (for Mexico), which was made by substantial internal migration from other regions. This inordinate growth was done (by industrial planners) with little attention to public policies, social-political policies for health or human well-being. Therefore, the decision was made to have a school of social work in each of these two zones (Poza Rica and Minatitlán) that had a level of accentuated social problems. And so we didn't put the schools in Xalapa or the Port of Veracruz. Instead, UV always thought to have them in these two spaces.

While the building of the schools of social work in Veracruz were responses to neoliberal economic policies in Mexico, UV responses to processes of globalization continued to occur throughout the history of the exchange program. Alba offered substantial evidence of UV administration interests in leveraging outcomes of globalization processes, which he viewed as good opportunities for the university. He said,

Given the internationalization, and where it's taking us, UCLA in California is asking us if we can send our professors there to serve the Hispanic population....

We have to be thinking that globalization has helped to amplify our opportunities. Alba also described UV opportunities in collaborating with the University of Quebec, providing professors to work as trilingual (English, French, Spanish) evaluators in higher education throughout Latin America. He said,

And so there is a level (of educational quality and capacity) in Veracruz that is sufficient, it's already satisfactory, where our capacity in the field of education, in other disciplines, allows us to enter into countries with lower levels of educational attainment in order to evaluate and develop public policies for them.

Globalization for us is favorable, but we need to invest.

Interest 5.4. Expand exchange programs to other academic departments and educational institutions

Evidence indicated the UV administration represented organizational interests in expanding exchange programs to other academic departments and educational institutions. For the UV administration, these interests were shared with one other

stakeholder group: UGA administration. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests for other stakeholders in the program.

Miguel Alba gave evidence of UV's strong interest in this regard, describing their plans to diversify the exchange agreement to other educational entities in Georgia. As he explained, one goal of this diversification in exchange partners would be “to import knowledge about distance learning, about working in the field of small and medium size enterprises, and the interventions you have done there.” Claiming that “we have entered now into a new phase in the exchange with Georgia,” Alba confirmed what had already become clear, the UGA-UV exchange, “was no longer just with social work, but with many other parts of the university.”

Further evidence of UV administration interests in expanding exchange programs to other academic departments and educational institutions was obtained through interviews with Matilde Cabrera, Director of the School for Foreign Students (EEE) at the University of Veracruz, Xalapa. The school, founded in 1957 at UV, had responsibility to organize programs for foreign academic institutions, including the University of Georgia. With the exception of academic dignitaries, all foreign visitors were channeled through there on the front end of their time spent at UV. Without the official title, and lacking formal authority relative to other higher ranking administrators on campus, Cabrera's office gave the impression, nevertheless, that in addition to being a language school for foreign students, it was the de facto UV office of international affairs, studies, and development, all rolled into one location

There were other organizational responsibilities at EEE, such as occasionally facilitating a practicum for a visiting student, or finding locations for research projects for visiting students and faculty, in addition to arranging for their housing and meals. The majority revenue producing role of the school was to provide Spanish language instruction. Describing the EEE interest in expanding exchange programs at UV, she said,

The School for Foreign Students is one of the schools at UV that specifically has the objective to organize programs for foreign institutions...its objective (is) not just the organization of courses in Spanish language and culture, but through these courses to push the process of internationalization at the university.

Cabrera explained that in her role as Director of these programs, she had to see what the interests were of the foreign institution, whether it was simply to have had a course in Spanish for students, or, perhaps, to have served another interest much broader. She claimed that,

In the case of UGA, the interests are many. Not only do their professors and students take courses here in Spanish, but they also do research projects related to the curricula of the university (UV) and they learn how things are done here. And well, in this case, I'm able to refer to the program that initiated this movement, it was from UGA. The first was the most active, and it was the social work program, of course. I believe that it is one of the best examples of a program that began only with Spanish courses but also began with the principle that they

weren't going to stop there. They made use of the School for Foreign Students initially, but as the activities broadened, they diversified.

Interest 5.5. Extend university services and outreach internationally

Evidence indicated the UV administration represented organizational and societal interests in extending university services and outreach internationally. For the UV administration, these interests were shared with one other stakeholder group: UGA administration. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests for other stakeholders in the program.

Closely woven with interests in expanding the exchange to more departments and institutions were interests held by UV administrators to further extend university services and outreach. Miguel Alba gave evidence of this by saying that one way the exchange with UGA served UV was that it furthered their contact “with the vast educational system in Georgia”. Regarding the politically sensitive issue of emigration being debated in Mexico, Alba said the relationship with UGA had permitted the UV administration to extend itself to “visualize the problematic, or to problematize Hispanics that are in Georgia”. He continued,

The exchange has given us the possibility to see which, in general terms, are the policies being implemented in the United States.... What we have observed there permits us to know what we have to teach and research here, because right now, in Veracruz, and many parts of the country, the biggest attention that we are giving is towards our human resources that we are losing to you.

Alba's comments resonated with those of many others heard during interviews in Veracruz for this case study. In interview after interview, claims were made in regard to extending outreach and services due to the importance of “better formation of human resources for those (emigrants) in search of work.” Alba reiterated the commonly stated phrase in Mexico about the importance in forming emigrants “to be the best that they can be.” He said,

We want to help in their case as much as we can, so that they don't have problems inserting themselves in your society, in another socioeconomic context. The relationship with UGA has permitted us to see more, to better understand what goes on there, to respond. This is valuable to us, particularly given what has happened in the past 10 years, when the migration current has exploded.

Moreover, Alba also saw the vast Mexican communities in the U.S.A. as potential customers and as sites for extension of UV outreach and services. Speaking frankly, he said,

We would like to serve our immigrants in Mexico, and we would like to have a UV office in Georgia to serve many cases of people who didn't finish their studies here, or who partially finished their higher education here. And they would be able to have us facilitate the completion of their studies, at a lower cost (than restarting there).

Interest 5.6. Manage tasks, functions, processes, and operations of academic exchange

Evidence indicated the UV administration represented organizational interests in managing tasks, functions, processes, and operations of academic exchange. For the UV

administration, these interests were shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, UGA faculty, and UV faculty. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Similar to claims made by other stakeholder groups in both institutions, Jose Cuevas expressed concerns about exchange management issues. Although the UVA-UV exchange had been in existence for ten years, Cuevas said that never had there been a substantive planning meeting between key administrators of the two schools. He viewed this as a fundamental oversight in exchange planning that had hindered and negatively impacted the program since its inception. To resolve this problem, he offered the following solution,

Well, I propose...to have a working meeting, at the level of university administrations between UGA and UV. And this would not simply be a tourism visit. For example, recently we had here Dr. Lawrence and Dr. Williams, excellent persons, excellent professors, but they came solely to sign a contract for (continuing) the exchange. There didn't exist in any moment a closed-door meeting exclusively between Ben Williams, Michael Lawrence, Dr. Alba, or Dr. Pardo, seated at the table and asking how can we make a model for the exchange, how can we have shared responsibilities, how can we share financing, what are the social problems that both states have, Georgia and Veracruz, what are the strategies we are using to confront these problems -- this doesn't exist.

Cuevas argued that administrators from both schools had never engaged in planning the exchange beyond the formality of signing an exchange agreement. He strongly expressed

his opinion that it was long past due to take the next step by bringing important administrators from both sides together at the planning table. He said,

Until now, we haven't had this meeting. I believe that both sides think the same, they think that simply the fact of signing and exchanging a contract means that we are working with an international exchange program. No! To sign the contract is just the first step. The second step is more difficult, to work together in an organized way, to work together to help each other. I believe the total history from 1992 until today, and there are 10 years between UGA and UV, gives us sufficient elements to seat ourselves at the table and design between both universities a model of international academic exchange.

Interest 5.7. Move the university to the next stage of internationalization

Evidence indicated the UV administration represented personal, organizational and societal interests in moving the university to the next stage of internationalization. For the the UV administration, these interests were shared with one other stakeholder group: UGA administration. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Multiple forms of data were analyzed to obtain evidence indicating the UV administration's strong interest in moving the university to the next stage of internationalization. These data included the professional histories of UV administrators. For example, evidence of UV administration interests in internationalization of UV was obtained by analyzing Dr. Marco Pardo's professional history. During the time of data collection for this study, Pardo was President of the University of Veracruz. Given the

strict, hierarchical, administrative structure at UV, the interests of the top UV administration effectively represented the interests of those situated lower in the institutional hierarchy. To illustrate the degree to which authority and control rested at the top of the UV leadership, when one clicked on the “contact us” link on the large and impressive UV website, Dr. Pardo's personal “Sir Speedy” email popped up.

As Rector (President), Dr. Marco Pardo held the top position of authority at the University of Veracruz, and during his tenure, he held an array of leadership positions in international higher education, raising UV's visibility, and advancing administration interests in internationalization. Dr. Pardo was born in Cordoba, Veracruz, Mexico in 1949. He completed his Licenciatura degree in psychology in 1973 at the University of Veracruz. In the United States, he completed a Master's degree in 1974 in educational technology at Western Michigan University, and he obtained his PhD in Instructional Systems Technology in 1978 at West Virginia University.

Dr. Pardo's professional career provided a blueprint for a scholar interested in the internationalization of higher education in Mexico and Veracruz. From 1973 to 1991, Dr. Pardo taught at UV, UNAM, and the National Institute of Public Administration (INAP). From 1978 to 1981, he was Chair of the Department of Psychology and Head of the Social Sciences College at UNAM. From 1981 to 1985, Dr. Pardo was Chairman of Academic Programs at Mexico's National Association of Universities and Higher Education Institutions (ANUIES). From 1988 to 1997, Dr. Pardo was Head of the University Development Office and General Director for Higher Education at Mexico's

Ministry of Public Education, (SEP), the most powerful educational institution in Mexico. In 1997, he was appointed Rector of the University of Veracruz.

From 1992 to 1997, Dr. Pardo represented the Mexican government at the Trilateral Steering Committee for Collaboration in North American Higher Education. In 1998, he was appointed President of the Education and Culture Commission of the Gulf of Mexico States Accord. Dr. Pardo was a member of the Executive Council of the Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC). He was Vice President of the Mexican Region of the Interamerican University Organization (OUI). Finally, Dr. Pardo was founding member of the Global Alliance for Transnational Education (GATE).

While Dr. Pardo was the unquestioned leader at the top of UV, representing state, national, and international educational interests, it was Miguel Alba who maintained authority and control of decision-making power in day-to-day operation of the exchange program. Alba made repeated claims during interviews that demonstrated strong interests in moving the university to the next stage of internationalization. For example, he explained the importance of formation of social work students and scholars in context of globalization of higher education labor markets, which he claimed had prompted UV to enter in the UGA-UV partnership. He said

First, I believe that in this era of globalization and the internationalization of education, especially in Mexico, and more specifically in Veracruz, neither our programs, nor our graduates, can think any longer that they are going to have a guarded and predetermined labor market, whether regionally or locally.

Moreover, the international distribution of knowledge requires that we have awareness in other geographic latitudes. And it was there from which the opportunity arrived in the communication and the relationship with Georgia. This was because Georgia, for reasons which have been materially determined, also has some of the same problems, surely some of the same social problems, that we do. Therefore, we both wanted to have an interrelationship in which we could compare how we form our social work students, what techniques we apply, how we channel our programs.

Alba provided evidence of the importance of this interest through his claims of a paradigm shift that he believed was occurring within Latin American social work education. In his comments he claimed that frameworks for the theory and practice of social work were moving from purely Marxist models to more mixed notions incorporating conceptions of individual case phenomena. Indeed, Alba emphasized that these theoretical shifts were driven by the internationalization of higher education, a response to forces of globalization. Moreover, he indicated that similar transformations were occurring rapidly in all academic areas at UV, and he believed these changes were providing UV with competitive advantages in the global higher education marketplace. He said,

In the case of internationalization, this favors us (UV) because it permits us to see other ways in which the practice of social work is done that are distinct from how we think in Latin America. Traditionally we have viewed this as group practice, with little attention to case work, or the study of an individual as a particular case.

Now we realize that the practice can also be viewed as the social worker carrying forth a clinical intervention as a facilitator, between just one individual (labor), and dependence (capital), institutions, and the organization in which they work, and we can use this to benefit groups and sectors of society as a response to demands for social good.

Alba also explained why social work was a good choice for early exchange activities with Georgia, in the face of the transformation of Mexican social services and education from the public sector to the private, and the social need to judge and evaluate these new public policies in Mexico. He said,

In recent times, there have been emerging spaces in the private sector that have required that we, and our social work graduates, understand that their formation must make them attentive to private enterprise and the private sector. That is why the Department of Social Work here was selected to begin this exchange in order to help the university, to help social work students attend to the immediate demand from these sectors, which are undergoing neoliberal changes. It is through the practice of social work that we can begin to judge how satisfied, or dissatisfied, we are with the public policies that are being applied for the poor, the marginalized, towards the masses that are still impoverished and oppressed, towards our youth – which we are losing to you – towards our elderly, and towards adults. Ultimately, they are the ones that will tell us what level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction exists in society in this age of neoliberal globalization.

Interest 5.8. Raise levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach

Evidence indicated the UV administration represented organizational interests in raising levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach. For the UV administration, these interests were shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, and UGA faculty, and UV faculty. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

As suggested in the previous section, UV administrators embraced goals of increased global recognition for fundamental university activities. During his interview, former UGA faculty member Dan Brown made claims that provided attribution of UV administration interests in this area. His statements described how varying discourses were at work in both institutions, in which a variety of messages regarding the value of exchange activities could be heard when moving down through the university hierarchies. Brown claimed that similar discourses were heard at the tops of both schools, given by their respective administrators. He described these as marketing and public relations efforts, which were meant to reinforce the importance of the fundamental activities each university was doing in the exchange. He said,

We almost have to look at levels of the institutions because I think at the top levels, at the President and Vice-President offices, there was much more a concern for the image of the institution, at both UV and UGA, and they would use similar language, internationalizing the curriculum, international faculty development

opportunities, common research factors, those kinds of issues, which are really a type of marketing concern.

In addition to the discourses and marketing messages, Brown also described concrete involvement in internationalization activities, which were used by the schools to raise their visibility with regard to these interests. He said,

Both institutions could say 'we are an international institution, we have a sister school (sic) relationship. Look at our common research.' From Veracruz there's a big emphasis on participating in the NAFTA process and they link into NACHE, the North American Consortium of Higher Education. And also Veracruz participates in the Gulf States Governors Conference. They have some educational concerns, and the current President is active in both those groups, very active. So there are those concerns at the top level of universities for their image, to be considered cutting edge. Both Georgia and Veracruz are those kinds of institutions. They're both the flagship of their state. So at that level the talk sounds a lot more similar, and the images used are more similar.

Interest 5.9. Enhance communication, cultural understanding, and cultural exchange

Evidence indicated the UV administration represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in enhancing communication, cultural understanding, and cultural exchange. For the UV administration, these interest were shared with three other stakeholder groups: UGA administration, and UGA faculty, and UV faculty. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for other stakeholders in the program.

Miguel Alba offered convincing testimony of his belief in the value of UGA and UV engaging in cultural exchange and cooperation. In particular, he made claims of appreciation for the way in which UGA engaged UV, given the asymmetries that existed between the two universities. His comments were indicative of personal, organizational, and societal interests in mutual understanding in the face of significant cultural, economic, and political asymmetries between schools, states, and countries in the exchange. He said,

Well, from my point of view, for us, this was always going to be an asymmetrical exchange because of the economic differences of the universities, and in our societies. But the fact is, and this is one of the things I appreciate about Georgia, because they were conscious of the asymmetries that we have. We have looked (to them) for extraordinary help, and we were waiting, and hoping, they would give it to us, that they would help us in a way that would permit a large increase in our graduate and post-graduate studies. It seems to me that Georgia was conscious of the differences we have in mobility, economic differences, and for us this was an advance, because we have always been so aware of this inequality. My perception was that the professors who had come (from UGA) presented themselves to the UV professors with relative equality, as if there wasn't an asymmetrical situation, so I felt like it was a question of being gentile, of good conduct, but also knowledge and consciousness of where they were.

Stakeholder Group Six: Administrators, University of Georgia, Athens

For the purpose of narrating the case study, the sixth stakeholder group consisted of ten anonymous characters, all current and former administrators at UGA. All UGA administration stakeholder characters were situated within the University of Georgia, Athens. Members of this group did not include administrators in the School of Social Work, who were represented and grouped as UGA social work faculty stakeholders. Data about UGA administrators, and their stakeholder interests, were collected through formal interviews with real UGA-UV exchange stakeholders conducted in Georgia and Veracruz, Mexico. Additional data included departmental documents, written communications, articles about particular stakeholders and their departments, departmental websites, and information about professional histories of key UGA leadership. UGA administration stakeholder characters were:

1. Dr. I. Michael Highman, (Former) Associate Professor, Department of Elementary Education, University of Georgia, Athens;
2. Dr. Q. Harold Drucker, (Retired) Director, (and Former Associate Vice President for Public Service and Outreach), Office of International Development, University of Georgia, Athens;
3. Jane Francis, Assistant Director, Office of International Development, University of Georgia, Athens;
4. Dr. George O. Z. Zykes, Director, Office of International Development, University of Georgia, Athens;
5. Dr. Michael Lawrence, (Former) Associate Provost, Office of International Education, University of Georgia, Athens;

6. Dr. Roscoe Riding, (Retired) Director, Office of International Education, University of Georgia, Athens;
7. Dr. Franco Villareal, (Former) Director, Office of International Education, University of Georgia, Athens;
8. Dr. Mark Zunk, (Retired) Associate Provost, Office of International Education, University of Georgia, Athens;
9. Dr. Gerald (Jerry) Schultz, (Retired) Vice-President, Office of Public Service and Outreach, University of Georgia, Athens; and
10. Dr. Benjamin (Ben) Williams, Vice-President, Office of Public Service and Outreach, University of Georgia, Athens.

Interest 6.1. Diversify funding sources for international academic exchange

Evidence indicated the UGA administration represented organizational interests in the diversification of funding sources for the exchange. UGA administration interests in diversifying funding for the UGA-UV exchange were shared interests, along with UGA faculty, and UV administration. Together these three stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for the other stakeholders in the exchange program.

Although funding was low at first, money for the exchange, and for UGA international programs increased over the history of the exchange. Nevertheless, UGA administration stakeholders frequently expressed concerns about the lack of funding for the Veracruz exchange, the need for more funding for exchange activities, and the difficulties experienced in accomplishing that goal. For example, during an interview

with Dr. Harold Drucker, former Director of the Office of International Development, the need for funding diversification was clearly expressed by him. He said,

The program was never funded adequately. At the time that we were trying to mount this program, international activities were not the highest priority on campus. That situation has changed considerably.... We were trying to push this thing back in the early nineties, and it was very, very difficult to get funding.

Based on the comments of Drucker and other UGA administrators, the years during which the exchange began were particularly lean ones, owing in part to lower public funding for higher education. The exchange was begun with very modest seed money, but over time was able to attract more money from more sources, culminating in a substantial increase coming from USAID.

Extending Drucker's claim for the need for diversifying funding, Jane Francis, Assistant Director to Dr. Drucker, offered evidence during an interview of how funding, funding sources, and the scope of the exchange began to grow. She claimed that,

The Veracruz program grew to include things like a Holiday Inn scholarship. We got some money from Holiday Inn so we put together a competitive scholarship for faculty and students to go to Xalapa for two weeks to do the language immersion.... In 1996 and '97 we put together the USAID grant for the institutional partnership. And that was \$96,000.00.

According to Francis, the USAID grant was a turning point in the relationship between the universities. As she said, it was the first time UGA could say to UV, "Look, we have

this grant and we want, you know, we've been coming down to you, and this grant has funds to bring (your) students and faculty to UGA.”

Although attempts were made to acquire funding from Mexican sources, program funding and diversification was almost all UGA- and U.S.A.-based, with very little reciprocal giving from UV. This was true for a variety of reasons, not least of which was another in a series of economic crises into which Mexico had fallen, coinciding with capitalist economic cycles in the United States. Higher education in Veracruz was primarily funded through state level budgets, which were much smaller and more selective in targeting programs and projects than is the case in the United States, where federal and private funds supplement public ones. Another factor limiting Mexican funding was that much of the private wealth in the country was in the hands of a few individuals, and few of them had demonstrated interests in funding academic exchanges. Moreover, interviewees in Veracruz commented that philanthropic giving was not common in Mexican culture. As Drucker described,

William Arcado was the exchange shepherd early on, and interestingly he tried to get some funding from a very wealthy family in Mexico (former Governor of Veracruz, and son of a former Mexican President), which owns several newspapers there, radio stations and many, many other businesses. The wife of the head of this family had graduated from Veracruz and we were hoping that they might give us some finance. Well...we could never get that money from the family.

Interest 6.2. Extend university services and outreach internationally

Evidence indicated the UGA administration represented personal, organizational, and societal interests in extending university services and outreach internationally. For the UGA administration, these interests were in common with the UV administration, but not a shared one, because they competed for expansion locations and partner institutions. For example, UV carried an interest in expanding exchange activities in GA, but not necessarily with UGA or schools in the state system. A high priority for UV was to expand outreach to serve the rapidly growing Latino population in Georgia, some of which had attended UV but not finished their programs of study. Together UGA and UV administration stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for the other stakeholders in the exchange program.

Evidence of the degree to which UGA administration elites held a strong shared interest to ever expand UGA outreach and services internationally was obtained, in part, by examining biographical data for Dr. Gerald Schultz. His professional history gave convincing evidence of the importance of this organizational interest for Schultz, as it was for others within this powerful group of UGA university leadership and their collective offices. Indeed, it was from Schultz that the initial seed funding for the exchange came, indicating how UGA outreach interests were a driving force for initial program funding.

Schultz was responsible for the UGA international development program and was instrumental in establishing cooperative research and teaching programs with universities around the world. The extent of Schultz's office was enormous, almost like a small

empire at UGA, and the people at UGA and UV involved in developing the exchange were fortunate to establish a relationship and shared interests with him, which continued through the first few lean years and beyond.

Data obtained through the examination of the professional history of Dr. Schultz's successor, Dr. Benjamin Williams, also provided similar evidence of UGA administration interests in expanding UGA outreach and service internationally. Continuing to embrace the exchange and its outreach potential that existed in the office upon his arrival, Williams also became an important stakeholder for the program, traveling to Veracruz on numerous occasions. He, too, carried enormous weight in university affairs, and like Schultz, his career had substantial international outreach involvement. After taking over for Schultz, William's continued funding of the exchange was evidence not just of his interest in the program, but also indicative of the interests he and other UGA administration stakeholder elites held in expanding outreach and services to as many far flung locations as possible, including Veracruz.

Jane Francis gave testimony providing convincing evidence about UGA administration interests in extending UGA outreach and services internationally to Veracruz, using the UGA-UV exchange as a vehicle. Francis was a UGA stakeholder who maintained important administrative and planning responsibilities for the program, serving continuously through a series of key administration stakeholder changes within UGA. During this time exchange program participants began to include additional UGA academic departments and schools beyond the School of Social Work. Francis continued

as a Veracruz exchange program stakeholder even after the School of Social Work ended its participation in the exchange in 2002.

During a face-to-face interview, Francis described her responsibilities in the Office of International Development with regard to the UGA-UV exchange, which demonstrated some of the interests present in her office to expand UGA outreach to Veracruz. She said,

We are a public service and outreach unit and so we report to the Vice-President for Public Service and Outreach.... And we work on international programs project development. And what we do is kind of different from other offices in that were primarily looking at kind of developing countries, and trying to put together faculty-driven, faculty- and staff-driven projects, usually with collaborating institutions in those countries....I think what we do is more fluid (than other UGA offices with international responsibilities) in that we sort of respond to faculty interests and desires.... And our role, again, is usually to help the faculty members put together the projects, write the proposals, submit the proposal, and then sometimes we actually administer the project.

Harold Drucker provided evidence of the early outreach collaboration in the UGA-UV exchange involving the Office of International Development, the Office of Public Service and Outreach, the School of Social Work, and administration stakeholders at the University of Veracruz. Their collaboration indicated the degree to which these stakeholders shared interests in outreach and internationalization, and the natural interconnectedness they formed in the development of the program. Drucker said,

(We) were contacted at the university by a chap by the name of William Arcado who had graduated earlier from the University of Georgia in social work. And William had spent a good part of his career in Mexico as the USAID person. So he made this contact and wanted to know if the university would be interested in establishing some kind of relationship (with UV). Jerry Schultz, who was then Vice-President of Public Service and Outreach, made the initial contact with Arcado.... Now I became deeply involved in the program. Then I got to know Daniel (Brown) very, very well, and we almost immediately invited the delegation up from the University of Veracruz.... We had a very good visit. Well, they returned to Veracruz having gotten to know our senior staff.... And shortly thereafter a delegation from UGA went down there...And all the while Arcado was working on the inside as a facilitator.

Although over time other UGA administration stakeholders would rise in importance, each embracing their own particular interests, in the early days of the exchange the shared interests among key UGA administrators in extending outreach and services internationally was a powerful force. Indeed, the importance of this interest continued throughout the history of the exchange, and drove IPSO's success in obtaining funding for exchange activities.

Interest 6.3. Increase the contributions of the university to neoliberal globalization

Evidence indicated the UGA administration represented organizational and societal interests in increasing the university's contribution to neoliberal globalization. For the UGA administration, these interests were shared with one other stakeholder

group: the UV administration. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for the other stakeholders in the exchange program.

During a telephone interview, Harold Drucker made claims of UGA administration interests related to neoliberal globalization. According to him, the primary goals of the exchange were two fold: first, organizational, for the university system; second, for society, served through benefits provided by business through the economic successes of globalization. Drucker explained,

Remember about the time that we were trying to launch this program, there was something called NAFTA that had just come on the scene.... And the two countries, Mexico and the United States were committing themselves to bold new initiatives to facilitate international trade and international business.... NAFTA is the full-fledged, international treaty now. Trade between Mexico is greater than it's ever been. Cultural, political ties are greater than they've ever been. It's extremely important that we get to know those folks and they get to know us.... It has to start with our students, otherwise their education is not relevant to the new world in which we live

Interest 6.4. Manage tasks, functions, processes, and operations of academic exchange

Evidence indicated the UGA administration represented organizational interests in managing tasks, functions, processes, and operations of academic exchange. For the UGA administration, these interests were in common with three other stakeholder groups: UGA faculty, UV administration, and UV faculty. Together these four stakeholder

groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for the other stakeholders in the exchange program.

Their stories regarding this interest frequently described the many challenges in dealing with substantial differences between the two universities in their administrative structures, operations, and distinct cultures. Their descriptions of the evolution of authority structures and mechanisms was also an important part of the evidence obtained from them in this area. As the exchange grew over time, with new people and departments becoming interested in participation, the challenges also increased. Jane Francis explained how the groundwork for a chaotic relationship between the schools was laid by a lack planning early, exacerbated by asymmetrical participation benefiting UGA. She said,

There wasn't any kind of strategic plan for the relationship at that time. I think it was, I don't want to say hap-hazard, but it was just whatever faculty members up here had any interest in going and the time to do it.... I was the administrative coordinator for the project.... And it was kind of chaotic.

Not surprisingly, Francis provided evidence of strong interests among UGA administrators in the administrative issues in the exchange. She described the challenges faced during the formation and evolution of responsibilities in her office, which during the early years of the exchange was the major administrative coordinative unit within UGA involved in negotiating with UV. Key issues arose involving problems of information sharing and differences in protocol between the distinct organizational cultures. She said,

(Dr. Alba and Jose Cuevas) got upset because there was a social work student...(who) went down to Xalapa to do dissertation research, and none of them knew he was there. And I mean they couldn't fathom how the student was down there and we hadn't bothered to tell them when, you know, we really didn't know he was down there. And you know, people from Social Work probably did, but didn't give it a second thought. But it was a big issue down there. And there were just some issues with UGA faculty members making commitments that UGA could not follow up on. And so our office started on a kind of coordinative role, which I don't think worked out very well.

Moreover, Francis described the challenges she faced, given the complicated mix of stakeholders. She explained that over time, her role began to require enforcement of policies addressing protocol among UGA exchange participants. She said,

Relationships got very complicated because there were lots of people involved, lots of personalities. And I think some faculty members who thought they really understood the culture and the system there, clearly did not....Well, I felt like, I mean it really put me in the uncomfortable position here of seemingly policing UGA faculty members.

For Francis, day-to-day administrative duties regarding the exchange were made more difficult by the hierarchical authority structure at UV. The importance of rank and protocol within the UV culture, contrasted by an open and relatively informal culture at UGA, presented many UGA administrators, including herself, with confounding cross-

cultural issues in communication and decision making that effected many exchange issues and features.

As growth in participation in the exchange continued, more UGA administrators became involved and interested in exchange management issues. Administrative tasks, functions, and processes for the exchange quickly dispersed across UGA people and departments. In time, responding to both chaotic growth and pronounced differences in institutional structures between the two universities, more formal administrative functions and processes began to develop at UGA. Consequently, as evidence of their group's strong interest in administrative aspects of the Veracruz exchange, the department of International Education incrementally took on more exchange management authority. On the UV side, by contrast, almost all exchange administration authority remained centralized in Miguel Alba's office in Xalapa.

The UGA Director of International Education at the time of data collection for this study was Dr. Franco Villareal. During his interview he made assertions that provided evidence indicating the vital importance for his office in gaining control of what had become an increasingly chaotic situation in the exchange. Beginning with Roscoe Riding, and continuing through a series of directors, International Education leadership was looked upon by other UGA administration stakeholders, and looked upon themselves, as the logical group to effectively and efficiently administer UGA international exchanges and foreign study programs. During 2002, Dr. Villareal managed two fronts of international education at UGA. Responsibilities of his office included managing processes for students leaving UGA to study abroad, and for foreign students

coming to study at UGA, including all processes related to their student immigration. For the exchange, this was an important responsibility because by the time of his interview hundreds of UGA students had traveling to Veracruz as exchange participants.

Interest 6.5. Move the university to the next stage of internationalization

Evidence indicated the UGA administration represented organizational interests in moving the university to the next stage of internationalization. For the UGA administration, these interests were in common with one other stakeholder group: UV administration. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for the other stakeholders in the exchange program.

Responding to processes of neoliberal globalization, during the history of the exchange the phenomenon of internationalization impacted every dimension of higher education systems worldwide, and UGA and UV were no exceptions. This was certainly the case for Board of Regents in Georgia. As Drucker stated during his interview, “Their goal was to get more colleges and universities in the state system involved in international programs.” Evidence of the interest in internationalization at UGA also was espoused by UGA President Michael Adams. In 2002 he proposed,

By the year 2010, 25% of graduating class will have participated in study abroad: equivalent to top 5 ranking among research institutions (UGA international affairs newsletter, fall 2002).

Adams similarly stated,

We need to provide an increasingly global dimension to everything that we do... I believe it is the responsibility of every program, every dean, and every academic

leader to raise questions today about interrelatedness of the world at large. (State of the University Address, 1998).

Additional data collected in the study provided evidence indicating the UGA administration's supreme interest in institutional internationalization as a response to neoliberal globalization. Evidence of this was obtained in part by examining the professional history of Harold Drucker. In addition to extensive international experience as a career diplomat for the U.S.A. State Department, while at UGA Dr. Drucker directed the UGA international development efforts. Using his international experience and contacts in the U.S.A. and foreign governments, Drucker identified international development projects, assisted students sponsored by federal and international agencies, and coordinated the university's international agreements. Importantly, he was a key stakeholder possessing knowledge and ability to facilitate negotiations among and between other administrators who assisted in the development of academic exchange program with Veracruz, Mexico.

Moreover, Drucker's interest in increasing internationalization at UGA was expressed through his leadership and widespread involvement in international activities. During his tenure as Director in the International Development Office, he also administered the UGA Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, and the European Center of Georgia. Administering language courses for faculty and staff and assisting in the preparation of proposals to international donor organizations were among other responsibilities of the unit Dr. Drucker oversaw for seven years.

Interest 6.6. Enhance communication, mutual understanding, and cultural exchange

Evidence indicated the UGA administration represented personal and organizational interests in enhancing communication, mutual understanding, and cultural exchange. For the UGA administration, these interests were in common with five other stakeholder groups: UGA faculty, UGA students, UV administration, UV faculty, and UV students. Together these six stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for the other stakeholders in the exchange program.

Real differences existed between UGA and UV exchange stakeholders in cultural norms and behaviors. Because of these differences, many statements were made by UGA administration stakeholders about the importance of enhancing communication and understanding among UGA and UV exchange participants. During his interview, Harold Drucker claimed the importance of understanding *personalismo* in effectively establishing personal relationships in Mexican culture. He said,

It's a personal relationship between two people. And those two people coordinate, have trust in each other. And from them everything else flows. That's a very difficult concept in the U.S.A. university.... Personal contact of going down and having dinner with those folks, spending a little time, getting to know their families. That's very, very important, all that kind of stuff... So that little tension has underlaid a lot of the whole program in Veracruz, with Veracruz. And the central manager back in the U.S.A. needs to always understand that concept...that's the challenge.

Reinforcing claims of the need for personalismo, other UGA administrators and faculty asserted the need to enhance effective communication to better cultural understanding and real international cooperation among participants. This was driven by the gap in organizational cultures and societal norms between the institutions and countries. Jane Francis provided evidence of perceptions, misunderstandings and unacceptability of UGA participant behaviors by UGA administrators about U.S.A. cultural norms, their organizational authority structures and protocols. She also provided evidence in regard to occasional lack of follow through on commitments made by UGA stakeholders, and the unacceptability of these behaviors by UV counterparts. This struck a negative chord with UV stakeholders and was viewed as behavior akin to the “ugly American” showing off money and power, with little regard for personal integrity and following through on commitments. She explained,

There was talk about UGA buying property there.... And you know, the people from Veracruz actually took some UGA people around to look at property and wanted to help negotiate. And then, well, kind of not promises, but it was implied that we would give Veracruz an office here at UGA, and things like that....

Relationships got very complicated because there were lots of people involved, lots of personalities. And I think some (UGA) faculty members thought they really understood the culture and the system there, but clearly did not. Clearly just didn't, you know.

Interest 6.7. Expand exchange programs to other academic departments and educational institutions

Evidence indicated UGA the administration represented organizational interests in expanding the exchange program to other academic departments and educational institutions. For the UGA administration, these interests were in common with one other stakeholder group: UV administration. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for the other stakeholders in the exchange program.

Although the UGA-UV exchange was initially a School of Social Work initiative, broader institutional interests were at work in UGA to expand the program to other departments and programs. Building on evidence obtained from the analysis of professional histories of other UGA administration elites, examining Dr. Michael Highman's impact on future direction of the exchange program provided additional evidence in this regard. In 2003, Highman received the Roscoe Riding Internationalization Award from the UGA Office of International Education for his work in Veracruz, Mexico. Highman served as chair of the UGA Study Abroad Risk Management Review Board for its first two years, helping shape policies and review programs to ensure the safety of students abroad. He also served on the Blue Ribbon Committee on International Affairs in the College of Education.

Highman was a key stakeholder who helped grow the fledgling Georgia - Veracruz Partnership. Following the path cleared by the School of Social Work, he developed a Maymester and summer study abroad program for the UGA School of Education in Xalapa, Mexico, a student exchange program with the University of

Veracruz, and a general agreement with the Secretary of Education and Culture for the state of Veracruz. In 2002, Highman received a Fulbright Grant that allowed him to spend spring semester teaching and pursuing research at the University of Veracruz.

Interest 6.8. Increase administration, faculty and student participation in study abroad programs

Evidence indicated the UGA administration represented personal and organizational interests in increasing administration, faculty and student participation in study abroad programs. For the UGA administration, these interests were in common with one other stakeholder group: UGA faculty. Together these two stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for the other stakeholders in the exchange program.

Evidence of this interest was obtained in part through examination of the professional history of Dr. Michael Lawrence. Before coming to UGA, Lawrence was Assistant Vice President for Research and Director of International Programs at the University of Montana. In 2001, Lawrence was named Associate Provost for International Affairs at the University of Georgia. The Associate Provost position was intended to provide leadership for the institution-wide focus on international faculty research activity and student study-abroad and exchange programs. As director of the Office of International Affairs, the Associate Provost was responsible for maintaining a comprehensive knowledge of the UGA international efforts, coordinating the institutional programs associated with international education, and serving as the principle link for UGA with the University System of Georgia's Office of International Education.

At the time of Lawrence's appointment, the UGA Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost said,

This is a very important position at the university, and I'm pleased we were able to attract a person with the broad international experience that Dr. Lawrence brings. He has already served as the central coordinator for wide-ranging international research and exchange programs and has a solid track record in increasing the number of students studying abroad, which is one of our institutional priorities (citation).

When Lawrence was appointed, nearly 15 percent of the UGA undergraduate students graduated with an international experience through participation in 42 study-abroad programs in 23 countries, and 46 exchanges in 15 countries (citation). In addition, UGA was a participant in more than 140 formal agreements with universities worldwide involving faculty research collaborations and exchanges. The UGA President Michael Dawn said,

We have been expanding opportunities for students and faculty to study and work abroad, which is so important in today's global society. I'm confident that Dr. Lawrence will help the University of Georgia continue to advance in this area (citation).

Interest 6.9. Provide equal opportunities for participation by students and faculty in the exchange program

Evidence indicated the UGA administration represented personal and organizational interests in providing equal opportunities for participation by students and

faculty in the exchange program. For the UGA administration, these interests were in common with three other stakeholder groups: UGA faculty, UV faculty, and UV students. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for the other stakeholders in the exchange program.

Evidence of the UGA administration's interest in more equitable participation was obtained in part by interviews conducted in the Office of International Education. Stakeholders there were concerned about extremely low participation in international study by students of color at UGA, as well as concern for what has become majority participation in study abroad by UGA Business School students, frequently in pursuit of “academic tourism,” often to the most high cost locations.

In addition to providing his knowledge about exchange structures, processes, and mechanisms at UGA, Dr. Franco Villareal shared specific facts about who at UGA participated in study abroad, and where. He said,

Interestingly, the majority of (UGA) students who travel (for study abroad) aren't from social work, or education, or liberal arts, but are from the School of Business. And it's interesting that the manifestation of more and more economic tourism is favored now in place of real field practice as an exchange experience. The ones who go now are the students who have money, who have resources able to pay \$7,000 or \$8,000 per semester in order to study in Europe. 87% of those who participate (in UGA study abroad) go to Western Europe. And of them, 80% are business students.

Other claims of concern were evidenced by UGA administration stakeholders about barriers to participation caused by hegemony of English language. Low fluency in English negatively impacted TOEFL and GRE scores, which served as barriers to entry to UGA graduate study for every UV social work student who applied for admission.

Occasionally concerns were expressed by UGA administrators about lack of equitable opportunities for potential exchange participants occurring within the UV system. Again Francis explained,

In terms of administrative exchange, I mean and this grant had lots of funds to bring their faculty here.... And so we had that situation where the, you know it's very hierarchical down there, and faculty members there just can't say, well I'm going to go to Georgia like we can here. They've got to clear it. And so anytime we tried to make that happen, it's like their boss is always the one who wanted to come.

There were many claims made by members in almost all stakeholder groups about barriers to participation by UV students due to inability to obtain a U.S.A. travel visa.

This concern was also raised by UGA administration stakeholder Jane Francis. She said,

And even with our USAID grant, you know, we would have a formal letter of invitation where we would say, you're coming under this U.S.A. Government funded grant (TIES). We're paying for you to be here the entire time. And some of the students still couldn't get (U.S.A.) visas.

Interest 6.10. Raise levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach

Evidence indicated the UGA administration represented personal and organizational interests in raising levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach. For the UGA administration, these interests was in common with three other stakeholder groups: UGA faculty, UV administration, and UV faculty. Together these four stakeholder groups negotiated these interests at the planning table for the other stakeholders in the exchange program.

Reinforcing statements made by other UGA administrators interviewed for the study, Dan Brown provided evidence of attribution for their claims of UGA administration interests in enhancing the reputation and recognition of the university through exchange participation.

Brown said,

We almost have to look at levels of the institutions because I think at the top level, at the President and Vice-President offices there is much more a concern for the image of the institution both UV and UGA, and they would use similar language, internationalizing the curriculum, international faculty development opportunities, common research factors, those kinds of issues, which are really a type of marketing concern. Both institutions can say we are an international institution, we have sister school relationship. Look at our common research.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to answer research question one: What were the stakeholder interests in the UGA – UV social work education exchange? The aim of this chapter was to provide a description of stakeholders interests, which will then be used to answer research question two, in Chapter Six. Limitation of space prevented describing all stakeholder interests in the exchange program. Consequently, only a critical subset of interests necessary to answer the research questions were described. All of these interests, and many more, combined to shape multiple, historically developing, and intersecting planning tables in the UGA-UV academic exchange.

CHAPTER SIX

NEGOTIATION OF POWER AND INTERESTS

The purpose of this chapter is to answer research question two: How did the negotiation of interests shape the UGA – UV social work education exchange? Limitation of space prevents describing all of the many outcomes that were shaped by stakeholder negotiations in the exchange program. Consequently, only a critical subset of outcomes necessary to answer the research questions are described. All of these outcomes, and many more, were shaped by stakeholder negotiations, which occurred at multiple, historically developing, and intersecting planning tables in the UGA-UV academic exchange.

A review of the theoretical framework

The Study was rooted in a theoretical framework of educational program planning developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006). This perspective frames educational planning as a “social activity whereby people construct educational programs by negotiating personal, organizational and societal interests in contexts marked by socially-structured power relations” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998, 2006). Four concepts structure the theory -- power, interests, negotiation, and responsibility. These concepts account for the world that planners experience, and define their actions, as well as prescribe their ethical obligations.

Guiding planning actions in real world contexts, Cervero and Wilson provided a toolbox for planning practitioners and researchers consisting of technical knowledge and skills, a framework for political analysis, and a normative standard, all of which are necessary for substantively democratic and responsible educational planning. Viewed through this lens, UGA-UV academic exchange program planners engaged in a process of negotiating multiple, historically developing, and intersecting interests in relations of power in their planning worlds. Through this process, exchange stakeholders shaped the exchange program through their practical judgments, resulting in its educational outcomes, and also its social and political outcomes. Consequently, the results of their judgments in exchange planning practice either reproduced, or changed, the social and political relationships that characterized the exchange program.

In addition to having used the Cervero and Wilson theoretical framework, their metaphor of the planning table was the central means utilized to weave description, analysis, and interpretation of the dynamics of exchange stakeholder actions in their real world contexts of Georgia and Veracruz, where factors such as race, class, gender, and political economy confounded use of more traditional planning practice frameworks (Cervero & Wilson, 1998, 2006). The planning table metaphor enabled a critical vision of planning practice. This vision saw planning as a situated process, not just one of negotiation of power and interests, but also one requiring that an ethical determination be made. In exchange stakeholders' worlds of multiple planning tables in varying contexts, this vision of planning framed a realistic process through which stakeholders made ethical determinations about whose interests actually got to the exchange planning tables.

Finally, the vision of exchange planning used in this study enabled a political interpretation of exchange planning practice, which asked who benefited from the academic exchange and in what ways. This vision of adult education saw it as a struggle for knowledge and power in social situations (Cervero & Wilson, 2001, 2006; Wilson & Cervero, 2001, 2003), which were situated in the planning spaces of the international academic exchange program in Georgia and Veracruz.

Dimensions of the Planning Table

In their theory of educational program planning, Cervero and Wilson (2006, p. 84) indicated four key dynamics are in operation at the planning tables where educational programs are produced: 1) power relations enable and constrain people's access to and capacity to act at the planning table; 2) people represent interests at the table; 3) ethical commitments define who should be represented at the table; and 4) negotiation is the central practical action at the table.

Power relations shaped the planning table

The first important dynamic that operated in the UGA-UV academic exchange was that power relations enabled and constrained stakeholders' access to, and capacities to act, at the many planning tables situated in Georgia and Veracruz. The planning tables in the exchange were dovetailed into the sociopolitical relationships among and between stakeholders, and constituted planning locations where power was produced and exercised by exchange stakeholders (Cervero & Wilson, 2006) in the construction of the exchange program. The power relations at work in the exchange were crucially important because they influenced whose interests were represented at the tables.

Cervero and Wilson (2006) recognized power to have three important characteristics for educational planning. First, people do not possess finite amounts of power to wield against others, but rather power is a social and relational characteristic at work in all planning interaction. Second, power relations occur as a structural characteristic in sociopolitical contexts, but also, importantly, as an activity exercised through individuals. Third, power relations are continuously negotiated at educational planning tables.

Seen through this framework, the first characteristic of power at work in the UGA-UV academic exchange program was that stakeholder power was fundamentally the capacity to act, acquired by virtue of their position and participation in ongoing social and organizational relationships in the academic exchange. Stakeholder power was not just a consequence of their individual attributes. Rather, stakeholders in the UGA-UV academic exchange possessed the capacity to act at the planning tables, which was rooted in the complex milieu of socially structured relationships present in the exchange program.

The second characteristic of power seen through this framework was that power relations occurred in the exchange both as a structural characteristic in sociopolitical contexts, but also, importantly, as an activity exercised through individual stakeholders. In the UGA-UV academic exchange, although many power relations were highly asymmetrical forms of domination, structuring and limiting the construction of exchange features and reproducing domination, there were also many power relations in which capacities to act were distributed relatively equally to all stakeholders at the table, thus

enabling the creation of new, even liberating, political relationships. Importantly, the outcomes of the exercise of power by exchange stakeholders, about and at the planning tables, could not have been predetermined, but was contingent instead on how they chose to exercise that power in their particular contexts. Although preexisting power relationships certainly existed, exchange stakeholders always faced new challenges of how to achieve their interests through the exercise of power as challenged occurred.

The third characteristic of power seen through the framework of the planning table was that power was always being negotiated at the planning table. Given the asymmetrical forms of domination in the exchange, the preexisting structural characteristics limited capacities to act, but they were, nonetheless, affected by who got to make decisions at the planning tables. Importantly, negotiated decisions by stakeholders had two crucial outcomes (Forester, 1989; Cervero and Wilson, 1998, 2006). First, stakeholder negotiations focused on decision making about the educational features of the UGA-UV academic exchange program. Second, those negotiations either maintained or altered the social and political relationships of those who were included or excluded from exchange program planning. Consequently, in the UGA-UV academic exchange, the fundamental dynamic at work at the planning tables was that planners always negotiated with their own power, and between and among the political relationships of other stakeholders, which enabled them to make judgments about the features and outcomes of the program. Moreover, simultaneously in the planning process, exchange stakeholders also negotiated about the political relationships in the exchange, seeking to reinforce or alter them.

Peoples' interests played out at the planning tables

The second important dynamic in operation at academic exchange planning tables was that stakeholders represented the interests described in Chapter 5 at the multiple tables situated in the many diverse contexts of the exchange. Power relations shaped multiple planning tables in these various contexts by enabling or constraining the capacities to act for program planning stakeholders. Therefore, stakeholders sought to achieve their represented interests through their exercise of power at these tables (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, 1994a, 1994b). In the UGA – UV academic exchange program, stakeholders represented and negotiated their complex sets of interests at planning tables situated in the various contexts described in Chapter 4. As Cervero and Wilson (2006, p. 88) explained, these interests were “predispositions, embracing goals, values, desires, and other orientations and inclinations that lead a person to act in one direction or another.”

For the many academic exchange stakeholders described in Chapters 4 and 5, the interests they represented provided them with motivations and purposes, which led them to act, or not act, depending on their capacities to have done so. Moreover, the outcomes of their actions were dependent upon the challenges they faced relative to the diverse contexts in which they were situated, and also dependent on the ongoing judgments they made in response to these challenges. The stakeholders involved in the UGA - UV planning process exercised their power relative to their own interests, the interests of other stakeholders, and the interests of those of whom they represented at the planning

tables. Collectively, their actions, or lack thereof, represented the social heart of the program planning process in the UGA – UV social work academic exchange.

Through their representation and negotiation of interests, the actions of program planning stakeholders defined the features of the academic exchange. Consequently, the features that cumulatively represented the UGA – UV social work academic exchange program were causally related to specific interests of the persons who planned them (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, 1994a). As Cervero and Wilson indicated (2006, p. 89), “people with interests plan programs.” Their ongoing judgments, and their capacities to act, however, were not predetermined. Instead, the judgments and actions of program planning stakeholders were dependent upon: 1) which of them were at the table; 2) the places in which these tables were located; 3) which and whose interests they represented, and; 4) how each of them chose to exercise (or not) their power at the table. Because of these contingencies, and the many ways in which they could have played out at the planning tables, the features represented by the UGA – UV exchange program could have turned out significantly different. Regardless of the outcomes, the exchange program would have resulted from the power relations that shaped the planning tables, the multiple, historically developing, and intersecting interests represented by stakeholders at various tables, and the particular negotiations that occurred there.

Of the complex sets of interests represented by stakeholders in the UGA – UV exchange, some were related to educational outcomes for the program, while others were related to social and political outcomes, or “hidden agendas.” Although the stated purposes and objectives of the exchange program were academically oriented, social and

political interests were as integral a part of the planning process as educational interests, if not more. Because of the contradictory way in which stakeholders represented divergent interests at the planning tables, the process often appeared confusing, even confounding. Therefore, whether analyzing or interpreting dynamics in the study, it was crucial never to lose sight of the following questions: Whose interests were at stake in the program? And, what were those interests?

Ethical commitments defined who was represented at the tables

The third important dynamic in operation at academic exchange planning tables was that ethical commitments of exchange stakeholders defined who was represented at the planning tables. Which stakeholders sat at planning tables in the UGA-UV academic exchange was of critical importance to the shaping of the features that defined the program. Depending on who was seated at a particular table, there was a causal relationship among whose interests those stakeholder planners represented, the practical judgments they made, and the specific program features that resulted (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a; 2006). As Cervero and Wilson (2006, p. 91) indicated, the fact that educational programs are causally related to stakeholder interests “is no superfluous claim, for if program features were not determined by these interests, then what would determine them?”

Ideally, for exchange planners, evidence should have informed their practical judgments, but in reality they were normally made due to attempts to achieve specific outcomes. Moreover, as Cervero and Wilson (2006, pg. 91) have said, it was precisely because educational programs matter that their resulting features are shaped by the

interests of their planners. In the case of the UGA-UV academic exchange program, it mattered because it created possibilities in the futures of students, faculty, institutions, communities, and societies, both in Georgia and Veracruz, and in United States and Mexico.

Fundamental to their actions, exchange stakeholder judgments were made based on ethical commitments each of them brought to the planning tables -- assuming they were privileged to be seated or represented there. In the UGA-UV academic exchange, stakeholder judgments helped construct the possible futures of participants, personally, in their organizations, and in their respective societies, and these possibilities resulted, at least in part, from the academic exchange they shaped.

In the case of the UGA-UV exchange program, stakeholder commitments drove decision making that occurred in the negotiation of interests at uneven planning tables situated in the various contexts described in Chapter 4. As Cervero and Wilson noted (1994a, 2001, 2006), within such contexts and at such tables, exchange stakeholders enacted their ethical commitments by answering two fundamental questions: Who should benefit in what ways from educational programs, and whose interests should be represented at the planning tables where judgments are made about educational programs?

Importantly, these two kinds of ethical commitments – who should benefit, and who should be at the table – are intertwined (Cervero & Wilson, 2006). Ethical commitments were intricately woven into the political relationships in the social and organizational settings where planning occurred in the exchange. Ethical commitments

of exchange stakeholders were enacted in contexts of conflicting interests, resource asymmetries, and unequal power relations, which constructed the uneven planning tables at which most of the planning occurred. This reality of exchange planning was crucial to understand, because as Forester (1990, p. 253) pointed out, “(If) ethical thinking is blind to the world of politics and pragmatism, then ethics, it seems, asks us to be saints and martyrs, not planners.” Therefore, absent of ethical commitments by stakeholders about who should have benefited and who should have been seated at the many exchange planning tables, then those with the most power always would have exercised it to determine the features of the exchange program, as well as its educational and political outcomes. Thankfully, this was not always the case.

People negotiated at planning tables

The fourth important dynamic in operation at academic exchange planning tables was that negotiation was the central practical in planning action by stakeholders at the planning tables. In addressing the many planning activities that occurred in the far reaching Georgia-Veracruz partnership, stakeholders undertook the necessary practical actions to accomplish these activities at planning tables where they conferred, discussed, and argued in making judgments that produced the critical features embodied in the exchange program. Whether conferring, discussing, or arguing in their planning interactions, negotiation was the fundamental, political action that best describes the social activities they engaged in to reach agreements about how to construct the program. What made the negotiations of exchange stakeholders political was that they were neither neutral nor objective about addressing even the most procedural tasks. Rather, these

negotiations represented how they exercised power to represent their own interests, and the interests of others, in shaping the educational and political outcomes of the UGA-UV academic exchange program.

As described in Chapters 4 and 5, situations at the various planning tables occupied by exchange stakeholders differed dramatically, whether measured, for example, by geographic location or various resource factors. Situations at these tables also differed in another crucial way. Sometimes there was widespread agreement by stakeholders about the interests they represented, while at other times high levels of difference and conflict existed. Cervero and Wilson (2006) classified these types of negotiations into three groupings, depending on the level of conflict present: consultations, bargaining, and disputes. Moreover, they argued that each situation requires a different approach to negotiation. In the UGA-UV exchange program, as stakeholders represented interests at the planning tables, they needed to be able to anticipate and interpret differing situations in order to select and utilize negotiation approaches that matched these situations.

Often exchange planners encountered situations described as consultations, where two or more stakeholders embraced common interests that overcame any others, leading them to share information and engage in mutual problem solving.

A second type of situation that exchange planners encountered was described as bargaining. The negotiations undertaken in these situations occurred at planning tables where two or more stakeholders held both common and conflicting interests, but engaged purposefully to reach agreement.

A third type of situation that exchange planners encountered was described as disputes. These negotiations were marked by a great deal of conflict at the planning table. Although outright disputes in negotiation situations were uncommon in the exchange, some did occur.

Social, historical, and structural factors influencing planning tables

This section will answer Research Question 2: How did the negotiation of interests shape the UGA – UV social work education exchange?

At the outset of the UGA-UV partnership, varying motivations existed within the two universities for developing international programs, including common interests in research and economic development. In Georgia, a significant force pushing the growth of international programs was the increasing ethnic diversity of the population, driven substantially by immigration. Although international programs had existed in colleges and universities for at least a century, responding to processes of neoliberal globalization, the 1990s was a decade of rapid expansion in the internationalization of American higher education (Desruisseaux, 1999). During the 1990s, increases were substantial in numbers of foreign students studying at U.S.A. institutions, and U.S.A. students studying at foreign institutions (Brown & Cervantes, 2000). Despite occasional educational funding cutbacks coinciding with crises of global capitalism, and the negative effects of September 11th, recent trends in international study continued to point to vitality of exchange programs.

During the history of the UGA-UV academic exchange, international experiences originating from within schools of social work in the U.S.A. mirrored those of higher

education. The past 20 years saw increasing interests in international issues within schools of social work education. As exchange stakeholders Dan Brown and Matilde Cabrera wrote (2000),

Global interdependence has created important avenues for international involvement by reshaping the social work environment in the following ways: a) international issues and events, especially movements of populations, have changed U.S.A. domestic practice and demand new knowledge and competencies; (b) social problems are commonly shared by developed and developing countries to an unprecedented degree; (c) the political, economic, and social actions of one country directly affect other countries' social and economic well-being; and, (d) exchanges are made possible by extraordinary technological developments, such as the Internet.

From the perspective of social work exchange stakeholders in Veracruz, UV entered the partnership with UGA due to the need to establish international exchange programs with the U.S.A. to acquire knowledge and resources to better prepare students and faculty in an age of increasing professional specialization and expansion of knowledge, as well as to address critical issues of social well-being. Although historically based on a development and social action model, during the 1990s social work education and practice in Veracruz changed its orientation increasingly towards a clinical model. Thus, there was a desire within the UV School of Social Work to adopt and diffuse knowledge of clinical social work, which it anticipated would be provided through international education exchange with the UGA.

On the other hand, from the UGA perspective, there was a felt need to form an international social work exchange program with UV to develop Spanish/English, bilingual, culturally competent social work scholars and practitioners who could effectively address a range of education and practice issues related to the growing Hispanic population in the Georgia.

These distinct UV and UGA social work educational responses arose from forces of globalization supporting internationalization in social work education at both universities. In particular, educational responses to globalization processes were being pushed along by commitments of UV administration stakeholders at UGA and UV in order to broaden the preparation and experiences of their students, faculty, and graduates. Moreover, educational responses to globalization were occurring within the broader contexts of institutional internationalization of higher education in both the USA and Mexico, with commitments from powerful stakeholders at levels within and outside of both university systems.

From a planning viewpoint, informal planning for the UGA – UV academic exchange program began in 1990, when a small number of stakeholders from the two universities came to the table to begin negotiating the exchange. In the beginning of the UGA – UV academic exchange, planning activities focused only on social work education, which represented the boundary of this case study. Over time, a much broader UGA -- UV exchange program developed, expanding into other academic areas. These included: 1) elementary education, secondary education, and early childhood education in the College of Education; 2) child development, housing, and textiles in the College of

Family and Consumer Sciences; and 3) several departments of the College of Agriculture, the College of Veterinary Science, and some ancillary services, such as landscape management and auxiliary business management. While all of the stakeholder groups and interests of the broader exchange intersected and influenced the dynamics of the social work exchange program, and vice versa, any substantive description and analysis of them is beyond the scope of this study.

Historically, both UGA and UV administration stakeholders had signed numerous official agreements for academic exchanges with universities in other countries, most of which amounted to little more than signing ceremonies. Indeed, there was a previous agreement between these two universities that resulted in little activity, substantially due to lack of commitments by these stakeholders from both schools.

During the 1990s, however, the UGA - UV social work exchange began to acquire life and recognizable form. Reinforced by the 1996 Olympic Games experience in Atlanta, UGA began to define itself as an institution of national and international significance. At the same time, Georgia was becoming very active in the resettlement of refugees, especially in Atlanta, due in part to the presence of CARE, the Carter Center, and other international non-governmental organizations located there. Due to economic and population growth in Georgia, the state became a destination for immigrants and migrant workers, the majority of whom came, and continue to come, from Mexico.

During the same period of time in Mexico, the University of Veracruz aspired to become a premier public university in that country, and began developing projects and programs of institutional internationalization. At least as far back as the Spanish colonial

era, the Port of Veracruz – indeed, all of the Veracruz region -- has been an area with strong interests rooted in commerce, export, trade, and communications. Given the area's export of citrus (the largest in the world), coffee, oil, and petrochemicals, among many other commodities, during the 20th century it was common social practice for Veracruzanos to establish new relationships, both inside and outside of their state and country.

Influence on exchange tables: globalization processes

Because of the history of international commercial exchange, the government of the state of Veracruz was very receptive to helping to facilitate internationalization efforts when communication began between UGA and UV. Given these structural factors, combined with the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994, stakeholders in Georgia and Veracruz gained more and more awareness of the discourse and goals put forth by proponents of neoliberal globalization. These goals included long-term North American integration, with privatization of a wide variety of government institutions and their activities: commerce and trade; environmental regulation; health and human services; education; immigration, law enforcement and criminal justice; social security systems and taxation.

NAFTA proposed opening completely the trade frontiers between the three North American countries by 2010. In signing the agreement, Mexico, ranked 48th on the United Nations Human Development Index, entered into a partnership with Canada and the USA, both ranked in the top five. Shortly after joining NAFTA, Mexico also officially became a member state of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and

Development (OECD). These moves underscored the importance of science and technology-driven modernization for a series of Mexican governments over the past two and a half decades. By entering NAFTA and OECD, the Mexican government took on the difficult challenge to bring the country "in a relatively short 15 years, to an economic and social level that will allow it to compete with the major economic powers" (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1994, p. 141).

Policies such as NAFTA, and its possible successor, the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (FTAA), may have appeared to have had little to do with issues of educational policy, planning, or international academic exchange programs. In public discourse, NAFTA was widely described as an economic pact that opened the economies of industrialized nations (United States and Canada) to a major Third World country (Mexico). Closer scrutiny of NAFTA revealed another scenario. A decade after its implementation, it was clear that the treaty was part of a larger set of "globalization" processes driving changes in social relations, policies, and services in all three North American countries. Indeed, history may judge the metaphorical "NAFTA" to be one of the most important North American social policy decisions of the 20th century (Poole, 1996).

Alongside NAFTA, in 1994 the Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC) was formed. CONAHEC was "a trilateral consortium advancing collaboration, cooperation and community-building among higher education institutions in North America" (CONAHEC, personal communication, April 7, 2002). In addition, many private foundations granted funding to drive the process of

international convergence, and NAFTA-related research expanded rapidly. Two key funding organizations that facilitated closer North American relations in education and training were the Institute of International Education (IEE), and the U.S.A.- Mexico Commission for Educational and Cultural Exchange (COMEXUS).

In the area of North American social work education, the Task Force for International Social Work of the Council for Social Work Education (CSWE) took the lead in this area by urging faculty exchanges and joint research efforts and by working toward the development of a national accreditation body in Mexico. Several schools of social work provided leadership as well, including the University of Texas at Pan American, Tulane University, University of Calgary, University of New Mexico at Las Cruces, University of Toronto, Mexican National School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, and University of Georgia (Poole, 1996).

Influences on exchange tables: similarities and differences of the universities

Many similarities existed between the two universities in this case study, and between their respective states of Veracruz and Georgia. As large public higher education systems with major missions for teaching, public service, and outreach, UGA and UV served large and diverse geographical regions and constituencies. Both states had three major sub-regions, coastal plains, piedmont (sierra), and mountains, each of which required different approaches to outreach and extension activities. Both institutions served states with abundant natural resources and large agricultural and agribusiness sectors. There was remarkable congruence between the two institutions in the academic programs offered. On the cultural level, both institutions represented states with diverse

populations, strong local and regional identities, with histories of formality and respect for local traditions.

In contrast to similarities, there were significant differences between the academic institutions, and their respective states and nations. Asymmetrical factors existed from the start of exchange planning, especially major disparities of economic resources. In Georgia, during the 1990s, UGA benefited from substantial increases in funding. Supportive governors and legislatures in Georgia invested substantial resources in higher education, which were driven by sustained economic and population growth. By contrast, in Veracruz -- indeed, in all of Mexico -- the majority of the population experienced harsh economic conditions, both before and throughout the formal history of the exchange. These structural factors impacted planning tables in myriad ways, positively and negatively, affecting judgments made by stakeholders and stakeholder groups, sometimes limiting possibilities for outcomes, at other times creating opportunities.

Socioeconomic and political influences on planning contexts derived in part from the Mexican economic crisis of the 1990s, one of a series of financial crises in that country, the first of which erupted in 1983, when Mexico defaulted on its foreign debt, resulting in the imposition of harsh international monetary policies and austerity programs. Other economic factors influenced stakeholders and planning tables, including a long-term decline of oil and petrochemical production and revenues, especially in Veracruz, particularly in Poza Rica and Minatitlán.

Significant academic differences existed between the universities, which acted to shape planning tables. One major difference between institutions was academic credentials of faculty and administrators, represented by the fact that most all UGA faculty possessed doctoral degrees from institutions across the U.S.A., while UV faculty were primarily graduates of UV, with few having obtained degrees beyond the master's level. Curricular structure was very different between the schools, with UGA having more open and flexible curricula than at UV, especially when the exchange began. Differences in epistemology and professional practices existed. In recent decades at UGA, social work knowledge production and professional practice were organized around a technical-rational, clinical model, with complex professional practice and governance structures. On the other hand, at UV, social work knowledge production and practice methods were organized for decades around a Marxist community model.

The types and levels of degrees offered by the two universities differed in important ways. The terminal degree for social work in Georgia was the Master of Social Work (MSW), while the terminal degree at UV was the Licenciatura degree, which was of a higher level than a Bachelors degree, but not the equivalent of a Masters degree. Further, the state of Georgia had a license law for social workers and a strong professional association. The profession in Veracruz lacked a statewide professional organization. Moreover, job opportunities for Georgia graduates in social work were excellent, while employment opportunities for graduates of social work in Veracruz were few.

Finally, the organizational processes, administrative structures, and the academic cultures at UGA were more open and informal than those at UV, which were strictly hierarchical and very formal. At UGA, as the oldest land grant university in the U.S., with over 200 years of history behind it, much more institutional evolution had occurred than at UV, which was still a relatively young state university, founded in 1944.

Stages of Development for the UGA – UV Social Work Education Academic Exchange

The UGA – UV social work education academic exchange evolved through stages of development typical of such programs (Gacel-Avila, 1999). Following the schema of Brown and Cervantes (2000), five distinct phases of development were identified in the UGA – UV social work education partnership. Phase one occurred from 1990 through 1993, when stakeholders from both universities engaged in many conversations, mutual visits, and negotiation of an exchange agreement between the partner institutions. During this initial phase, the presence of two committed stakeholders was crucial. One was William Arcado, retired USAID official and consultant for the Department of Human Services in Mexico City, who also served on the University Foundation Board at UV in 1990. The other was Harold Drucker, Vice President for Public Service and Outreach at UGA with a particular interest in Latin America. During phase one, these two individuals maintained warm personal relationships with key stakeholders in both partner institutions, and added an important cultural element, *personalismo*, the Mexican value on personal relationships, which was crucial for successful interpersonal relations in that country.

The second phase of the UGA – UV partnership occurred in 1994 and 1995, and consisted of identification by UGA and UV stakeholders of academic partners in each institution and negotiation of discipline specific agreements. During this phase the UGA School of Social Work began relationships with the two social work campuses of UV, one in the northern region of the state at Poza Rica, and the other in the southern region at Minatitlán, Veracruz.

The third phase of the exchange took place in 1995 and 1996, and consisted of identification by UGA and UV faculty stakeholders of both human resources and financial support at both institutions. This phase consisted of formal invitations from UV stakeholders and extended visits by UGA faculty stakeholders to the main campus in Xalapa, and the schools of social work in Poza Rica and Minatitlán.

Phase four took place from 1996 through 1998 and included the implementation of a range of activities by the partner schools of social work. During this phase UGA faculty stakeholders applied for and won three competitive internal grants from the UGA Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), totaling more than \$25,000 over three years, which demonstrated a high level of institutional commitment. In Veracruz, the UV VPAA continued to provide financial support for UGA stakeholder visits as well as for a lecture series and curriculum consultations by UGA faculty at the Poza Rica and Minatitlán campuses.

Phase five occurred from 1997 through 2003, and included the expansion of the exchange by UGA administration stakeholders to other disciplines at both UGA and UV. During this phase, several disciplines at UGA organized student and faculty exchanges

with partner disciplines at UV. Financial self-sufficiency began to occur in the student exchanges through fee payment for classes, while departmental funds and the UGA VPAA financed faculty visits.

In 1998, The UGA School of Social Work, the College of Education, and the Office of International Development of UGA, in partnership with the UV Area of Humanidades, received a \$98,000 grant from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Association Liaison Office for two years of funding for the exchange activities. Focused on education within the professional disciplines of social work, activities ranged from cultural immersion classes at the EEE to continuing education seminars, including distance learning broadcast by satellite television from Georgia to Veracruz, social work field practicum experiences, and semester faculty visits at both universities intended to inspire joint research and publication.

As mentioned previously, a milestone event occurred in 2003, with the decision by the UGA School of Social Work to end its participation in the exchange.

This section described the history of the UGA – UV social work education academic exchange, focusing on 1) motivations for the exchange; 2) institutional and cultural factors among and between the participating institutions; and, 3) stages of development in the exchange.

Features of the Exchange

Negotiation was the fundamental practical planning action by stakeholders at the planning tables. In addressing the many planning activities that occurred in the far reaching Georgia-Veracruz partnership, stakeholders undertook the necessary practical actions to accomplish these activities at planning tables where they conferred, discussed, and argued in making judgments that produced the critical features embodied in the exchange program. Whether conferring, discussing, or arguing in their planning interactions, negotiation was the fundamental, political action that best describes the social activities they engaged in to reach agreements about how to construct the program. What made the negotiations of exchange stakeholders political was that they were neither neutral nor objective about addressing even the most procedural tasks. Rather, these negotiations represented how they exercised power to represent their own interests, and the interests of others, in shaping the educational and political outcomes of the UGA-UV academic exchange program.

As described in Chapters 4 and 5, situations at the various planning tables occupied by exchange stakeholders differed dramatically, whether measured, for example, by geographic location or various resource factors. Situations at these tables also differed in another crucial way. Sometimes there was widespread agreement by stakeholders about the interests they represented, while at other times high levels of difference and conflict existed. Cervero and Wilson (2006, p. 94) classified these types of negotiations into three groupings, depending on the level of conflict present: consultations, bargaining, and disputes. Moreover, they argued that each situation

requires a different approach to negotiation. In the UGA-UV exchange program, as stakeholders represented interests at the planning tables, they needed to be able to anticipate and interpret differing situations in order to select and utilize negotiation approaches that matched these situations.

As stakeholders of the UGA-UV academic exchange engaged in planning activities, they utilized many forms of practical actions to construct the program. For example, UGA social work students provided practical feedback after participating in Maymester coursework in Veracruz. Some UV students contributed in similar fashion after attending seminars conducted by UGA faculty in Poza Rica and Minatitlán. Faculty from both universities collaborated in instructional development activities, both for exchange courses, and for curriculum revisions occurring in their respective schools of social work. And UGA and UV administrators prepared budgets, sought grant funding to keep the exchange program afloat, and conducted various sorts of evaluation activities to determine its successes and failures, as well as its future course. During all of these procedural tasks, stakeholders – students, faculty, and administrators -- brought their technical knowledge and skills to the planning tables situated in their respective contexts. While many of these activities were based primarily on technique, these stakeholders also brought to bear their power and interests to determine which particular tasks they would address, and how they would be approached.

Often exchange planners encountered situations described as consultations, where two or more stakeholders embraced common interests that overcame any others, leading them to share information and engage in mutual problem solving. For example, in the

UGA-UV exchange, administrators from both universities came together in 1994 to sign the initial exchange agreement. In that negotiation, best described as a consultation, UGA and UV administration stakeholders treated each other as allies working together on common interests of advancing internationalization of their respective universities. In this instance, although both UGA and UV administrators came to the table wielding tremendous capacities to exercise power, that was relatively unimportant because they all held similar sets of interests that were commanding their judgments. As administrators came together from both institutions to give birth to the exchange, trust was high, and they engaged in mutually supportive negotiation with little or no concern about their counterparts acting to leverage their power to undermine activities at the table. While it was likely that one or more thorny issues arose during those negotiations, given the successful creation of the partnership, it was clear that university administrators present from both sides acted to mutually support the others in solving any problematic stumbling blocks that may have occurred.

A second type of situation that exchange planners encountered was described as bargaining. The negotiations undertaken in these situations occurred at planning tables where two or more stakeholders held both common and conflicting interests, but engaged purposefully to reach agreement. For example, UGA and UV faculty frequently negotiated regarding the planning of the numerous trips made by UGA faculty from Georgia to the Schools of Social Work in Poza Rica and Minatitlán. While these situations served well the personal and organizational interests of the UGA faculty, often these interests were not held in common by their UV counterparts. Rather, they had to

interrupt their working routines to both plan the activities that would occur, and host their foreign visitors during their stays. Moreover, often UGA faculty came to Veracruz with inflated agendas, and because of their limitations, UV faculty were unable or unwilling to accommodate them. The negotiations undertaken in these situations were bargaining because the final set of agreements about these program features did not address the interests of either faculty as they would have preferred. Nevertheless, although for different reasons, it was in the interest of both faculties to continue to engage in the exchange. The faculty members from both schools involved in these negotiations needed each other, and they sought to find, if not to maximize, areas of common interest. During this bargaining negotiation, UGA faculty sometimes incorporated a strategy to educate UV faculty stakeholders about the benefits they would gain from the visit. On the other hand, UV faculty occasionally withheld information at the table regarding the real reasons for being unable to accommodate their visitors preferred agendas.

While interests were served on both sides during these bargaining consultations, they were not always served equally. Unlike in consultations, in bargaining situations the amount of power that stakeholders brought to the table now mattered. Although UGA faculty relented on some of their agenda demands for the common good of keeping the exchange relationship together, UV faculty gave up more at the table in terms of what it cost them in time and labor to plan and serve their frequent guests. The UGA faculty interests prevailed because of the political relationships of each stakeholder group, and the differing sets of capacities of power they were able to exercise at the table.

A third type of situation that exchange planners encountered is described as disputes. These negotiations were marked by a great deal of conflict at the planning table. Although outright disputes in negotiation situations were uncommon in the exchange, some did occur.

For example, problems were identified by Dr. Miguel Alba, the day-to-day top UV administrator of the exchange, involving UGA students arriving unannounced at the University of Veracruz. The resulting dispute arose, in part, due to cultural differences in personal and organizational protocols of behavior and lines of authority. For some UGA stakeholders, especially students and faculty accustomed to independent travel for study and research with few strings attached, it was not perceived by them to be in their personal interests to alter their norms of behavior by adhering to a ridged protocol requiring approved itineraries and limited access to educational venues in Veracruz. The UV administration, however, believed it was in their best interest to have full knowledge of UGA visitor comings and goings, as well as substantial control over their activities within the bounds of the University of Veracruz.

The resulting dispute involved negotiations among students, faculty, and administrators from both universities whose conflicting interests outweighed their many common ones. Each stakeholder, and stakeholder group, involved in negotiations involving visitor protocol held a view of winning the dispute by furthering their own interests and gaining ascendancy of their particular viewpoints. The battle over visitor freedoms continued for some time, and was characterized by distrust on all sides, with varying tactics used by each stakeholder group intended to frustrate the actions of their

perceived adversaries. After an extended period, Dr. Alba won out, and UGA visitors acquiesced to adopting and following the rules he put in place. Alba won the dispute in part due to the highly asymmetrical structural power relationships present at the metaphorical planning table for this issue, which was situated in Xalapa. Perhaps more importantly, Alba won out due to his capacity to exercise his power on the issue at the table in Xalapa.

Neither UV faculty or students held any compelling interests in this issue, and had no compelling interest to be represented at the table. Even if they had, given the contingencies of the situation, and given the other stakeholders' capacities to act at the table, they would not have had sufficient capacities to exercise power to sway the dispute one way or another. On the other hand, for a variety of reasons, UGA students and faculty held strong interests in maintaining their travel liberties and freedoms. But in the end, as students, faculty, and visitors to UV, UGA stakeholders lacked any sufficient capacities to exercise power at a table located in Veracruz, and dominated by powerful UV administration stakeholders. Finally, UGA administrators, especially those in the Offices of International Development and International Education, were bound in an alliance to negotiate the interests of UGA travelers, and to protect their own interests of maintaining power and control over administrative functions, which were threatened by the deteriorating situation. Indeed, stakeholders from both UGA administration offices fought to counteract their UV adversary and win the dispute, hoping to maintain the status quo, placate their UGA allies, and avoid more administrative duties present in the red tape of UV administrative demands. In the end, however, Alba won out, because he

possessed the capacity to exercise more power in negotiations, which occurred primarily at a table situated in his own institutional context. Importantly, the outcome of these negotiations was not just the acquiescence of UGA students and faculty to Alba's dictates, but ultimately the beginning of a complete overhaul of UGA administrative structures and protocols for all study abroad students.

Shaping the Features of the Exchange Program

Utilizing Table 5, this section describes the main features of the UGA - UV social work academic exchange. The features were: (1) social needs and the exchange; (2) educational needs and the exchange; (3) purpose of the exchange; (4) the audience for the exchange; (5) content of the exchange activities; (6) funding for the exchange; and (7) evaluation of the exchange.

Exchange Feature One: Social Needs in Veracruz and Georgia

In Table 5, four stakeholder groups that negotiated the importance of social needs, numbered as: 1) UV students; 2) UGA students; 3) UV faculty; and 4) UGA faculty. These stakeholders negotiated and represented two primary interests to form an understanding of the social needs in Georgia and Veracruz and their relationships to the UGA - UV social work academic exchange. The interests negotiated to determine social needs were numbers: 7) Increase the contribution of social work education to solve current problems in families and society; and 11) Increase employment opportunities for social work students, faculty, and practitioners. UGA student and faculty stakeholders understood social needs as situated in Georgia context. There were identified by them to

be: 1) poverty and child welfare; 2) domestic violence; 3) health, mental health, and substance abuse; 4) aging; and 5) immigration.

UV student and faculty stakeholders generally engaged in consensual consultative negotiations with each other, and with the UGA stakeholders, and the educational outcome for them was a significantly different understanding of social needs, primarily because they were situated in Veracruz contexts. In their world, UV student and faculty stakeholders understood social needs relative to be: (1) employment; (2) basic needs including food, housing, and health; (3) population growth and internal migration; (4) emigration; and (5) political corruption.

UGA student and faculty stakeholders engaged in negotiation consultations with each other, and with UV stakeholders in representing substantive interests to determine social needs for exchange planning. For both sets of stakeholders, by far the most important interest they negotiated was to increase the contribution of social work education to solve problems in families and society, and this interest was perceived by them to be embedded in the social needs of Georgia. Compared to declarations made by UV stakeholders about social needs in Veracruz, UGA stakeholders identified the social needs in Georgia as relatively shorter-term phenomena, but still having persisted over substantial time.

Dan Brown described the consultations of social needs in Georgia as being related to Latino (primarily Mexican) immigration and population growth in the state. The outcome of UGA stakeholder negotiations identified social needs framed as immigration

driven, which became the central feature to consider when doing educational needs assessment for the exchange. Brown said,

School social workers are probably the most aware (of immigration) of any segment in social work, because they encounter the non-English-speaking parents. And of course the City of Dalton is now something like 60% Latino. Several of the elementary schools are 80% and 90% Latino. Now the absolute numbers are the same in Whitfield County, which is a separate school system. Whitfield County is the only place in the Southeast with a 20 percent density of Latino population. That's pretty high.

For Brown the feature of social needs in the exchange also related to the history of labor exploitation there, particularly that of the highly vulnerable immigrant worker. He said,

Well, why Georgia? It started in Dalton the same way it started in Gainesville in the mid- 80s. Low wage work available to Mexicans, and they came to the poultry plants. But in Dalton they soon discovered that they had an alternative in a much higher wage, more stable, carpet employment, which was at that time growing rapidly. But the Mexicans were appealed to. So there's a social political story there in terms of preference for a submissive labor force. This is not in the official record. So they came by the thousands. And that created the migration chain. And it's gone on at a high intensity ever since.

In contrast to UGA student and faculty stakeholders, when UV student and faculty stakeholders negotiated features of social needs, they understood these to be

manifesting as longer-term phenomena. They saw social needs intertwined with Mexican historical, economic and political forces, exacerbated by the exploding out-migration of Mexicans to the United States. For example, Francisco Fernandez claimed,

Well, in general terms, I feel like the poverty (in Mexico) is very extreme.... The principle problem that we have in the state of Veracruz is unemployment, and this generates a series of other problems that we have in the form of alcoholism, family violence, street children, and many problems of mental health.

Continuing the development of Francisco's economic statements about the features of social needs for the exchange, Ruth Palmero added the dimension of immigration, saying,

We have quite a problem in the question of migration, people that come from Central America, and for which this region of Minatitlán is an obligated passage way for our Central American companions who are traveling to the United States. It's an especially grave problem.

Further elaborating the immigration element, Ruth's claims demonstrated how important the issue was in UV student and faculty negotiations, which shaped the features of social needs in context of the program in Veracruz, Ruth said,

Perhaps the most severe problem is the loss of our human capital to The North. This impacts our society in so many ways, so many abandoned villages, abandoned people young and old. There is a very long history of this in Mexico, connected to the history of your country, but its consequences here are much

different. And so we miss them when they go, but we must always be vigilant in our duty to help our continental travelers go successfully on their way.

Echoing Francisco's economic character of social needs in Veracruz, when Maria Davila went to planning table, she likely emphasized the harsh economic realities faced by many in Mexico. Until the year 2000, Maria had lived her entire life in Veracruz while just one political party, the PRI, ruled the country. Consequently, she framed the social needs there through a political lens with a Marxist critique of the capitalist system, and its conditioning of the Mexican government and economy. She stated that,

Mexico, Veracruz, and Poza Rica are all part of a capitalist country in which the means of production are in few hands. Shouldn't only the government have the right to distribute economic resources? But it hasn't worked here in Mexico. The consequence of this is that we lack programs -- we lack programs for solidarity and social wellbeing. Mexico is a highly populated country, we have a huge demographic explosion.... And as a consequence, this also brings about migration from the countryside to the city, which makes the cities saturated with people who don't have access to the political process, to economic resources, to work. This results in pockets of misery on the margins of our cities, in spite of us being a state rich in agriculture, grain, citric fruit, fertile land, coffee, tobacco, cattle, pigs, poultry, oil, petrochemicals.

Monica Zamora also framed social needs in Veracruz through an economic lens, explaining how these challenges often limited lifestyle choices to just one – the satisfaction of basic needs. She said,

There are many needs that derive precisely from the question of unemployment, which is so prevalent in Poza Rica, and in our profession in recent years. If there is no work, there are no economic earnings, and if there are no economic earnings, then the people cannot satisfy their basic needs. It's as if there's a cycle, and if I am not buying, then the people who have a certain means of money to invest, well, what they invest becomes static, there is no movement, no flow, in terms of the economic questions. No? There are many needs in the region. Here the people, including those attempting to work in our profession, have a basic choice: eat or go the movies.... All of these questions revolve around the monetary question.

Berta Nieto saw the features of social needs in Veracruz as facets on the larger problem of an ineffective political system and corrupt government, which prevented social work from having space for adequate policy formation and program implementation. She described this phenomenon as historical and institutionalized, and the primary reason for the disconnect between politics in Mexico, and the many social needs begging for effective interventions.

There aren't programs...and there things stay, and you do what little you can, while political authorities give what little money there is to the parents of the family, for (their own) political purposes.... They do not permit us to undertake works that could be effective.... The official says, or speaks about social themes, but the reality is that our authorities are not very interested in the solution to

problems.... It's as if they are playing with double discourse. And so there is not work for social workers, and there is no public space for us.

Partly due to his personal experience of working on government social programs in Mexico, Francisco Fernandez negotiated the construction of social needs as problems of corruption, enabled frequently by stealing funds from programs specifically targeting the disenfranchised in the Mexican political system. He used the example of street children to argue for those that lacked a stake in the political process. He explained that,

The government throws a lot of money at programs, but...this money is...utilized in other ways than intended. They pick and choose their opportunities skillfully.... (For example) money disappears in our programs for street children and in many other programs.... For the government, street children don't represent any political problem. Street children cannot form political associations. They are not able to assemble a political protest. They can't take over the municipal palace. They do not vote. Consequently, they do not represent any potential political problem, therefore money allegedly intended for these programs can be diverted into dirty pockets.

To summarize, understanding by stakeholders of the social needs relative to the UGA - UV exchange varied among and between student and faculty stakeholders in UGA and the UV. Generally, the UGA stakeholders understood social needs in Georgia to include: (1) poverty and child welfare; (2) domestic violence; (3) health, mental health, and substance abuse; (4) aging; and (5) immigration. On the other hand, UV stakeholders had significantly different understandings of social needs. For them, social needs in

Veracruz included: (1) employment; (2) basic needs including food, housing, and health; (3) population growth and internal migration; (4) emigration; and (5) political corruption.

Moreover, a general distinction could be drawn in that UGA stakeholders expressed social needs relative to the exchange as short-term phenomena resulting significantly from Mexican immigration to the United States. UV stakeholders, on the other hand, expressed social needs in their country as long-term phenomena intertwined with global economic and Mexican political realities, and exacerbated by Mexican emigration to the United States.

Exchange Feature Two: Educational Needs and the UGA - UV Academic Exchange

Six stakeholder groups negotiated and represented substantive interests at the planning table to determine educational needs relative to planning the UGA-UV academic exchange program.

UV student and faculty stakeholders generally engaged in bargaining and consensual consultative negotiations with each other, and consultations with the UGA stakeholders, while the UGA student and faculty stakeholders engaged in negotiation consultations with each other, and with UV stakeholders in representing substantive interests to determine educational needs for exchange planning. The educational outcome of these negotiations was the identification of educational needs for the UGA-UV exchange program, while the political outcome was reproduction of asymmetrical power relations among and between the six stakeholder groups, privileging UGA stakeholders over UV stakeholders, UV administration over UV faculty, and UV faculty over UV students.

In Table 5, the six stakeholder groups that negotiated educational needs are numbered as: 1) UV students; 2) UGA students; 3) UV faculty; 4) UGA faculty; 5) UV administration; and, 6) UGA administration. These stakeholders negotiated and represented seven primary interests to form an understanding of the educational needs in Georgia and Veracruz and their relationships to the UGA - UV social work academic exchange. In Table 5, the seven primary interests negotiated to determine educational needs are numbered as: 1) Acquire clinical case methods, models and theories for social work education; 2) Acquire community practice theories, models, and methods for social work education; 3) Develop faculty through cooperative research, joint publications, and technical cooperation programs; 4) Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners in foreign language knowledge, skills, and ability; 5) Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners to be culturally competent; 8) Increase the level of academic preparation for social work faculty; and 15) Enhance communication, cultural understanding, and cultural exchange.

With regard to educational needs and the exchange, the UGA stakeholders understood these to include (1) bilingual, culturally competent social work faculty and practitioners in USA; (2) Spanish language skills for faculty and students; (3) community practice theory and methods; and (4) international research and grants for faculty and students. On the other hand, Mexican stakeholders understood educational needs relative to the exchange to include (1) curriculum reform adopting flexible curriculum (European and U.S.A. models); (2) clinical methods for SW practitioners; (3) faculty research and

publication knowledge and skills; (4) English language skills for faculty and students; and (5) internationalization in context of globalization.

UGA student and faculty stakeholders engaged in consultations and bargaining with each other, and consultations and bargaining with UV stakeholders in negotiating and representing substantive interests to determine educational needs for exchange planning.

Douglas Golay described the features of educational needs for the exchange program as embedded in needs related to Latino immigration. Like all other UGA stakeholders, he often shaped exchange educational needs around the critical need for bilingual, culturally competent social workers in Georgia. He claimed that,

(The) critical need is to train social workers in their educational programs with (Spanish) language and cultural skills. Social work as a discipline has built in a lot of emphasis on diversity and cross-cultural relating and that sort of thing, but it doesn't deal with the language unless that's built (into the educational program).

Giving evidence for his expression of how Latino immigration fundamentally shapes social needs, social work practice, and the need to form culturally competent social workers in higher education in Georgia, Golay explained that,

Well, the way that migration has occurred created some issues. When you had in the beginning, the early waves, large numbers of single young men.... So that was an early area where there was a need for professionals.... (Social) services were then begging for trained social workers who could do the cross-cultural work.

The next thing that started...was when the families came with large numbers of

young children. Then you had the schools begging for, not only teachers but the counselors and social workers who could relate to the families.... It's much more family centered now.... (But) the need is across the services. Medical, emergency, hospital, mental health, and DFCS.... So all these basic social services are begging for social workers.

Like the other UGA faculty and student stakeholders, Dan Brown negotiated the features of exchange educational needs by linking the shortage of bilingual, culturally competent social workers in Georgia to the need for academic training in the UGA - UV academic exchange. Brown emphasized the need to adequately prepare bilingual, culturally competent social workers in Georgia. He said ,

Relating to a (Latino) child, or to a family, or to a client, means...understanding family patterns, understanding the different definition of family, understanding the basic concept of respect, and machismo, and basic themes of...culture. One to establish rapport. And two, in being able to work with the family by understanding their value system. That doesn't come through language studies. And it really doesn't come without being in the home culture for a while. Seeing where these folks come from. How their culture operates and where the tensions that conflict with dominant Anglo culture are. Adding the piece of putting the social worker in the experience of being the outsider. So they have a little sense of the process of psychological stress that immigration involves. So the exchange addresses all those issues. It stresses language, cultural knowledge and the

experience piece of having some sense of how an immigrant might feel. And you can't do that sitting in a classroom in Georgia.

In contrast to the UGA stakeholders, the UV stakeholders shaped exchange educational needs in Veracruz as longer-term phenomena intertwined with Mexican historical, economic and political forces, exacerbated by the exploding emigration to the United States. When Maria Davila went to the planning table to negotiate exchange educational needs, she emphasized the lack of effective academic formation for social workers at the Licenciatura level as contributing to the educational problem in Veracruz. She explained that,

The Licenciatura, which is the first academic degree granted by any university in Mexico, and the Licenciatura in social work, such as here in Minatitlán, does not form nor train.... We need to change and improve this degree to make it more like your master's degree... But as a faculty person in social work, that isn't enough, especially in the future.... Right now we need masters degrees, better yet, doctorates, from schools like yours, to be prepared in these times.

With regard to educational needs and the exchange, the UGA stakeholders expressed these to include (1) bilingual, culturally competent social work faculty and practitioners in USA; (2) Spanish language skills for faculty and students; (3) community practice theory and methods; and (4) international research and grants for faculty and students.

On the other hand, Mexican stakeholders expressed educational needs relative to the exchange to include (1) curriculum reform adopting flexible curriculum (European

and U.S.A. models); (2) clinical methods for SW practitioners; (3) faculty research and publication knowledge and skills; (4) English language skills for faculty and students; and (5) internationalization in context of globalization.

Moreover, a general distinction could be drawn in that Georgia stakeholders seemed to express educational needs in the exchange as short-term phenomena resulting significantly from Mexican immigration to the United States. Mexican stakeholders, on the other hand, view educational needs in their country as long-term phenomena intertwined with global economic and Mexican political realities, and exacerbated by Mexican emigration to the United States.

Exchange Feature Three: Purpose of the UGA - UV Academic Exchange

Six stakeholder groups negotiated and represented substantive interests at the planning table to determine the purposes of UGA-UV academic exchange program. As a result of stakeholder negotiations at this planning table, power asymmetries were reproduced among and between the six stakeholder groups, privileging UGA stakeholders over UV stakeholders, and UV faculty over UV students.

UV student and faculty stakeholders generally engaged in consultations, bargaining, and disputes in negotiations with each other, and consultations, bargaining, and disputes with the UGA stakeholders. The UGA student and faculty stakeholders engaged in consultations, bargaining, and disputes in negotiations with each other, and consultations, bargaining, and disputes with the UV stakeholders in representing substantive interests to determine purposes for exchange planning. The educational outcome of these negotiations was the identification of purposes for the UGA-UV

exchange program, while the political outcome was the reproduction of asymmetrical power relations among and between the six stakeholder groups, privileging UGA stakeholders over UV stakeholders, UGA administration over UGA faculty and students, UV administration over UV faculty, and UV faculty over UV students.

In Table 5, the six stakeholder groups that negotiated purposes of the exchange are numbered as: 1) UV students; 2) UGA students; 3) UV faculty; 4) UGA faculty; 5) UV administration; and, 6) UGA administration. These stakeholders negotiated and represented 10 primary interests to form an understanding of purposes for Georgia and Veracruz and their relationships to the UGA - UV social work academic exchange. In Table 5, these interests are numbered as: 1) Acquire clinical case methods, models and theories for social work education; 3) Develop faculty through cooperative research, joint publications, and technical cooperation programs; 4) Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners in foreign language knowledge, skills, and ability; 5) Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners to be culturally competent; 6) Establish an international social work research agenda; 8) Increase the level of academic preparation for social work faculty; 10) Extend university services and outreach internationally; 12) Increase the contributions of the university to neoliberal globalization; 14) Move the university to the next stage of internationalization; and, 19) Raise levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach.

Understanding of the purposes of the UGA - UV exchange varied among and between stakeholders and stakeholder groups. The UGA stakeholders expressed the exchange to include the following purposes: (1) to educate students about Mexican

culture, economy, and social work practice; (2) to educate faculty about Mexican culture, economy, and social work community practice; (3) to develop an international social work research agenda; and (4) to internationalize the UGA School of Social Work through collaborative international partnerships.

On the other hand, Mexican stakeholders had significantly different understandings of the purposes of the exchange. These purposes included: (1) to develop faculty intellectual resources through graduate study at UGA; (2) to learn and adopt a clinical practice model; (3) to develop research and publication skills; (4) to educate students about U.S.A. culture, economy, and social work practice; and, (5) to internationalize the University of Veracruz.

One UV stakeholder, Matilde Cabrera, Director of the UV School for Foreign Students language school in Xalapa, contributed to the shaping of exchange purpose features in UV with her characterization of them as being tied to institutional goals of internationalization and collaborative partnerships at UV. She viewed her role as keeping eyes trained on developing special projects and research with international partners, while never losing sight of satisfying institutional interests on all sides. She said,

The School for Foreign Students...specifically has the objective to organize programs for foreign institutions.... (I)ts objective (is)...to push the process of internationalization at the university....to see what are the interests of the foreign institution, whether it's only to have a course in Spanish for its students...or perhaps another interest much broader. In the case of UGA, the interests are many.... (T)he social work program...I believe...is one of the best examples of a

program that began only with Spanish courses but also began with the principle that they weren't going to stop there. They made use of the School for Foreign Students initially, but as the activities broadened, they diversified.

Francisco Fernandez was much more educationally focused regarding the purposes of the exchange, especially on the need to develop and train faculty resources, and the need to adopt a clinical practice model to address the challenging social and educational needs in Veracruz. Francisco claimed that,

The social work faculty here in Minatitlán should have academic visits...to see how social work is done in their agencies, how they supervise their classrooms, how they train faculty in the face of real problems in their communities and contexts.... These visits would permit learning about how they do their work; how they do interventions; how a social worker links to their problematic; how they carry it to the classroom, discuss it; how they propose new alternatives; how they utilize theoretical frames, like systems, ecological (theory); and how they use models to help direct work more specifically.

Monica Zamora negotiated the purpose of the exchange as an opportunity to go beyond just training and capacity building, allowing for a move in the direction of an ideological shift, with the exploration and adoption of theories and methods from the United States -- long viewed with suspicion by many in Mexican social work. Monica said,

We Mexicans have to make a big effort in this.... I have had opportunities to observe Canadian social work, and social work in the United States, which has

permitted me to see that there are other ways very different to do social work, and they are able to be very effective, and they don't stop contemplating reality, and they show that we have to intervene directly. So I believe that is what we are lacking just a little.... Our plans of study are more contemplative, theoretical; we are trained to give a lecture about a phenomenon, but not to say how we can intervene in it. So this is the part that we are lacking in our plan of studies, and where this linkage and exchange would be able to help us resolve these gaps, which exist between theory and reality, the real practice of direct intervention, with real individuals, real persons.

As mentioned previously, significant differences existed among and between stakeholders, and stakeholder groups, in the way the purpose for the exchange was negotiated and ultimately shaped. Highlighting this fact, Dan Brown commented,

In the formal sense, at the top level, the purposes were, sounded similar. But when it gets down to the faculty-to-faculty, student-to-student, and program-to-program, the motives (of different stakeholders for the exchange) were quite different. The Veracruz faculty, from the beginning, wanted opportunities for graduate studies at Georgia. And actually the exchange program did a good deal, even though we didn't have anybody that got up to the (required) English level (for graduate study at UGA).

For Berta Nieto, the broader purposes of the exchange were always murky, but she negotiated personal opportunities, particularly the opportunity to learn English and more technical-rational theories and practice models. Berta said,

In a personal sense, I wanted to go to broaden (myself) and to search (for personal development). I didn't know exactly what I was going to do, but I knew that I must learn English.... From the perspective of the objectives of the exchange program, I didn't know about them much and I didn't care.

In an omen of the eventual demise of the social work education component of the UGA – UV exchange, for some of the stakeholders in Veracruz, not only the purposes, but the actual existence of the social work academic exchange seemed uncertain.

Clearly, for some UV stakeholders in Poza Rica and Minatitlán, there was little capacity to act at the exchange planning tables. For example, Ruth Palmero said,

Well, from my point of view, we've had almost two years with no contact with Georgia. Two years ago (UGA faculty) came, and until now, with your arrival, we haven't know anything (about the exchange). I feel like the exchange with Georgia here in Poza Rica...has disappeared. We don't know if they needed more money, or if our side didn't put in what was needed to continue to exchange. We don't know, and personally I don't know. For me, I feel the truth is that with Georgia we won't ever again have the exchange.

To summarize, stakeholder expressions of the purpose of the UGA - UV exchange varied significantly depending upon whom was being interviewed. Generally, the UGA stakeholders understood the exchange to include the following purposes: (1) to educate students about Mexican culture, economy, and social work practice; (2) to educate faculty about Mexican culture, economy, and social work community practice; (3) to develop an

international social work research agenda; and (4) to internationalize the UGA School of Social Work through collaborative international partnerships.

On the other hand, UV stakeholders had significantly different understandings of the purposes of the exchange. These purposes included: (1) to develop faculty intellectual resources through graduate study at UGA; (2) to learn and adopt a clinical practice model; (3) to develop research and publication skills; (4) to educate students about U.S.A. culture, economy, and social work practice; and, (5) to internationalize the University of Veracruz.

Exchange Feature Four: Audience and the UGA - UV Academic Exchange

Six stakeholder groups negotiated and represented substantive interests at the planning table to determine the audience for the UGA-UV academic exchange program. As a result of stakeholder negotiations at this planning table, power asymmetries were reproduced among and between the six stakeholder groups, privileging UGA stakeholders over UV stakeholders, UV administration over faculty, and UV faculty over UV students.

UV student and faculty stakeholders generally engaged in bargaining and disputes in negotiations with each other, and consultations and bargaining with the UGA stakeholders. The UGA student and faculty stakeholders engaged in consultations with each other, and consultations and bargaining with UV stakeholders in representing substantive interests to determine audience issues for exchange planning. The educational outcome of these negotiations was the identification of audience features the UGA-UV exchange program, while the political outcome was the reproduction of

asymmetrical power relations among and between the six stakeholder groups, privileging UGA stakeholders over UV stakeholders, UV administration over UV faculty, and UV faculty over UV students.

In Table 5, the six stakeholder groups that negotiated audience issues are numbered as: 1) UV students; 2) UGA students; 3) UV faculty; 4) UGA faculty; 5) UV administration; and, 6) UGA administration. These stakeholders negotiated and represented nine primary interests to form an understanding of audience features in Georgia and Veracruz and their relationships to the UGA - UV social work academic exchange. In Table 5, these interests are numbered as: 3) Develop faculty through cooperative research, joint publications, and technical cooperation programs; 4) Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners in foreign language knowledge, skills, and ability; 5) Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners to be culturally competent; 6) Establish an international social work research agenda; 8) Increase the level of academic preparation for social work faculty; 16) Expand exchange programs to other academic departments and educational institutions; 17) Increase administration, faculty and student participation in study abroad programs; and, 18) Provide equal opportunities for participation by students and faculty in the exchange program; 19) Raise levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach.

The UGA stakeholders understood the audience features for the UGA - UV exchange to include: 1) faculty; 2) BSW/MSW/PhD students; (3) continuing education practitioners; (4) administrators; (5) international social work/academic stakeholders; (6)

political/business leaders with Latino interests; and, (7) privileged, open participation. On the other hand, Mexican stakeholders understood audience issues relative to the exchange to include (1) administrators; (2) faculty; (3) students; (4) local and regional constituencies; and, (5) lack of privilege, closed participation.

Differences existed between stakeholders in the way they negotiated their understanding of audience issues -- including difference in recognition of the varying ranges of privilege among participants. There were also differences in how stakeholders understood the importance of using exchange activities as a political tool (public relations) in their respective institutions and communities. Robert Hendricks explained,

At UV the faculty made a big effort to get Georgia faculty and students into their classrooms and to present to large groups of students. That was one of their audiences. Their enrolled students were a major target audience. Whereas at UGA, we would take (UV faculty visitors) through a few classes, but there wasn't the same commitment of the (UGA) School of Social Work to receive these visitors and their expertise as there was on the other end.

Dan Brown claimed that important target audiences resulting from the Veracruz stakeholder negotiations of this feature were their own academic communities, and that they negotiated through the exchange for political outcomes that reshaped power relations in the exchange to their advantage. He explained that,

[An important] audience (in Veracruz) was their general community. Both the schools of social work in Veracruz, but particularly in Minatitlán, which is located on a health campus, used the American visitors to raise the profile of the social

work program and the profession. They saw that the newspapers, the television and the radio covered these visits. That lifted the community's estimation of the social work program because they were worthy of these important international visitors.... The Veracruz faculty were skillfully using it to advance their students' knowledge, to raise their profile in the community, and to raise their profile in the university system. It was a political tool for them.

Moreover, Brown described how public relations about exchange activities also shaped target audiences for UGA stakeholders. Their negotiation of interests at the planning tables led to formation of exchange activities that appealed to top institutional administrators, and drew the attention of the international social work academic community. He claimed that,

One UGA audience was the international academic community to create the impression that UGA was an international school with international sister schools, creating publications and research at the international level. It was a very strong thing at UGA. So it was a (public relations) thing, but more to the international academic community. Also, to the administrative academic community, both the Dean and the Vice-President interpreted this UGA/UV exchange as an example of how committed the University of Georgia was to internationalization. So those were two big audiences. To a lesser degree, the political structure of Georgia (was an audience) in that the university wanted to use this exchange as a way to leverage grants and programs in Georgia directed towards the Georgia resident Latino population.... When the education college got the Goizueta money, it

probably would not have occurred without all these years of groundwork (in the exchange), putting out the word. (Public relations activities targeting) the State of Georgia paid off in enhanced resources.

In sharp contrast to the privileges enjoyed by most UGA participants in the exchange, on the UV side the overarching issue for most was the limited opportunity for participation by UV students and faculty. Because many forms of participation in the exchange were an unrealistic expectations. For them, lack of privilege and closed participation were the primary features of audience outcomes. As Maria Davila explained,

Well, one of the biggest problems is economic. In our university there is no money, at least not for academic exchanges...there are few economic resources to be had. After that, we must recognize the economic question of social work, and that our students come from low levels economically, they are from the lower classes, and it's difficult for them to attend conferences and training courses, let alone foreign travel. Therefore, this is also an important influence. There is no ability among our students to travel or pay for outside development.

In contrast to Maria's views about asymmetrical participation and limited opportunities for UV stakeholders to participate and benefit from the exchange, Francisco Fernandez viewed the value of his privileged experience as a significant expectation. Like other UV stakeholders privileged to travel to Georgia, he viewed his participation as being based on a purely personal stake, one in which he saw very little outside benefit to be gained by the broader UV academic community. Francisco said that,

Within the process of (planning) this exchange program is where I believe that some expectation arises, in my case personal. I had the good fortune of knowing Dan Brown... (We co-authored) an article that was published in a social work journal from Universidad Autonoma de Nuevo Leon and the University of Texas, Austin. This was a very beneficial personal situation, a personal expectation. If I wouldn't have gotten to know him, I wouldn't have had the opportunity to publish an article....Moreover, I didn't know how to do it, but now I know a little bit about the path (to publication). And even better, well, very soon after that I sent out another article that I was able to publish. This expectation is personal, no?

On the UGA side, Gilroy Nance described direct challenges from his own faculty and administration questioning the value of sustaining the exchange, and described how he and others negotiated using internal marketing (public relations) tactics to appeal to the very important audience of UGA faculty colleagues. Nance noted that,

Well there was always an audience of the (UGA) social work faculty to demonstrate (to them) the value of the exchange program, to (show how it could) bolster education and research. Because there was a local minority that never wanted it to happen...there had to be constant marketing. I did reports after every visit. I reported at every faculty meeting. I got things put in the minutes. I sent out general faculty mailings just so that there was increased awareness and a sense of investment, and I took different people all the time to try to create a larger pool of people that had some commitment.

To summarize, stakeholder expressions of the audience for the UGA - UV exchange varied among and between stakeholders in UGA and UV. With regard to understanding audience issues and the exchange, the UGA stakeholders expressed these to include (1) faculty; (2) BSW/MSW/PhD students; (3) continuing education practitioners; (4) administrators; (5) international social work/academic stakeholders; (6) political/business leaders with Latino interests; and, (7) open participation. On the other hand, UV stakeholders expressed audience issues relative to include (1) administrators; (2) faculty; (3) students; (4) local and regional constituencies; and, (5) closed participation.

Exchange Feature Five: Content of the UGA - UV Academic Exchange

Six stakeholder groups negotiated and represented substantive interests at the planning table to determine the content features for the UGA-UV academic exchange program. As a result of stakeholder negotiations at this planning table, power asymmetries were reproduced among and between the six stakeholder groups, privileging UGA stakeholders over UV stakeholders, UV administration over UV faculty, and UV faculty over UV students.

UV student and faculty stakeholders generally engaged in bargaining and disputes in negotiations with each other, and consultations and bargaining with the UGA stakeholders. The UGA student and faculty stakeholders engaged in consultations with each other, and consultations and bargaining with UV stakeholders in representing substantive interests to determine content issues for exchange planning. The educational outcome of these negotiations was the identification of content features the UGA-UV

exchange program, while the political outcome was the reproduction of asymmetrical power relations among and between the six stakeholder groups, privileging UGA stakeholders over UV stakeholders, and UV faculty over UV students.

In Table 5, the six stakeholder groups that negotiated content for the exchange are numbered as: 1) UV students; 2) UGA students; 3) UV faculty; 4) UGA faculty; 5) UV administration; and, 6) UGA administration. These stakeholders negotiated and represented seven primary interests to form an understanding of the content features in Georgia and Veracruz and their relationships to the UGA - UV social work academic exchange. In Table 5, these interests are numbered as: 1) Acquire clinical case methods, models and theories for social work education; 2) Acquire community practice theories, models, and methods for social work education; 3) Develop faculty through cooperative research, joint publications, and technical cooperation programs; 4) Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners in foreign language knowledge, skills, and ability; 5) Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners to be culturally competent; 8) Increase the level of academic preparation for social work faculty; and 15) Enhance communication, cultural understanding, and cultural exchange.

Stakeholder expressions of the content of the UGA - UV exchange activities varied among and between stakeholders in Mexico and the USA. With regard to content issues and the exchange, generally the UGA stakeholders expressed these to include (1) summer exchanges for BSW/MSW students; (2) research opportunities for MSW/PhDs/faculty; (3) Spanish language study by students and faculty at EEE in UV; (4) academic visits by administrators and faculty; and (5) academic entrepreneurial

activities. On the other hand, UV stakeholders expressed exchange content to include (1) English language study by faculty and administration at American Language Program in UGA; (2) cultural, educational and practice experiences for faculty and administrators; (3) cultural and educational experience for students; and (4) academic visits by administrators and faculty.

Explaining some of the differences in understanding of exchange content issues that resulted from negotiating interests related to the feature, Dan Brown believed that few stakeholders ever understood the extent of content sharing that occurred in the exchange program, which unbeknown to most, impacted the respective curricula in all three schools of social work. While the UV stakeholders were keen on learning about direct practice and clinical models, those from the UGA School of Social Work were interested in the community work done in Mexico. For the UV students, their view of content especially focused on how to become effective bilingual, culturally competent social workers. Brown explained that,

On the two sides it was very different. The Veracruz social work side, actually the students there were very interested in curriculum content. What do you teach at the University of Georgia? What is the theory of social work? Give us a workshop and direct practice in case management. The UGA side learned rather slowly that the Veracruz programs had a lot to offer.... Georgia, content-wise, was mostly coming from...a typical North American point of “what can we get out of this experience for us.”

Although there was resistance at first, Brown claimed that over time, UGA faculty gradually began to recognize value in the Mexican curriculum and methods, particularly around community practice. Brown described a transparent reciprocal sharing process, which that he facilitated through negotiations the planning tables in all three Schools of Social Work that shaped content features. He said,

UV social work curriculum was going through their seven year revision, and the University of Georgia School of Social Work was going through its strategic planning and its curriculum redevelopment within two years of each other.... So I actually transported a number of concepts back and forth. People may never realize where some of it came from. And after I worked with UV social work for a while I took back some of their concepts into our evolving new curriculum.

And we developed what's called a community empowerment track. It's still in the curriculum. Well a lot of those concepts were really very consistent with what Veracruz had been doing for thirty years. So there was a cross fertilization.

For Ruth Palmero, exchange content was understood to extend far beyond social work theory and practice models in Veracruz. Because travel to Georgia as an academic visitor was part of Ruth's experience as a participant in the exchange, the content features that she helped to shape ultimately impacted her world view, giving her a better understanding of Mexican realities in the U.S.A.. Moreover, with this new knowledge, she believed that she could reproduce a little of this understanding in her students, too. She explained that,

There has been an enormous enrichment, first to learn a little English, and later to know other experiences such as being close to my compatriots who have gone to the U.S.A., to see how they live there.... I went there and got to know Mexicans who are in the U.S.A., and I can be clear about when some say this is the “truth”, and others say that’s a “lie”, or others claim what is “real” (about Mexican experiences there).... With my students I can try to reproduce a little of the lived experience.

For Monica Zamora, as she negotiated at the planning tables, the most important content features were those still absent from the exchange: specifically, how could she and other UV stakeholders participate in an academic exchange that was effectively closed to their participation, and that lacked value for their contributions. She explained that,

I believe that at the local level...we don’t know how to engage in an exchange, how to make it happen. We want to link ourselves with this (university) or that (one), in a very strong way, and with much effort, but in the end we lose... We have a lot (to offer) in terms of our community work... But we lack in another way, we don’t know as social workers how to write up our experiences. We are rich in rural social work knowledge, incredibly rich, but we don’t know how to present it, how to give form to it, systematize it and write a book or an article about it.... We don’t have it written because we don’t know how to do it. And this is because of three concrete points: the economic reality here, the lack of training, and if we were able to do it, the lack of value for our methods from your side.

To summarize, stakeholder expressions of the content of the UGA - UV exchange varied among and between stakeholders in UGA and UV. With regard to content issues and the exchange, generally the UGA stakeholders expressed these to include (1) summer exchanges for BSW/MSW students; (2) research opportunities for MSW/PhDs/faculty; (3) Spanish language study by students and faculty at EEE in UV; (4) academic visits by administrators and faculty; and (5) academic entrepreneurial activities. On the other hand, UV stakeholders understood content issues relative to the exchange to include (1) English language study by faculty and administration at ALP in UGA; (2) cultural, educational and practice experiences for faculty and administrators; (3) cultural and educational experiences for students; and (4) academic visits by administrators and faculty.

Exchange Feature Six: Funding of the UGA - UV Academic Exchange

Four stakeholder groups negotiated and represented substantive interests at the planning table to determine the funding issues for the UGA-UV academic exchange program. As a result of stakeholder negotiations at this planning table, power asymmetries were reproduced among and between the six stakeholder groups, privileging UGA stakeholders over UV stakeholders, UGA administration over faculty and students, UV administration over faculty, and UV faculty over UV students.

UV student and faculty stakeholders generally engaged in consultations and bargaining in negotiations with each other, and consultations, bargaining, and disputes with the UGA stakeholders. The UGA student and faculty stakeholders engaged in consultations and bargaining with each other, and consultations, bargaining, and disputes

with UV stakeholders in representing substantive interests to determine funding issues for exchange planning. The outcome of these negotiations was the identification of funding features the UGA-UV exchange program, while the political outcome was the reproduction of asymmetrical power relations among and between the four stakeholder groups, privileging UGA stakeholders over UV stakeholders, and UV faculty over UV students.

In Table 5, the four stakeholder groups that negotiated funding issues are numbered as: 3) UV faculty; 4) UGA faculty; 5) UV administration; and, 6) UGA administration. These stakeholders negotiated and represented eight primary interests to form an understanding of audience features in Georgia and Veracruz and their relationships to the UGA - UV social work academic exchange. In Table 5, these interests are numbered as: 6) Establish an international social work research agenda; 9) Diversify funding sources for international academic exchange; 10) Extend university services and outreach internationally; 12) Increase the contributions of the university to neoliberal globalization; 14) Move the university to the next stage of internationalization; 16) Expand exchange programs to other academic departments and educational institutions; 17) Increase administration, faculty and student participation in study abroad programs; and, 19) Raise levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach.

Stakeholder understanding of the asymmetrical nature of funding in the UGA - UV exchange was very consistent among and between stakeholders in UGA and UV. With regard to funding issues and the exchange, most stakeholders understood these to

include (1) large exchange expenditures (travel and language school at UGA) funded by grants obtained by UGA; (2) hospitality expenses paid by UV for UGA visitors to Veracruz; and, (3) generally the exchange was very under funded. In addition, UV stakeholders view the development of knowledge and skills in obtaining funding as an important goal in the internationalization process, ranging from attracting grants and funding for faculty research to student entrepreneurial activities for the creation of employment.

Dan Brown described the outcomes of early negotiations by UGA stakeholders that began to shape the pattern of exchange funding. He explained,

(I)t was the summer of '95, I believe, when Dr. Alice Thomas, Dr. Gilroy Nance, and I applied to the Dr. Zunk, then the Vice-President of Academic Affairs, for a small grant, which we got, about \$4,500. And it funded our trip (to Veracruz) for over three weeks...with three (UGA) students. And we started in Xalapa, got the orientation at the language school...then we split into two groups, and one went to Poza Rica, and one went to Minatitlán....We used that money up, and the next summer wrote a new grant, which was funded for \$15,000. So it gave us funds for another four years...from Dr. Zunk, the Vice-President of Academic Affairs, which was to initiate new international programs.

Continuing his explanation of early funding for the exchange, Brown described a milestone in the history of the broader UGA – UV exchange, one that would assure its long-term survival, laying the groundwork for future USAID funding. At the same time, he was also describing the start of a funding stream that would begin to shift focus away

from social work exchange activities, towards other departments and programs, many of which were more commercially oriented. Brown said,

Later, in '96 I believe, I began working with the Office of International Development, which was in ... Public Service and Outreach.... That's when we got the \$97,000.00 three-year grant from USAID through the ALO. And that funded another three years of activity. So that's where we could bring additional faculty to UGA for visits for a semester...to fund the Mexico people to come here.... And we used that to bring (one UV faculty) for two semesters, and (another UV faculty) for a month. And pure rationale, that Vice-President of Academic Affairs' money was to establish a link and facilitate some of them into graduate studies (which never happened).

Harold Drucker explained his recollection of early funding efforts for the exchange. He described often frustrating and almost always futile efforts to solicit funding for the exchange from Mexican stakeholders. He also detailed what he called “a piecemeal approach” to overall funding for the program, which slowly began to develop linkages to new stakeholders in other parts of Georgia, and fertilized efforts to internationalize the university, both at home and abroad. He stated that,

[W]e put together a number of small grants and project proposals, and were able to piece together funds from several sources.... And then I was able to get funding from the State System, the Board of Regents.... Their goal was to get more colleges and universities in the state system involved in international programs.... We had several delegations to go down there from various and sundry schools

across the state. And all of that activity led to form a Latin-American Studies Counsel for the whole state system, which is operating today.

Gilroy Nance described early negotiations to shape funding situated in context of the organizational complexity of UGA, within which early stakeholders at many levels of authority had sufficient capacities to act in making planning judgments compared with the top heavy centralized structure at UV. Nance recollected that,

There was a guy who was working in the Office of the Academic Vice-President. So it wasn't in (UGA VP's) office, and it wasn't in (another UGA VP's) office either. And I will say it was impossible as a new faculty member to understand all the complexities of the University of Georgia, between all these different offices. I just, I was kind of following (UGA Social Work Department Chair's) direction.... But anyway, we submitted our proposal there. We were awarded \$14,000.00. And that's, in my mind, how it got started for me... So we just sat around and kind of thought it up.

Given the asymmetrical nature of resource capacities between UGA and UV, Dan Brown claimed that sensitivities always were aroused when the topic of funding came up. Negotiating around the issue required the need for cultural sensitivity, and a keen awareness of hospitality and reciprocity etiquette on both sides. He stated that,

Well there was always a sensitive area having to do with difference in resources. UGA had greater financial resources, and designated them or found them through grants. So for a while the agreement was that if UGA people paid their way to Veracruz, then the University of Veracruz would take care of the in-state

expenses. And I knew that it was a stretch for them to do it, but we could never say that because it had to do with hospitality. They were going to show that they could do it.... Whenever there was a banquet or a farewell party or anything...they would do that with great flare. And so their entertainment was equal to ours. And we tried to reciprocate, but see on the Georgia side there was not that expectation. It was sort of, I sometimes had to do education of the administrators to help them understand that these people wouldn't have a faculty travel allowance to pay things when they were in Georgia. So I had to work to be sure that that was reciprocal.... Those little issues kept coming up.

Responding to processes of globalization, a primary focus of internationalization efforts at UV was to target research funding, and opportunities to extend their higher education activities into the global marketplace. Ruth Palmero explained how meta-negotiations about funding issues with UV had empowered her and other UV faculty to have newly acquired access to the planning for exchange funding. She explained that,

The school of social work in Poza Rica has been in existence for 30 years, and in that time the opportunity to negotiate space in institutions here, where they give us voice and a chance to make proposals has been only since 1998, the date when the present Rector (Marco Pardo) opened up the opportunity for us to create projects that the university sells to the major enterprises here.

Explaining this reshaping of power relations a bit further, Ruth explained that,

As a result...(social work) education now has a new redefinition. We have meetings, we are carrying forth projects, and we are generating lines of energy

and the application of knowledge.... We enter into...projects, and we want to sell them to associations and foundations, where they provide us with funding, resources such as we've received from Kellogg Foundation to carry out projects.... So we've already begun to develop themes and projects, and we are waiting for CONACYT to register them and accept us.

Ruth described how the new curriculum adopted from exchange partners has been used to teach students to identify and develop new spaces for entrepreneurial opportunities. Given this fundamental shift, negotiations by UV stakeholders shaped exchange funding with features of the free market, self-sufficiency, and piecemeal privatization of social work education and practice. She explained,

We have now a holistic vision of formation for our students.... This is an entrepreneurial vision. This is to say that rather than facing unemployment or underemployment as so many do today, (that not the government, but rather) the student, will be their own employers.

To summarize, stakeholder expressions of the asymmetrical nature of funding in the UGA - UV exchange was very consistent among and between stakeholders in UGA and UV. With regard to funding issues and the exchange, most stakeholders understood these to include (1) large exchange expenditures (travel and language school at UGA) funded by grants obtained by UGA; (2) hospitality expenses paid by UV for UGA visitors to Veracruz; and, (3) generally the exchange was very under funded. In addition, UV stakeholders viewed the development of knowledge and skills in obtaining funding as an important goal in the curriculum reform process, ranging from attracting grants and

funding for faculty research to student entrepreneurial activities for the creation of employment.

Exchange Feature Seven: Evaluation and the UGA - UV Academic Exchange

Five stakeholder groups negotiated and represented three primary interests at the planning table to determine the evaluation issues for the UGA-UV academic exchange program. As a result of stakeholder negotiations at the evaluation planning table, power asymmetries were reproduced among and between the five stakeholder groups, privileging UGA stakeholders over UV stakeholders, and UV administration over, faculty and students.

UV student and faculty stakeholders generally engaged in bargaining and disputes in negotiations with each other, and consultations with the UGA stakeholders. The UGA student and faculty stakeholders engaged in consultations and bargaining with each other, and consultations with UV stakeholders in representing substantive interests to determine evaluation issues for exchange planning. The outcome of these negotiations was the identification of evaluation features the UGA-UV exchange program, while the political outcome was the reproduction of asymmetrical power relations among and between the four stakeholder groups, privileging UGA stakeholders over UV stakeholders, and UV administration over UV faculty over UV students.

In Table 5, the five stakeholder groups that negotiated evaluation features are numbered as: 2) UGA students; 3) UV faculty; 4) UGA faculty; 5) UV administration; and, 6) UGA administration. These stakeholders negotiated and represented three primary interests to form an understanding of evaluation features in Georgia and

Veracruz and their relationships to the UGA - UV social work academic exchange. In Table 5, these interests are numbered as: 5) Educate social work students, faculty, and practitioners to be culturally competent; 13) Manage tasks, functions, processes, and operations of academic exchange; and, 19) Raise levels of recognition for university stakeholders in international service, teaching, research and outreach.

Stakeholder understanding of the evaluation of the UGA - UV exchange varied among and between stakeholders in UGA and UV. With regard to evaluation issues and the exchange, the UGA stakeholders expressed these to include (1) theory-driven (Brown Model) measurements of cultural competence; (2) research oriented; and, (3) decentralized with many different people and organizational units collecting data, but not necessarily sharing it with others. On the other hand, UV stakeholders understood evaluation issues relative to the exchange to include (1) Rector centered process reflecting the hierarchical and centralized organizational structure at UV.

Integrated into the UGA social work approach to the exchange planning from the beginning, UGA faculty stakeholders embraced an evaluative perspective into planning that informed by research of cross-cultural competency acquisition (the Brown Model). Moreover, to supplement this evaluation framework, UGA School of Social Work faculty negotiated the construction of a formative evaluation tool, which was used to further inform the whole exchange planning process. As Dan Brown explained,

We conceptualized the exchange process as though we were doing social work. So the first part would be relationship building, exploring mutual needs, sort of assessing just like you would be working with a family or a community or a

client, assessing what the needs on both sides are. Then (we would) crystallize some approaches as to how to meet those needs. That meant negotiating across language barriers. And there were only a couple of us on either side who could do that. So it became pretty much a personal relationship thing between me and...the other side. And then I would go to the UGA people and say, this is the communication, here are some options, what do you wish to do? And I would always offer a clear plan. Because if you just gave information it didn't go anywhere. So it's sort of like offering a tentative treatment plan. It was a tentative exchange.

Reinforcing Brown's account describing the negotiated construction of intentional theory-driven evaluative features both guiding and assessing the outcomes of academic exchange, Craig Sampson, a former UGA Dean of Social Work said,

The (Brown) model was home stay, intensive Spanish instruction, and visiting social service agencies.... I would say, you know Brown, again he drove it, this idea that you could measure the gain in cultural competence of the students (was) used.

Although the theory-driven method was well recognized by stakeholders within the School of Social Work, outside the school other UGA stakeholders seemed unaware that any evaluation activities had taken place in the exchange. When asked if there were evaluation mechanisms built into the exchange, Harold Drucker replied,

No, not really. The exchange might have been evaluated at some point in time.

Informal evaluations were of course basically from the management of the

exchange. I was the contact person from the university campus, probably for the state, and when something wouldn't work...I would have to take action.... But that was very minor.... And that was the evaluation, if there were any.

On the Veracruz side, a different model of evaluation was constructed. Rather than multiple, decentralized and disparate data collection processes, like those occurring at UGA, in Veracruz, the main feature of evaluation was its centralization in the Office of the Rector in Xalapa. This Rector-centered approach reflected the general organizational shape of UV. Ruth Palmero characterized the final product of the annual exchange evaluation in Poza Rica as a “registered document” falling under the umbrella of the “Rector’s Report of University Labor Activities”. She described something akin to an elaborate, centralized, exclusive approach to planning and evaluation, that was implemented through a relatively inclusive process allowing for local influences. In a very long quotation that matched her perception of the process, She stated that,

The Rector (Marco Pardo) is...the only one who has the authority to sign agreements for academic exchanges.... After that, it trickles down to the Area...empowered after the Rector signs off.... This person is (Miguel Alba), the Director of the Academic Area of Humanities, under which social work falls. The Director is the person who makes the linkages (within UV), sometimes by Internet (email), or by telephone, with personal contacts, to discuss the programs in demand and the needs (of the exchange). After the Director makes the call to the two faculties of social work (in Minatitlán and Poza Rica) for a meeting in the city of Xalapa, where we discuss... exchange visits relative to our programs. The

Director presents to us his plan, and asks us what line of exchange we would like to pursue, and how each faculty could be helped by the University of Georgia, and how we could help benefit Georgia. Then the (two) faculties make a plan, and although we live in the same state (Veracruz), and although the needs are the same, the approach is different.... The Director then analyzes our work, revises it, and then gives a presentation to the Rector about the possible advances from the exchange between Georgia, Poza Rica and Minatitlán. After the exchanges occur, the Rector presents in his annual report the beneficial outcomes from the academic exchange and the concrete programs between Georgia and the faculties of social work – the advances, percentages, activities within the university as a whole. His presentation and what it contains is a registered document, and is called the Rector's Report of University Labor Activities.

Given Ruth's testimony of the exchange planning and evaluation process, it seemed clear that the School of Social Work in Poza Rica had negotiated space to be empowered to participate in exchange planning and evaluation activities. However, not all stakeholders in Veracruz shared her understanding and interpretation of an inclusive process. For example, Maria Davila, Dean of the School of Social Work in Minatitlán strongly contested Ruth's testimony about the nature of affairs involving planning and evaluation in UV. Maria claimed that,

The truth? The truth is we play no role at all. Our role has been totally receptive. We react to the things that the University...wants us to.... There is no program development, in which we have voice in a reciprocal manner.... I'm telling you

that we have no role in the planning!... The Georgia contacts are made at the central level in Xalapa, and through the Direction of Academic Development, which is in charge of these types of situations. Questions about foreign students, or academic exchanges do not exist (at our level in the UV hierarchy). As I told you, this type of receptivity, this type of negotiation in exchange situations, does not exist for us. Nothing more than they call us and we have to receive (you) people.

To summarize, stakeholder expressions of the evaluation of the UGA - UV exchange varied among and between stakeholders in UGA and UV. With regard to evaluation issues and the exchange, generally the UGA stakeholders understood these to include (1) theory-driven (Brown Model) measurements of cultural competence; (2) research oriented; and, (3) decentralized with many organizational units collecting data, but not necessarily sharing it with others. On the other hand, UV stakeholders understood evaluation issues relative to the exchange to include (1) Rector centered process reflecting the hierarchical and centralized organizational structure at UV.

SUMMARY

This chapter described the main features of the UGA - UV social work academic exchange. The features were: (1) social needs and the exchange; (2) educational needs and the exchange; (3) purpose of the exchange; (4) the audience for the exchange; (5) content of the exchange activities; (6) funding for the exchange; and (7) evaluation of the exchange.

As evidenced by the statements of stakeholders on both sides of the exchange, participants tended to respond in a culturally conditioned manner. UGA stakeholders tended to view the goals and activities of the exchange from a typical utilitarian perspective (how the experience benefited the economy and institutional interests of Georgia and UGA). Thus, there was a great deal of public relations activities about the exchange to decision making stakeholders such as administrators and faculty members. On the UV side, many stakeholder responses indicated relational perspectives. That is, how knowing a key person on the UGA side led to personal growth and enrichment, which only incidentally was perceived as professional and institutional advancement.

As the respondents indicated, from the perspective of social work in Veracruz, there was a need to acquire knowledge and skills to better prepare students and faculty in an age of increasing professional specialization, internationalization of higher education and expansion of knowledge, as well as to address the critical issues of social well-being in Mexico. Although historically based on a development and social action model, the responses described here indicate that there is a strong desire among UV stakeholders to change their orientation towards a clinical model, and therefore a desire within the field of social work in Veracruz to adopt and diffuse knowledge of clinical social work through the UV -- UGA academic exchange.

On the other hand, from the perspective of Georgia social work stakeholders, there was a need to develop Spanish/English, bilingual, culturally competent social work scholars and practitioners who could effectively address the range of education and practice issues related to the growing Hispanic population in the U.S.A.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of this study's problem, purpose, research questions, method, and findings, followed by a discussion of the findings. The chapter concludes with a presentation of recommendations for theory and practice and future research.

Summary of the Study

From the perspective of social work education in Mexico, there was a growing need to for international exchange programs with the U.S.A. to acquire knowledge and resources to better prepare students and faculty in an age of increasing professional specialization and expansion of knowledge, as well as to address critical issues of social well-being. Although historically based on a development and social action model, during the 1990s social work education and practice in Mexico changed its orientation increasingly towards a clinical model. Thus, there also existed a desire within schools of social work in Mexico to adopt and diffuse knowledge of clinical social work from international academic exchanges with schools of social work in the U.S.A. On the other hand, from a U.S.A. perspective, there was a need for international social work exchange programs with Mexico to develop Spanish/English, bilingual, culturally competent social work scholars and practitioners who could effectively address a range of education and practice issues related to the growing Hispanic population in the U.S.A.

These distinct Mexican and U.S.A. social work educational responses (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000; Boyle, Nackerud, & Kilpatrick, 1997) arose from processes of globalization supporting internationalization in both U.S.A. and Mexican universities. In particular, educational responses to globalization processes were being pushed along by commitments of social work education stakeholders at Mexican and U.S.A. schools of social work to broaden the preparation and experiences of their students, faculty, and graduates (Boyle & Cervantes, 1997). Moreover, these educational responses to globalization were occurring within the context of institutional internationalization (Gacel-Avila, 1999) in each country, with commitments from social work education stakeholders at the highest levels within and outside university systems.

These educational responses were being shaped by North American social work education stakeholders, in part to broaden the international knowledge, skills, and abilities of faculty, pre-professional (undergraduate and graduate), and continuing professional education students (Boyle & Cervantes, 1997). From a policy and planning theoretical perspective, these programmatic responses were being shaped in part by negotiations of power and interests among and between stakeholders situated in relational contexts. (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006).

If the field of social work in North America is to rely on education, and international academic exchange, to be an effective means through which to advance research, develop knowledge, skills, and abilities of faculty and students, as well as implement policy, then ethical and democratic program planning will have to play a crucial role. The social act of planning programmatic interventions *ipso facto* shapes

programs (Umble, 1998). Just as importantly, these programs then contribute to the shaping of professional practice by those who participate in them. Ultimately, these socially constructed programs impact the public at large. Thus, the manner in which (how) these educational programs are planned influences significantly the quality and efficacy of the programs, and the welfare of society.

The aim of the research was to determine how the interests and negotiations of stakeholders – persons who affected a social work education academic exchange program (Mexico – U.S.A.), or whom the program affected – were shaping the program through their relational practice of educational program planning. This practice occurred among and between stakeholders with interests in social work education in Mexico and the U.S.A. The purpose of the study was to describe how stakeholders and stakeholder groups negotiated interests to shape a social work education academic exchange program.

The Study was rooted in a theoretical perspective developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006). This perspective holds that program planning is a “social activity whereby people construct educational programs by negotiating personal, social, and organizational interests in contexts marked by socially-structured power relations” (Cervero & Wilson, 1998).

The two research questions for the case study were:

1. What are the interests of the major stakeholders and stakeholder groups for the academic exchange program?
2. How have negotiations among and between stakeholders affected the features of the academic exchange program?

This study employed qualitative research (case study) as its approach. Qualitative research is a broad approach to the study of social phenomena that is naturalistic, interpretive, and utilizes multiple methods of inquiry (Denzin, 1994). This study was intended to be applied research. Traditionally, basic research has been distinguished from applied research (Chelimsky & Shaddish, 1997; Weiss, 1998). Basic research generates theory and produces knowledge for its own end, while applied research informs action and enhances decision-making. Basic research is judged by the explanations it provides, while applied research is judged by its effectiveness in helping policymakers, practitioners, and the participants themselves make decisions and act to improve the human condition (Patton, 1996).

This study employed qualitative case study for its research design. A case study investigate a complex phenomenon, uses many sources of evidence, and benefits from being rooted in an explicit theoretical perspective (Yin, 1994; 2003). One of the strengths of the case study was its use of multiple methods for data collection (Yin, 1994; 2003). The case studied in this research was the University of Georgia (UGA) – University of Veracruz (UV) Social Work Education International Academic Exchange Program.

Given the purpose of the study -- to describe how stakeholder negotiations in program planning shaped a social work education academic exchange program – the focus was on stakeholder groups comprised of elites in Mexico and the U.S.A. These six elite stakeholder groups included administrators, faculty, and students in the U.S.A. and Mexico. Outside of political science, until recently little attention had been given to

methods of elite research, in contrast to the large literature on general qualitative research methods. As a result, there was a significant “methodological gap” in the literature (Hughes & Cormode, 1999, p. 299).

This study utilized open-ended, “expert” interviews, conducted in English and Spanish, depending on the preference of the interviewee. The study also employed observation, participant observation, and document analysis. This study used semi-structured interviews as a primary data collection method in order to answer all the research questions. The researcher prepared specific questions that followed from the research questions. Formal interviews occurred between May and September of 2002 in Georgia, and during a first trip to Veracruz. Follow-up interviews were conducted as conversations, without interview guides, during additional trips Veracruz in the summers of 2003, 2004, and 2005. Follow-up interviews were conducted in the same manner in Georgia during the same time frame.

This case study used different data analysis methods for its descriptive and explanatory parts. This section describes the strategy and methods for each of these. Explanatory aspects of the study built on the descriptive aspects. The first tasks were to describe the program activities, stakeholders and their roles, and interests. This task required analysis of interviews, observations, and documents. The researcher used a modified form of explanation building, a technique described by Yin (1994; 2003), for the explanatory portions of the case study. In explanation building, the researcher utilized in the analysis a theoretical perspective of educational program planning developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006), which the case verified, occasionally

failed to verify, and further developed given the contexts and aspects of the study. In this case, the data were analyzed according to the theoretical perspective of the study.

Explanation building occurred after the descriptive sections of the analysis identified eighteen stakeholder interests and data on whether or not the interests were being met. The researcher then composed sections explaining how the program's seven educational features were produced through negotiation of interests among the study's stakeholders. The researcher analyzed the interview and observational data on the program's history and context to interpret how various types of negotiations about and between interests and power relations had produced the program.

In this process of explanation building in the explanatory analysis, it was assumed that these negotiations would help explain the following: (1) how meta-negotiations contributed to the establishment of relationships among the UGA and UV stakeholders, thus shaping the planning tables at which the program was produced; (2) how the substantive negotiations on the program were carried out, and their effects on the program; (3) whose interests were represented well, or poorly, in these negotiations; (4) the power relationships among and between stakeholders that shaped how negotiations were carried out; (5) how the power relationships among and between stakeholders were reinforced and/or changed as a result of the planning process and the program itself; and, (7) how the program arose through the internationalization of higher education responding to processes of globalization. Based on the data analysis four conclusions were drawn and recommendations for theory and practice were suggested.

Conclusions and Discussion

This study had four major conclusions: 1) internationalization of higher education is an agent and reactor to globalization; 2) stakeholders' negotiation of power and interests at planning tables frame and shape the development of international academic exchange programs; 3) values and rationales underpin strategies, programs, and policies driving international academic exchange; and, 4) power relations among and between elite stakeholder and researcher pose methodological challenges.

Internationalization Is an Agent and Responder to Globalization

The first conclusion of this study was that internationalization of higher education is an agent and reactor to globalization. This conclusion was obtained in part from the answers to Questions One and Two in the study, and partially through the examination of the historical factors of Georgia and Veracruz during recent decades. This study supports many of the assumptions indicated in the literature below, and can contribute to literature addressing issues of globalization and internationalization of higher education in the USA and Mexico, especially in regard to planning international academic exchanges.

Globalization is influencing universities in the USA and Mexico and is radically changing the face of the university as an institution. The corporate discourse of efficiency and effectiveness advocated by both national governments within a context of neoliberal globalization has reshaped social institutions in both countries, including universities.

Globalization and internationalization are both taken as outstanding features of significant modern and post-modern social theories (Held et al. 1999). These dialectical concepts are often interchangeably used in academic circles, and are also confused in

wider use (Gacel-Ávila, 2005; Knight, 2005; Yang, 2004). They are, however, two different terms, reflecting phenomena with different rationales, objectives and effects (Yang, 2004). The need to distinguish internationalization from globalization is necessary, given the inevitability of increasing globalization, which constrains decision making in the area of internationalization in higher education (Gacel-Ávila, 2005; Knight, 2005; Yang, 2004). This finding of this case study demonstrate this need and describes influences of many of these types of constraints on decision making for a variety of stakeholders in various contexts within the boundaries of UGA and UV.

Globalization is increasingly characteristic of the realm of knowledge production in higher education, and this process is changing the nature of the university, altering its modes of organization, and its core functions of teaching, research, and service (Gibbons 1998; Yang, 1997, 2004). As globalization is dramatically reshaping universities worldwide, internationalization is entailed (Gacel-Ávila, 2005). The concept of globalization spans various separate yet overlapping domains (Sklair 1998). Knight (2001) defined the globalization of higher education “as the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas . . . across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities. . . . Internationalization of higher education is one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalization yet, at the same time, respects the individuality of the nation” (p. 20). All of these effects and processes were in play in this case and demonstrated how the international dimension in higher education is both an agent and reactor to processes of globalization.

This study examined in part how U.S.A. and Mexican universities are responding to this phenomenon in their cultural complexity and social contexts, using the University of Georgia – University of Veracruz Social Work Education Academic Exchange as an example. It dealt with the relationship between globalization, internationalization, and higher education from a perspective of international academic exchange. These processes were woven together in a complicated network, and mapping them out and describing them was a challenge. While processes of neoliberal globalization reshaped the economies in both countries in the late 1970's and beyond, one significant outcome was the displacement of a substantial number of Mexico's working poor. Consequently, substantially more economic migration began to occur with Georgia becoming a destination, then an enclave, for the immigrants, and the disruption to social relations from these changes impacted institutions that utilized social workers in both countries -- in Georgia due to the influx, and in Veracruz due to the outflow. This prompted a reaction to globalization in the form of internationalization activities within both UGA and UV, one of which was to establish the social work academic exchange. This internationalization in the form of the exchange program then became an agent of globalization due to the initiation of knowledge, technology, and people transfer across borders between Georgia and Veracruz. Within these processes, forces of internationalization and globalization pulled in different directions, and it was increasingly difficult for these two universities to reconcile their competing agendas.

For example, the academic fields of business, science, and technology are closely connected with markets and commerce, particularly international markets. Consequently,

research products in these fields often expand beyond national boundaries, and researchers need to ensure their own research product is internationally recognized (Yang, 2003a, 2004). Therefore, in these academic areas there are significant opportunities for increasing present levels of academic collaboration. However, the extent of opportunities for internationalization is much less in the social sciences, due in part to more varied ideologies, paradigms and discourses inherent in these fields, and higher dependency on language to convey their meanings. Opportunities to cooperate with international partners or win grants from external resources are much more limited (Yang, 2004). Indeed, these assumptions were supported in this study, during which time the Schools of Social Work terminated their involvement in the exchange program, while at the same time involvement by the UGA-UV agribusiness interests grew significantly, supported by large funding increases from the United States Agency for International Development.

The local impact of globalization on universities frequently begins with the transformation of a nation state into a competitive trader in the global marketplace, which has been the experience in Mexico, reinforced by its entry into NAFTA and the OECD. As a result of this transformation, education in Mexico, and at the University of Veracruz, has changed its orientation to become less an agent of social policy and more a key respondent of economic policy (Sassen 2000; Torres & Schugurensky, 2002; Yang, 2004). Claims made during interviews in this case study support these assumptions. Many UV stakeholders believed that globalization in Mexico has been a process influenced to a large degree by multinational financial and transnational corporations,

enabled by policies of the Mexican government. Moreover, UV stakeholders claimed that neoliberal globalization has been supported by international financial regulatory institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank; it has been furthered by international organizations and treaties governing free trade, such as the World Trade Organization, the North American Free Trade Agreement, and the General Agreement on Trade in Services; and, as was shown directly in this case, it has been propelled by funding from the largest governmental agency promoting modernization through economic development, the United States Agency for International Development.

Unlike many existing studies on this topic, the present study has recognized some positive consequences of global practices. It shows the character of globalization will be accomplished by the people in situations, and the direction that globalized institutions are taking, and will take in the future, is not predetermined (Robertson, 1992). Indeed, pushed along by processes of neoliberal globalization, UV demonstrated strong interests to acquire scientific and technical knowledge and skills, and to make its faculty, graduates, and university more competitive in the global labor market. However, local transformation is a part of globalization (Giddens 1990), and the true meaning of globalization is a reflexive process involving both global inputs and local acts of reproduction, in which the universal becomes conjoined with the particular (Spybey 1996). This has been especially evident in Veracruz state, situated as it is in a locale, and a nation state, that has been strong and vigilant in the preservation of its local cultures, while remaining very nationalistic as a country in the face of homogenizing effects of

globalization. Perhaps the degree to which this is true has been exemplified during the exchange by the virtual lack of English language fluency by UV participants, a fact that had negative consequences for UV stakeholders' participation. Nonetheless, while the hegemonic force of English is without question increasing in Mexico, the counter-hegemonic response in preservation of local languages and customs remains strong, particularly in comparison to many other Latin American countries.

Negotiation of Power and Interests Shape Exchange Programs

The second conclusion of this study was that stakeholders' negotiation of power and interests at planning tables frame and shape the development of international academic exchange programs. This conclusion was obtained primarily from the answers to Questions One and Two in the study. This study makes a significant contribution to the planning literature cited below, particularly in its extension of it into the domain of internationalization of higher education in the form of academic exchange between the USA and Mexico.

Although theories and models of program planning normally have not considered the role of stakeholders, many are beginning to advocate the need for more inclusive perspectives. A number of studies in adult and continuing education have demonstrated the centrality of negotiating power and interests (e.g., Mills, Cervero, Langone, & Wilson, 1995; Umble, 1998; Drennon, 2000; Maruatona, 2001; Kilgos, 2003; Kim, 2004; Penland, 2004; Robertson, 2004). From this body of work we can say with some confidence that we know *what* adult educators do. We know relatively less, however, about *how* adult educators and other stakeholders in the planning process actually

negotiate multiple -- and often conflicting -- interests in practice (Mabry, 2000; Yang, 1998). The findings of this study contribute to the efforts in the literature to explain both what planners do in their work, and, moreover, how planning stakeholders negotiate to shape and form programs through the planning process.

In an attempt to strengthen program planning theory by describing the actual character of these stakeholder negotiations, Cervero and Wilson (1998) combined frame theory and negotiation to refine their analysis, and found this move useful to distinguish different types of negotiation that occurs in the social process of program planning. Thus Cervero and Wilson have begun to describe how stakeholders manifest their own power by both maintaining as well as by transforming relationships of power through employing both substantive as well as meta-negotiations (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a, 1994b, 1998, 2006). Indeed, these substantive and meta-negotiations strategies are often used simultaneously. Cervero and Wilson (1998) write about these phenomena:

Thus, substantive and meta-negotiations are simultaneously interwoven in daily practice...Using the metaphor of the planning table, we have shown how adult educators are always simultaneously negotiating about the important features of educational programs (substantive negotiations) and about the political relationship of those who are included and excluded from such negotiations (meta-negotiations). (p. 20)

In other words, planners employ both substantive and meta-negotiation strategies to alter the relationships of power among stakeholders in order to make it more productive for them. This study approached the case utilizing the Cervero and Wilson

planning theory, and it contributes to the literature (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000; Boyle, Nackerud, & Kilpatrick, 1997) describing efforts of schools of social work to better understand how planning can play a crucial role in the development and implementation of international education exchange programs in order to be an effective means through which to advance knowledge and skills, as well as implement policy. This contribution made by this study is important because the social act of planning programmatic interventions *ipso facto* shapes programs (Umble, 1998). Just as importantly, these programs then contribute to the shaping of social work practice by those who participate in their development and implementation. Ultimately, in the context of this study, these socially constructed programs impact the public's social behavior in the USA and Mexico. Consequently, the manner in which (how) continuing education programs are planned, and the degree to which they may be improved through the findings of this study, could influence significantly the quality and efficacy of programs like these in higher education settings in the USA and Mexico.

In their theory of educational program planning, Cervero and Wilson (2006) indicated key dynamics are in operation at the planning tables where educational programs are produced, of which two are: 1) power relations enable and constrain people's access to and capacity to act at the planning table; and, 2) people represent interests at the table. Utilizing the metaphor of the planning table as an analytical tool, according to the Cervero and Wilson theory the first important dynamic that operated in the UGA-UV academic exchange was that power relations enabled and constrained stakeholders' access to, and capacities to act, at the many planning tables situated in

Georgia and Veracruz. The planning tables in the exchange were dovetailed into the sociopolitical relationships among and between stakeholders, and constituted planning locations where power was produced and exercised by exchange stakeholders (Cervero & Wilson, 2006) in the construction of the exchange program. The power relations at work in the exchange were crucially important because they influenced whose interests were represented at the tables.

Cervero and Wilson (2006) recognized power to have three important characteristics for educational planning. First, people do not possess finite amounts of power to wield against others, but rather power is a social and relational characteristic at work in all planning interactions. Second, power relations occur as a structural characteristic in sociopolitical contexts, but also, importantly, as an activity exercised through individuals. Third, power relations are continuously negotiated at educational planning tables.

Seen through this framework, the first characteristic of power at work in the UGA-UV academic exchange program was that stakeholder power was fundamentally the capacity to act, acquired by virtue of their position and participation in ongoing social and organizational relationships in the academic exchange. Stakeholder power was not just a consequence of their individual attributes. Rather, stakeholders in the UGA-UV academic exchange possessed the capacity to act at the planning tables, which was rooted in the complex milieu of socially structured relationships present in the exchange program.

The second characteristic of power seen through this framework was that power relations occurred in the exchange both as a structural characteristic in sociopolitical contexts, but also, importantly, as an activity exercised through individual stakeholders. In the UGA-UV academic exchange, although many power relations were highly asymmetrical forms of domination, structuring and limiting the construction of exchange features and reproducing domination, there were also many power relations in which capacities to act were distributed relatively equally to all stakeholders at the table, thus enabling the creation of new, even liberating, political relationships. Importantly, the outcomes of the exercise of power by exchange stakeholders, about and at the planning tables, could not have been predetermined, but were contingent instead on how they chose to exercise that power in their particular contexts. Although preexisting power relationships certainly existed, exchange stakeholders always faced new challenges of how to achieve their interests through the exercise of power as challenges occurred.

The third characteristic of power seen through the framework of the planning table was that power was always being negotiated at the planning table. Given the asymmetrical forms of domination in the exchange, the preexisting structural characteristics limited capacities to act, but they were, nonetheless, affected by who got to make decisions at the planning tables. Importantly, negotiated decisions by stakeholders had two crucial outcomes (Forester, 1989; Cervero and Wilson, 1998, 2006). First, stakeholder negotiations focused on decision making about the educational features of the UGA-UV academic exchange program. Second, those negotiations either maintained or altered the social and political relationships of those who were included or

excluded from exchange program planning. Consequently, in the UGA-UV academic exchange, the fundamental dynamic at work at the planning tables was that planners always negotiated with their own power, and between and among the political relationships of other stakeholders, which enabled them to make judgments about the features and outcomes of the program. Moreover, simultaneously in the planning process, exchange stakeholders also negotiated about the political relationships in the exchange, seeking to reinforce or alter them.

The second important dynamic in operation at academic exchange planning tables was that stakeholders represented the interests described in Chapter 5 at the multiple tables situated in the many diverse contexts of the exchange. Power relations shaped multiple planning tables in these various contexts by enabling or constraining the capacities to act for program planning stakeholders. Therefore, stakeholders sought to achieve their represented interests through their exercise of power (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, 1994a, 1994b). In the UGA – UV academic exchange program, stakeholders represented and negotiated their complex sets of interests at planning tables situated in the various contexts described in Chapter 4. As Cervero and Wilson (2006, p. 88) explained, these interests were “predispositions, embracing goals, values, desires, and other orientations and inclinations that lead a person to act in one direction or another.”

For the many academic exchange stakeholders described in Chapters 4 and 5, the interests they represented provided them with motivations and purposes, which led them to act, or not act, depending on their capacities to have done so. Moreover, the outcomes of their actions were dependent upon the challenges they faced relative to the diverse

contexts in which they were situated, and also dependent on the ongoing judgments they made in response to these challenges. The stakeholders involved in the UGA - UV planning process exercised their power relative to their own interests, the interests of other stakeholders, and the interests of those of whom they represented at the planning tables. Collectively, their actions, or lack thereof, represented the social heart of the program planning process in the UGA – UV social work academic exchange.

Through their representation and negotiation of interests, the actions of program planning stakeholders defined the features of the academic exchange. Consequently, the features that cumulatively represented the UGA – UV social work academic exchange program were causally related to specific interests of the persons who planned them (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, 1994a). As Cervero and Wilson indicated (2006, p. 89), “people with interests plan programs.” Their ongoing judgments, and their capacities to act, however, were not predetermined. Instead, the judgments and actions of program planning stakeholders were dependent upon: 1) which of them were at the table; 2) the places in which these tables were located; 3) which and whose interests they represented, and; 4) how each of them chose to exercise (or not) their power at the table. Because of these contingencies, and the many ways in which they could have played out at the planning tables, the features represented by the UGA – UV exchange program could have turned out significantly different. Regardless of the outcomes, the exchange program would have resulted from the power relations that shaped the planning tables, the multiple, historically developing, and intersecting interests represented by stakeholders at various tables, and the particular negotiations that occurred there.

Of the complex sets of interests represented by stakeholders in the UGA – UV exchange, some were related to educational outcomes for the program, while others were related to social and political outcomes, or “hidden agendas”. Although the stated purposes and objectives of the exchange program were academically oriented, social and political interests were as integral a part of the planning process as educational interests, if not more. Because of the contradictory way in which stakeholders represented divergent interests at the planning tables, the process often appeared confusing, even confounding. Therefore, whether analyzing or interpreting dynamics in the study, it was crucial never to lose sight of the following questions: Whose interests were at stake in the program? And, what were those interests? The next conclusion addresses these questions.

Values and Rationales Underpin Approaches to Academic Exchange

The third conclusion of this study was that values and rationales underpin strategies, programs, and policies driving international academic exchange. This conclusion was obtained primarily from the answers to Questions One and Two in the study. The finding of this study make a significant contribution to the literatures that attempt to explain the value and rationales that drive the theory, practice, and policy making of the internationalization of higher education, particularly in contexts of the USA and Mexico. A review of the literature over the last fifteen years indicates that several major scholars have generally used a similar typology of “approaches” to the internationalization of higher education (Aigner et al, 1992; Arum & Van de Water, 1992; de Wit, 1995, 2005; Knight, 1994, 1996, 1997, 2005, Yang, 2004). By

“approaches” these authors suggest strategies, programs, and policies adopted by stakeholders aimed at the promotion and implementation of internationalization.

Although the categories of approaches these scholars use sometimes include overlapping elements, as Qiang (2003) indicates, there are basically four different approaches being used to describe the concept of internationalization.

The activity approach, which promotes activities such as curriculum, student/faculty exchange, technical assistance, and international students. As described in Chapters Four, Five, and Six, the UGA-UV academic exchange program included all of these activities as approaches utilized by its planning stakeholders. Curriculum sharing was a major focus of the program, and was a particular interest of Dan Brown who was employed by UV to serve as a curriculum consultant in Poza Rica and Minatitlán. Student and faculty exchanges, and the hosting of international students, were seen in to a large degree by UGA students, faculty, and administrators going to Veracruz, and to a substantially smaller degree by UV stakeholders traveling to UGA. Finally, technical sharing was a major component of the exchange, especially that of proving knowledge of clinical skills to the Veracruz faculty.

The competency approach, which emphasizes the development of skills, knowledge, attitudes and values in students, faculty and staff. Again, these approaches were all part of strategies, programs, and policies produced by planning stakeholders in the UGA-UV exchange. The ethos approach, which emphasizes creating a culture or climate that values and supports international and intercultural perspectives and initiatives. This approach relates more to organizational development theories which

focus on the creation of a culture or climate within an organization to support a particular set of principles and goals, and was of particular importance to administration stakeholders on both sides. The process approach, which stresses integration or infusion of an international and intercultural dimension into teaching, research and service through a combination of a wide range of activities, policies and procedures. Again, these were seen to a significant degree in the exchange. A major concern in this approach is the need to address the sustainability of the international dimension. Therefore, the emphasis is placed on program aspects as well as organizational elements such as policies and procedures. Needless to say, sustainability was a failure in the case of the social work element of the UGA-UV exchange, and the findings of this study contribute to the literature in this area.

Just as there are a variety of ways to describe and define approaches to internationalization, there are also a number of different rationales or motivations for wanting to integrate an international dimension into higher education (Barnet, 1990; Kerr, 1994; Carnoy, 1995; Pennycook, 1996; Knight, 1997, 2005; Welch and Denman, 1997; Yang, 2004; de Witt, 1999, 2005). Knight clusters the possible rationales for internationalization into four groups: political, economic, academic and cultural/social, which this author believes is particularly useful to bring a framework and some logic to the discussion of the rationales.

The political rationale relates to issues concerning the country's position and role as a nation in the world, e.g. security, stability and peace, ideological influence, etc. Given the contribution of USAID to funding efforts, part of the rationale for this

exchange falls in this domain, particularly from the perspective of the interests of that agency. The economic rationale refers to objectives related to either the long-term economic effects, where internationalization of higher education is seen as a contribution to the skilled human resources needed for international competitiveness of the nation. The values and motivations of administration stakeholders on both in advancing their interests sides fall squarely in the economic domain. The academic rationale includes objectives related to the aims and functions of higher education. One of the leading reasons cited for internationalizing the higher education sector is the achievement of international academic standards for teaching and research. As described in Chapters Five and Six, all six stakeholder groups held interests underpinned by academic values and rationales, although faculty and students to a significantly greater degree than administrators. The cultural/social rationale concentrates on the role and place of the country's own culture and language and on the importance of understanding foreign languages and culture. Related to this point is the need for improved intercultural understanding and communication. This rationale drove the approaches to all internationalization activities to some degree, and was an especially important component, combined with an academic rationale, for UGA faculty and students, given the need for bilingual, culturally-competent social workers in Georgia. The academic and cultural/social rationales, reflected in measures like the mobility of students and staff, the improvement of the quality of education, a greater compatibility of study programs and degrees, and enhanced knowledge of other languages and cultures, seems all to be derived from the overarching economic rationale of strengthening human resources for

international competitiveness (Knight, 1997).

According to Cervero and Wilson (2006, 1994a, 1994b), an important dynamic in operation at academic exchange planning tables is that ethical commitments of stakeholders defined who was represented at the planning tables. Which stakeholders sat at planning tables in the UGA-UV academic exchange was of critical importance to the values and rationales underpinning the approaches -- the selection of strategies, programs, and policies -- utilized to shape the features that defined the program. Depending on who was seated at a particular table, there was a causal relationship among whose interests those stakeholder planners represented, the practical judgments they made about approaches, and the specific program features that resulted (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a; 2006). As Cervero and Wilson (2006, pg. 91) indicated, the fact that educational programs are causally related to stakeholder interests “is no superfluous claim, for if program features were not determined by these interests, then what would determine them?”

Ideally, for exchange planners, evidence should have informed their practical judgments, but in reality they were normally made due to attempts to achieve specific outcomes based on the values and rationales they embraced for the approaches of the exchange program. Moreover, as Cervero and Wilson (2006, pg. 91) have said, it was precisely because educational programs matter that their resulting features are shaped by the interests of their planners. In the case of the UGA-UV academic exchange program, it mattered because it created possibilities in the futures of students, faculty, institutions,

communities, and societies, both in Georgia and Veracruz, and in United States and Mexico.

Fundamental to their actions, exchange stakeholder judgments were made based on ethical commitments in the form of values and rationales that each of them brought to the planning tables -- assuming they were privileged to be seated or represented there. In the UGA-UV academic exchange, stakeholder judgments helped construct the possible futures of participants, personally, in their universities in Georgia and Veracruz, and in their respective societies in the USA and Mexico, and these possibilities resulted, at least in part, from the academic exchange they shaped.

In the case of the UGA-UV exchange program, stakeholder commitments drove decision making that occurred in the negotiation of interests at uneven planning tables situated in the various contexts described in Chapter 4. As Cervero and Wilson noted (1994a, 2001, 2006), within such contexts and at such tables, exchange stakeholders enacted their ethical commitments by answering two fundamental questions: Who should benefit in what ways from the UGA-UV social work academic exchange program, and whose interests should be represented at the planning tables where judgments were made about the exchange programs?

Importantly, these two kinds of ethical commitments – who should benefit, and who should be at the table – were intertwined (Cervero & Wilson, 2006). Ethical commitments were intricately woven into the political relationships in the social and organizational settings where planning occurred in the exchange. Ethical commitments of exchange stakeholders were enacted in contexts of conflicting interests, resource

asymmetries, and unequal power relations, which constructed the uneven planning tables at which most of the planning occurred. This reality of exchange planning was crucial to understand, because as Forester (1990, p. 253) pointed out, “(If) ethical thinking is blind to the world of politics and pragmatism, then ethics, it seems, asks us to be saints and martyrs, not planners.” Therefore, absent of ethical commitments by stakeholders about who should have benefited and who should have been seated at the many exchange planning tables, then those with the most power always would have exercised it to determine the features of the exchange program, as well as its educational and political outcomes. Thankfully the findings do not support this undesirable outcome.

Adult and continuing education is deeply embedded in the production and distribution of knowledge and power in society (Cervero & Wilson, 2001). However, in viewing day to day practice, it is often difficult to see educational pursuits as critical sites of struggle for knowledge and power. Nevertheless, whether as adult and continuing education practitioners or academic scholars, it is crucial to be able to understand how the power relations in society -- within contexts and processes of globalization -- are manifested in the planing of educational programs, practices, and policies for adults. Because of what is at stake for everyone, we must begin to see and understand how these connections are made; we must understand the reciprocal relationships between our everyday educational work and the transnational systems in this era of globalization, and, we must begin to understand ways of acting in the face of these power relations. This is to understand that there are clear connections between the “how to” of adult and continuing education planners and practitioners, and the imperatives of “what for,” which

connect the “why” of our work with the wider social, economic, cultural, and political systems in which we all dwell (p.xvii). This study has attempted to make a contribution in this regard.

This is not an easy task and there are no easy solutions at hand. However, just as individual persons have a vision in mind when making the journey from home to host country, in a politics of power it is imperative that we see what matters: “[T]he struggle for knowledge and power is about the constitution of individual lives and the society we create” (p. 279).

Power Relations Between Elites and Researchers Pose Methodological Challenges

The fourth conclusion of this study was that power relations among and between elite stakeholder and researcher pose methodological challenges. This conclusion was obtained primarily from the personal experiences of the researcher in negotiating with elite stakeholders in the study. Given the purpose of the study -- which was to describe how stakeholder negotiations in program planning shaped a social work education academic exchange program -- a significant focus of the study was on stakeholder groups comprised of elites in Mexico and the U.S.A. These elite groups included administrators, faculty, and students at the University of Georgia and the University of Veracruz. As Cormode & Hughes (1999) have indicated, researching “the powerful” poses significantly different methodological and ethical challenges from studying “down” (p. 299). The characteristics of those studied, the power relations among and between them and the researcher, and the politics of the research process differ substantially between elite and non-elite research (Conti & O’Niel, 2007). When studying elites, the scholar is a

“suppliant,” dependent on the cooperation of a small number of people with specialized knowledge, rather than a potential emancipator or oppressor (McDowell, in Cormode & Hughes, 1999, p. 299).

Some of the difficulties related to studying elites are intuitive and well documented in the literature on elite research – funding and locating travel to interview a mobile social group, gaining entrée into elite settings, modifying dress and appearance, and mastering specialized forms of knowledge in order to successfully complete interviews. Other issues were less expected – in particular, the strategic contest over authority during the research process and the emotional reactions that resulted from being ‘talked down to’ by interviewees. These are significant methodological difficulties that have dramatic effects both on the manner in which research is practiced and they influence the knowledge claims that it produces.

The experience of the researcher of this study supports this assumption. As an elite, the researcher enjoyed similar social and professional privileges as those being studied, all of whom possessed specialized knowledge about the exchange program. These similar privileges, along with likely perceptions among those being studied about the researcher's interests relative to advancing the exchange, enabled open access to interviewees. In negotiating with the elite interviews, it was a challenge for the researcher to be cognizant of making ethical judgments regarding his capacity to act in the exercise of power at the planning tables. These ethical determinations at times impacted the judgment of the researcher, thus influencing his conduct in performing the study, both positively and negatively. This was of particular concern given the

researcher's privileges relative to resource asymmetries between UGA and UV. Moreover, given the cross cultural positionality of the researcher, there were also challenges of maintaining objectivity – both in relation to the host culture, and to his own, due to the influences of culture shock, which work in both directions. This findings of this study have potential to contribute to the methodological literature that addresses these issues, particularly relating to Mexican research contexts.

Outside of political science, until recently little attention had been given to methods of elite research, in contrast to the large literature on general qualitative research methods. As a result, there is a significant “methodological gap” in the literature (Hughes & Cormode, 1999, p. 299). This neglect reflects to some extent the perceived difficulties of gaining access to elite networks as well as the political commitment of many social scientists to studying the less privileged. Nonetheless, the importance of studying those in positions of power is growing and worthy of attention because the gap between elite and non-elite continues to widen in terms of income distribution, conditions of work, and ease of international mobility. For example, Lasch (1995) and Sklair (1991), writing from very different ideological viewpoints, have both claimed that there is growing divergence between elite and non-elite opinion, with interests of some elites now tied more to the global system than to national territories and interests.

This study supports the assertions of Lasch and Sklair with regard to all six stakeholder groups, who relative to their constituents in their home countries – those not involved in the program -- frequently shared more personal and professional interests with their exchange colleagues, regardless of them being situated in a foreign university

system thousands of miles away. Moreover, UGA and UV stakeholders often made claims very similar to those of the same group from the other school. For example, UV administrator Miguel Alba expressed organizational interests for UV in the exchange related to advancing internationalization activities in support of neoliberal globalization. So, too, did UGA elite administrators. Faculty and students from both institutions made claims expressing very similar personal goals of improving scientific knowledge and skills for the advancement of their careers.

Globalization, “glocalization” (Swyngedouw, 1992) and the rise of regional trading blocs (such as the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA]) are also impacting elite networks. While the geographic scope of networks of professionals, such as social workers, is expanding, the spatial scale at which elite processes like social work professional education exchange occur is also changing. More and more corporate elites – in this case UGA and UV administrators, faculty, and students – are now constituted “glocally”. In this “new economic geography” that describes spatial characteristics of globalization, “the social”, “the cultural” and “the economic” are understood as being interconnected and mutually self-constituting, these socio-economic and political changes raise important questions about how to study these increasingly important actors and networks (Hughes & Cormode, 1999).

When studying elites, Oinas (1999) points to the importance of recognizing the role of “manifold social relationships” in which elites are deeply enmeshed, including their social, political, economic, religious, and family networks (p. 353). Indeed, observations made about Mexican stakeholders' social characteristics supports the

assumption that in Mexico elites were enmeshed in networks of social relationships well described as “manifold”. While a similar conclusion could be made about UGA stakeholders, the degree to which they were enmeshed in manifold social relationships seemed less than for their Mexican partners.

Appadurai (1996) highlights the international dimension of “connectedness” among and between elites by claiming “[g]lobalization has shrunk the distance between elites” (Oinas, 1999, p. 353). As Oinas indicates,

The various sets of social relations in which [elites] are involved may remain disparate, but it can be seen as a part of their role to *make connections* between the various sets of social relations. This may function as an empowering resource for them.

Indeed, as disparate as personal, social and cultural characteristics often seemed between UGA and UV stakeholders, observations and findings about the behavior of UGA and UV faculty, and especially administrators, in the exchange program supports the notion of their role as connection makers. In pursuit of their personal and organizational interests, these stakeholders were aggressive connection makers, from the point of establishing the program onward throughout its historical course. Often these connections were made with other stakeholders within the program, but across institutions, who shared similar interests. Occasionally, connections were made by both UGA and UV stakeholders with the same person or persons outside of both institutions, from whom capabilities of serving personal, organizational, and/or societal interests were perceived.

Implications For Theory, Practice and Research

This study examined in part how U.S.A. and Mexican universities are responding to this phenomenon in their cultural complexity and social contexts, using the University of Georgia – University of Veracruz Social Work Education Academic Exchange as an example. It dealt with the relationship between globalization, internationalization, and higher education from a perspective of international academic exchange. This study also focused on the need to distinguish the concepts of internationalization from globalization in international academic exchange planning and practice, given the inevitability of increasing globalization, which constrains decision making in the area of internationalization in higher education (Gacel-Ávila, 2005; Knight, 2005; Yang, 2004). The finding of the case indicating that internationalization of higher education is an agent and reactor to globalization demonstrates this need, and describes the influences of these types of constraints on planning practice, especially decision making, for a variety of stakeholders in various contexts within the boundaries of UGA and UV. This study examined in part how U.S.A. and Mexican universities are responding to this phenomenon in their cultural complexity and social contexts, using the University of Georgia – University of Veracruz Social Work Education Academic Exchange as an example. Given the proximity of the countries, and the increasing commonalities of social relations and problems, the need for new knowledge to help address these shared issues will only grow.

A recommendation for future research activity in this area involves the need to follow up some of the key issues raised in the findings and conclusions of the study. One

of the major findings of this study was that international academic exchange is both an agent and reactor to globalization. Proceeding from this finding, it is recommended that a study based on internationalization of higher education attempt to map and describe the paths of the flows of people, knowledge, and technologies that occur in context of an exchange program, and how these flows in turn prompt new responses to these globalizing processes in the form of new programs and policies. In particular, the need to describes the influences of these types of constraints on planning practice, especially decision making, for a variety of stakeholders in various contexts within the boundaries of UGA and UV and in their cultural complexity and social contexts

Historically studies on theories and models of program planning normally have not considered the role of stakeholders. Now many are beginning to advocate the need for more inclusive perspectives. A number of studies in adult and continuing education have demonstrated the centrality of negotiating power and interests in shaping educational programs (e.g., Mills, Cervero, Langone, & Wilson, 1995; Umble, 1998; Drennon, 2000; Maruatona, 2001; Kilgos, 2003; Kim, 2004; Penland, 2004; Robertson, 2004). From this body of work we can say with some confidence that we know *what* adult educators do. We know relatively less, however, about *how* adult educators and other stakeholders in the planning process actually negotiate multiple -- and often conflicting -- interests in practice (Mabry, 2000; Yang, 1998). This study focused the efforts to explain both what planners do in their work, and, moreover, how planning stakeholders negotiate to shape and form programs through the planning process. This study was the first to extend the Cervero and Wilson paradigm into the field of

international academic exchange and social work education (Boyle & Cervantes, 2000; Boyle, Nackerud, & Kilpatrick, 1997), and into the context of Mexico, by describing how planners play a crucial role in the development and implementation of international education exchange programs in order to be an effective means through which to advance knowledge and skills, and to implement policy.

Recommendations for future research in this area are a further exploration into the tactics planners use in negotiating at planning tables in development of international academic exchange. In particular, it would be useful to know whether planners adopt different negotiation strategies and tactics both among and between domestic and foreign stakeholder groups.

The study concluded that values and rationales underpin strategies, programs, and policies driving international academic exchange. The finding of this study make a significant contribution to the literatures that attempt to explain approaches to theory, practice, and policy making of the internationalization of higher education (Aigner et al, 1992; Arum & Van de Water, 1992; de Wit, 1995, 2005; Knight, 1994, 1996, 1997, 2005; Qiang, 2003; Yang, 2004), particularly in contexts of the USA and Mexico. The study also explores the values and rationales that underpin the approaches of the international dimension into higher education (Barnet, 1990; Kerr, 1994; Carnoy, 1995; Pennycook, 1996; Knight, 1997, 2005; Welch and Denman, 1997; Yang, 2004; de Witt, 1999, 2005). Moreover, utilizing Cervero and Wilson theory (1994a, 1998, 2001, 2006), the study explores planners' ethical commitments, values, and rationals for the approaches that shaped the academic exchange.

Finally, the fourth implication of this study was that power relations among and between elite stakeholder and researcher pose methodological challenges (McDowell, in Cormode & Hughes, 1999; Bonacich and Appelbaum, 2000; Burawoy, 2000; Dezalay and Garth, 1996,2002; Holmes and Marcus, 2005; Sklair, 1998). This conclusion was obtained primarily from the personal experiences of the researcher in negotiating with elite stakeholders in the study. Given the purpose of the study -- which was to describe how stakeholder negotiations in program planning shaped a social work education academic exchange program -- a significant focus of the study was on stakeholder groups comprised of elites in Mexico and the U.S.A. As an elite, the researcher enjoyed similar social and professional privileges as those being studied, all of whom possessed specialized knowledge about the exchange program. These similar privileges, along with likely perceptions among those being studied about the researcher's interests relative to advancing the exchange, enabled open access to interviewees. In negotiating with the elite interviews, it was a challenge for the researcher to be cognizant of making ethical judgments regarding his capacity to act in the exercise of power at the planning tables. These ethical determinations at times impacted the judgment of the researcher, thus influencing his conduct in performing the study, both positively and negatively. This was of particular concern given the researcher's privileges relative to resource asymmetries between UGA and UV. Moreover, given the cross cultural positionality of the researcher, there were also challenges of maintaining objectivity – both in relation to the host culture, and to his own, due to the influences of culture shock, which work in both directions. This findings of this study have potential to contribute to the methodological literature

that addresses these issues, particularly relating to Mexican research contexts.

REFERENCES

- Almanzor, A. (1967). The profession of social work in the Philippines. In Council on Social Work Education. An intercultural exploration: Universals and differentials in social work values, functions and practice. 123–37. New York: Council on Social Work Education.
- Altbach, P. & Davis, T. (1999). Global challenge and national response: Notes for an international dialog on higher education. In Altbach, P. & Peterson, P. (Eds.), Higher education in the 21st century: Global challenge and national response. (IIE Research Report 29). 3-10.
- Altbach, P., & Kelly, G. (1978). Colonialism and education. London: Longman.
- Altschuler, A. (1965). The city planning process: A political analysis. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Amin, S. (1997). Capitalism in the age of globalization. London: Zed.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Apple, M. (1979). Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (1982). Education and power. London: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (2001). Educating the 'right' way. New York: Routledge.

Arum, S. & Van DeWater, J. (1992) The need for a definition of international education in U.S.A. universities. In: KLASEK, C.B. (Ed.) Bridges to the Future: strategies for internationalising higher education. Carbondale: The AIEA.

Asamoah, Y., Healy, L., & Mayadas, N. (1997). Ending the international-domestic dichotomy: New approaches to a global curriculum for the millennium. Journal of Social Work Education, 33 (2) 389-401.

Babst, I. (2000). Beyond reason and personal integrity: Toward a pedagogy of coercive restraint. Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education. 41 (1), 27-50.

Ball, S. (1990). Politics and policy making in education. London: Routledge.

Ball, S. (1998). Big policies/small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy. Comparative Education, 34 (2) 199-130.

Barnet, R. (1990) The Idea of Higher Education Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Bayart, J. (1993). The state in Africa: The politics of the belly. London: Longman.

Beck, U., Giddens, A., & Lash, S. (1994). Reflexive modernization: Politics, tradition, and aesthetics in the modern social order. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Beeghley, L. (2004). The structure of social stratification in the united states. New York: Pierson.

Blackmore, J. (1999). Localization/globalization and the mid-wife state: strategic dilemmas for state feminists in education. Journal of Education Policy, 14 33-54.

Bogdon, R., & Biklen, S. (1992). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boone, E. (1985). Developing programs in adult education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Bose, A. (1992). Social work in India: Developmental roles for a helping profession. In M. Hokenstad, S. Khinduka & J. Midgley (Eds.) Profiles in international social work, 71–84. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In Richardson, J. (Ed.). Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education. 241-258. New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. (1996). Understanding. Theory, culture, and society. 13 17-37.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, S. (1976). Schooling in capitalist America. London: Routledge.

Boyer, R. & Drache, D. (Eds.). (1996). States against markets. London: Routledge.

Boyle, P. (1981). Planning better programs. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Boyle, D., & Cervantes, B. (2000). The implementation of a sustainable social work exchange program: The University of Georgia and the University of Veracruz. The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 3 (2) 11-23.

Boyle, D., Nackerud, L., Kilpatrick, A. (1999). The road less traveled: Cross-cultural, international, experiential education. International Social Work, 42 (2) 210-214.

Briar, S. & Miller, H. (1971). Problems and issues in social casework. New York: Columbia University Press.

Brown, P., & Lauder, H. (1997). Education, globalization and economic development. In Halsey, A., Lauder, H., Brown, P., & Wells, A. (Eds.). Education, culture, economy, society. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brueggeman, W. (1996). The practice of macro social work. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.

Burgoyne, J. (1994). Stakeholder analysis. In Cassel, C., & Symon, G. (Eds.). Qualitative methods in organizational research. 187-207. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Caffarella, R. (1988). Program development and evaluation resource book for trainers. New York: Wiley.

Carnoy, M. (1972). Schooling in a corporate society: The political economy of education in America. New York: McKay.

Carnoy, M. (1974). Education as cultural imperialism. New York: McKay.

Carnoy, M. (1984). The state and political theory. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Carnoy, M. (1995) Education and the new international division of labour. International Encyclopedia of Economics of Education. Oxford: Pergamon.

Carnoy, M. (1998). Globalization and educational reform. Melbourne Studies in Education, 39 (2) 21-40.

Carnoy, M. & Torres, C. (1994). Educational change and structural adjustment: A case study of Costa Rica. In Samoff, J. (Ed.). Coping with crisis. Austerity, adjustment, and human resources. 64-99.

Carnoy, M., Castells, M.; Cohen, S.; & Cardoso, F., (Eds.). (1993). The new global economy in the information age, Pennsylvania State University Press.

Carton, M., & Tawil, S. (1997). An introduction to the open file. Prospects, 27 19-25.

Castells, M. (1983). The city and the grassroots: A cross-cultural theory of urban social movements. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Castells, M. (1993). Economy and the new international division of labour. In Carnoy, M., Castells, M.; Cohen, S.; & Cardoso, F., (Eds.). The new global economy in the information age. Pennsylvania State University Press.

Castells, M. (1996). The rise of the network society, the information age: Society, economy, and culture, Vol. I. Oxford: Blackwell.

Castells, M. (1997). The power of identity, the information age: Society, economy, and culture, Vol. II. Oxford: Blackwell.

Castells, M. (1997). The end of millennium, the information age: Society, economy, and culture, Vol. III. Oxford: Blackwell.

CEPAL. (Comisión Económica para América Latina) (1996a) 15 años de desempeño económico. Santiago: UN.

CEPAL. (Comisión Económica para América Latina) (1996b) Panorama social. Santiago: UN.

Cervero, R. (1981). Collaboration in university continuing professional education. In Hunt, E. (Ed.). Realizing the potential of interorganizational cooperation. (New Directions for Continuing Education, no. 23). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cervero, R. (1988). Effective continuing education for professionals. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cervero, R. (1992). Professional practice, learning, and continuing education: An integrated perspective. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 11 (2) 91-101.

Cervero, R. (2001). Continuing professional education in transition, 1981-2000. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 20 (1/2) 16-30.

Cervero, R., & Wilson, A. (1994a). Planning responsibly for adult education: A guide to negotiating power and interests. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cervero, R., & Wilson, A. (1994b). The politics of responsibility: A theory of program planning practice for adult education. Adult Education Quarterly, 45, 249-268.

Cervero, R., & Wilson, A. (1996). What really matters in adult education program planning: Lessons in negotiating power and interests. (New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 69). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cervero, R., & Wilson, A. (1998). Working the planning table: The political practice of adult education. Studies in Continuing Education, 20 (1) 5-21.

Cervero, R., & Wilson, A. (2001). Power in practice: Adult education and the struggle for knowledge and power in society. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cervero, R., & Wilson, A. (2006). Working the planning table: Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing, and workplace education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cervero, R., Azzaretto, J., & associates. (Eds.). (1990). Visions for the future of continuing professional education. (The University of Georgia, Georgia Center for Continuing Education).

Chelimsky, E., & Shaddish, W. (Eds.). (1997). Evaluation for the 21st century: A handbook. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Chomsky, N. (1998). Conversation with Carlos Torres, MIT, Massachusetts, Oct. 9. In: Burbules, N. & Torres, C. (Eds.). Globalization and education: Critical perspectives. 38. New York: Routledge.

Colclough, C., & Manor, J. (Eds.). (1991). States or markets? Neo-liberalism and the development policy debate. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. American Journal of Sociology, 94 95-121.

CONAHEC. (Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration). Retrieved April 7, 2002 from the world wide Web: <http://conahec.org>.

Cook, T. & Campbell, D. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Conti, J. & O'Neil, M. (2007). Studying power: Qualitative methods and the global elites. Qualitative Research. 7 (1) 63-82.

Council on Social Work Education. (1967). An intercultural exploration: Universals and differentials in social work values, functions and practice. New York: Council on Social Work Education.

Curry, L., Wergin, J., & Associates. (Eds.). (1993). Educating professionals. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dale, R. (1999). Specifying globalization effects on national policy: A focus on the mechanisms. Journal of Education Policy, 14 1-17.

Deacon, B., Hulse, M. & Stubbs, P. (1997). Global social policy: International organizations and the future of welfare. London: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. (1994). The art and politics of interpretation. In Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). Handbook of qualitative research. 500-515. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Desruisseaux, P. (1999). Foreign students continue to flock to the U.S.A. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 16 (46) 57-59.

de Wit, H. (1999) Changing rationales for the internationalisation of higher education. International Higher Education, 15, pp. 2-3.

Dirlik, A. (1994). The postcolonial aura: Third world criticism in the age of global capitalism. Critical Inquiry, 20 328-356.

Dominelli, L. (1999). Neo-liberalism, social exclusion and welfare clients in a global economy. International Journal of Social Welfare 8(1) 14-22.

Donald, J. (1992). Sentimental education. London: Verso.

Dore, R. (1997). The diploma disease: Education, qualification and development. London: University of London.

Edwards, R. (1994). From a distance? Globalization, space-time compression, and distance education. Journal of Open Learning, 9 9-17.

Eisner, E. & Peshkin, A. (Eds.). (1990). Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate. New York: Teachers College Press.

Elgstrom, O., & Riis, U. (1992). Framed negotiations and negotiated frames. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 36 (2) 99-120.

Else, J. & Raheim, S. (1992). AFDC clients as entrepreneurs: Self-employment offers an important option, Public Welfare 50(4) 36–41.

Estes, R. (1992). Internationalizing social work education: A guide to resources for a new century. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work.

Etzioni, A. (1968). The active society, a theory of societal and political processes. New York: Free Press.

Firestone, W. (1993). Alternative arguments to generalizing from data as applied to qualitative research. Educational Researcher, 22 (4) 16-23.

Flores, G., & Lankshear, C. (2000). Facing NAFTA: Literacy and work in Mexico. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 44 (3) 240-245.

Flexner, A. (1915). Is social work a profession? School and Society, 1 901-911.

Flyvberg, B. (1996). Rationality and power. Aldershot: Avebury.

Forester, J. (1989). Planning in the face of power. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Forester, J. (1999). The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977. (Colin Gordon, Ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Fox, J. (2000). Assessing civil society coalitions: Lessons from the Mexico – U.S.A. experience. (Chicano/Latino Research Center, Working Paper No. 26). Santa Cruz: University of California Press.

Freire, P. (1997). Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessários a prática educativa. Sao Paulo: Paz e Terra.

Friedlander, W. (1955). Introduction to social welfare. New York: Prentice Hall.

Friedlander, W., (Ed.). (1958). Concepts and methods of social work. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Friedlander, W. (1975). International social welfare. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Fritzell, C. (1987). On the concept of relative autonomy in educational theory. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 8 23-36.

Fuentes, C., (2005). A New Time for Mexico. University of California Press, Berekley.

Gacel-Ávila, J. (1999). Internacionalización de la educación superior en América Latina y el Caribe: Reflexiones y lineamientos. México: Organización Universitaria Interamericana.

Gacel-Ávila, J. (2005). The internationalization of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. Journal of Studies of International Education, 9(2) 121-136.

Georgia. (n.d.). Crystal Reference Encyclopedia. Retrieved June 18, 2007, from Reference.com website: <http://www.reference.com/browse/crystal/13231>

Gibbons, M. (1998). Higher education relevance in the 21st century. UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education, Paris, France.

Giddens, A. (1990). The consequences of modernity. Cambridge: Cambridge Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1992). In Hall, S., Held, D., & McGrew, T. Modernity and its futures. p. 66. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goodman, A. (1999). Preface. In Altbach, P. & Peterson, P. (Eds.), Higher education in the 21st century: Global challenge and national response. (IIE Research Report 29). v-vii.

Gray, M. (1996). Promoting social development through community social work. Journal of Applied Social Sciences 21(1) 45–52.

Grant, J. (1994). The drama of democracy: Contention and dispute in community planning. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Green, A. (1997). Education, globalization and the nation state. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Green, J. (1990). Knowledge accumulation? Three views on the nature and role of knowledge in social science. In Guba, E. (Ed.). The paradigm dialog. Newbury Park: Sage.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park: Sage.

Habermas, J. (1990). Discourse ethics: Notes on a program of philosophical justification. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Hall, S. (1992). New ethnicities. In Donald, J., & Rattansi, A. (Eds.). Race, culture, and difference. London: Sage.

Hall, S. (1996). When was the post-colonial? Thinking at the limit. In Chamber, I. & Curtis, L. (Eds.). The post-colonial question: Common skies, divided horizons. London: Routledge.

Hall, S., Held, D., & McGrew, T. (1992) Modernity and its futures. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Harvey, N. (1996). Rural reforms and the Zapatista rebellion: Chiapas, 1988-1995. In Otero, G. (Ed.), Neoliberalism revisited: Economic restructuring and Mexico's political future. p. 188. Boulder: Westview.

Harvey, D. (1989). The condition of postmodernity. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (1992). In Hall, S., Held, D., & McGrew, T. Modernity and its futures. p. 67. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Healy, L. (1995). Comparative and international overview. In T. Watts, D. Elliott & N. Mayadas (Eds.). International handbook on social work education. 421-40.

Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldbaltt, D. & Perraton, J. (1999). Global transformations: Politics, economics, culture. Cambridge: Polity.

Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F., & Taylor, S. (1999). Working with/against globalization in education. Journal of Education Policy, 14 85-97.

Herod, A. (1999). Reflections on interviewing foreign elites: Praxis, positionality, validity, and the cult of the insider. In Hughes, A., & Cormode, L. (Eds.). Networks, cultures, and elite research: The economic geographer as situated researchers. Geoforum (Special Issue), 30 (4) 313-328.

Herod, A., Ó Tuathail, G., & Roberts, S. (1998). An unruly world? Globalization, governance and geography. London: Routledge.

Hirst, P. & Thompson, G. (1996). Globalization in question. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hokenstad, M. & Kendall, K. (1995). International social work education. In National Association of Social Workers. Encyclopedia of social work, 1511–20. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Hokenstad, M., Khinduka, S., & Midgley, J. (1992). The world of international social work. In M. Hokenstad, S. Khinduka & J. Midgley (Eds.). Profiles in international social work 1–10. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Hokenstad, M. & Midgley, J. (1997). Realities of global interdependence. In M. Hokenstad & J. Midgley (Eds.). Issues in international social work. 1–11. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Hoogvelt, A. (1997). Globalisation and the postcolonial world: The new political economy of development. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Houle, C. (1980). Continuing learning in the professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hughes, A. & Cormode, L. (1999). The economic geographer as situated researcher of elites. Geoforum, 30 (4) 299-300.

Ife, J. (1998). Globalization, internationalization and community services: Implications for policy and practice. The Journal of Applied Social Science 23(1) 43–56.

Ilon, L. (1994). Structural adjustment and education: Adapting to a growing global market. International Journal of Educational Development, 14 95-108.

Jarvis, P. (1999). The practitioner-researcher: Developing theory from practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jimenez, M. & Alwyn, N. (1992). Social work in Chile: Support for the struggle for justice in Latin America. In M. Hokenstad, S. Khinduka & J. Midgley (Eds.) Profiles in International Social Work. 29–41. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Johnson, P. (1999). A history of the american people. New York: Harper Perennial.

Jones, B. (1995). Globalisation and interdependence in the international political economy. London: Pinter Publishers.

Jones, P. (1998). Globalisation and internationalism: Democratic prospects for world education. Comparative Education, 34 (2) 143-155.

Katz, J. (1983). A theory of qualitative methodology: The social system of analytic fieldwork. In Emerson, R. (Ed.). Contemporary field research: A collection of readings. 127-148. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.

Kellner, D. (2001). Globalization and new social movements: Lessons for critical theory and pedagogy. In: Burbules, N. & Torres, C. (Eds). Globalization and education: Critical perspectives. 299-322. New York: Routledge.

Kendall, K. (1974). Foreword. In P. Stickney & R. Resnick (Eds.). World guide to social work education. i–v. New York: International Association of Schools of Social Work.

Kendall, K. (1995). Foreword. In T. Watts, D. Elliott & N. Mayadas (Eds.) International handbook on social work education. xiii–xvii. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Kenway, J. (1996). The information super-highway and post-modernity: The social promise and the social price. Comparative Education, 32 217-232.

Kerr, C. (1994) Higher Education Cannot Escape History: Issues for the Twenty-First Century. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Khinduka, S. (1971). Social work in the Third World. Social Service Review 45(1) 62–73.

Kilgos, E. (2003). Stakeholders perspectives on the importance of s.c.a.n.s. For adult literacy curriculum. University of Georgia.

Kim, H., (2004). The politics of evaluation for human resource development: A stakeholder perspective. University of Georgia.

Knight, J. & de Wit, H. (1995) Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: historical and conceptual perspectives. In: de Wit, H. (Ed.) Strategies for

Internationalisation: a comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America. Amsterdam: The EAIE.

Knight, J. & de Wit, H. (Eds) (1997) Internationalisation of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries. Amsterdam: EAIE.

Knight, J. (1997) Internationalisation of higher education: a conceptual framework. In: Knight, J. & de Wit, H. (Eds) Internationalisation of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries. Amsterdam: EAIE.

Knight, J. (2001). Internacionalización de la educación superior [Internationalisation of higher education]. In Calidad e internacionalización de la educación superior. México City, México: Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Knight, J. & de Wit, H. (Eds) (1999) Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education. Paris:OECD.

Knox, A. (2000). The continuum of professional education and practice. In Mott, V., & Daley, B. (Eds.). Charting a course for continuing professional education: Reframing professional practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krauze, Enrique (1998). Mexico: Biography of Power: A history of Modern Mexico 1810–1996. Perennial. ISBN 0-06-092917-0.

Kress, G. (1996). Internationalisation and globalisation: Rethinking a curriculum of communication. Comparative Education, 33 (2) 185-196.

Krumholz, N., & Forester, J. (1990). Making equity planning work: Leadership in the public sector. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Kushigian, J. (1998). International studies in the next millennium: Meeting the challenges of globalization. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Larson, M. (1977). The rise of professionalism. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lasch, C. (1995). The revolt of the elites and the betrayal of democracy. London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Laurell, A. (2000). Structural adjustment and the globalization of social policy in Latin America. International Sociology, 15 (2) 306-325.
- Lax, D., & Sebenius, J. (1986). The manager as negotiator: Bargaining for cooperation and competitive gain. New York: Free Press.
- Lindblom, C., & Cohen, D. (1979). Usable Knowledge. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Livermore, M. (1996). Social work, social development and microenterprises: Techniques and issues for implementation. Journal of Applied Social Sciences 21(1) 37–46.
- Lowe, G. & Reid, N. (Eds.). (1999). The professionalization of poverty: Social work and the poor in the twentieth century. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Lum, D. (1996). Social work practice with people of color. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Mabry, C. (2000). Negotiating power and interests in program planning for adult education: Multiple interviews with adult educators at a large, multi-national corporation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh.

- MacEwan, A. (1994). Notes on U.S.A. foreign investment in Latin America. Monthly Review, 45, 4–16.
- Marginson, S. (1999). After globalization: Emerging politics of education. Journal of Education Policy, 14 19-31.
- Maruatona, T., (2001). Literacy for what?: A critical analysis for planning for the Botswana national literacy program. University of Georgia.
- Mazibuko, F., McKendrick, B. & Patel, L. (1992). Social work in South Africa: Coping with apartheid and change', in M. Hokenstad, S. Khinduka & J. Midgley (Eds.) Profiles in international social work. 115–28. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Mazrui, A. (1978). Political values and the educated class in Africa. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Merriam, S. (1998) Case study research in education (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mexico. (n.d.). Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia. Retrieved June 18, 2007, from Reference.com website: <http://www.reference.com/browse/columbia/Mexico>
- Mexico. (n.d.). Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia. Retrieved June 18, 2007, from Reference.com website: <http://www.reference.com/browse/columbia/Mexico>
- Meyer, J., Ramirez, F., Rubinson, R., & Boli-Bennett, J. (1977). The world educational revolution: 1950-1970. Sociology of Education, 50 (4) 242-258.
- McClafferty, K., Torres, C., & Mitchell, T. (Eds.). (2001). Challenges of urban education: Sociological perspectives for the next century. New York: SUNY Press.

McGuire, C. (1993). Sociocultural changes affecting professions and professionals. In Curry, L., Wergin, J., & Associates. (Eds.). (1993). Educating professionals. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, Michael C.; William H. Beezley, editors (2000). The Oxford History of Mexico. Oxford University Press.

Midgley, J. (1981). Professional imperialism: Social work in the Third World. London: Heinemann.

Midgley, J. (1989). Social work in the Third World: Crisis and response. In P. Carter, T. Jeffs & M. Smith (Eds.) Social work and social welfare yearbook. 33–45. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Midgley, J. (1990). International social work: Learning from the Third World. Social Work 35(4) 295–301.

Midgley, J. (1992). The challenge of international social work. In M. Hokenstad, S. K. Khinduka & J. Midgley (Eds.) Profiles in international social work. 13–28. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Midgley, J. (1993). Promoting a development focus in the community organization curriculum: Relevance of the African experience. Journal of Social Work Education 29(3) 269–78.

Midgley, J. (1994). Transnational strategies for social work: Towards effective reciprocal exchanges. In R. Meinert, T. Pardeck & P. Sullivan (Eds.) Issues in social work: A critical analysis. 165–80. Westport, CT: Auburn House.

Midgley, J. (1997a). Social welfare in global context. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Midgley, J. (1997b). Social work and international social development: Promoting a developmental perspective in the profession. In M. Hokenstad & J. Midgley (Eds.) Issues in International social work. 11–26. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Midgley, J. (2001). Issues in international social work: Resolving critical debates in the profession. Journal of Social Work, 1 (1) 21-35.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Newbury Park: Sage.

Mills, D., Cervero, R., Langone, C., & Wilson. (1995). The impact of interests, power relationships, and organizational structure on program planning practice: a case study. Adult Education Quarterly, 46 (1) 1-16.

Minatitlán, Veracruz. (n.d.). Wikipedia. Retrieved June 18, 2007, from Answers.com Web site: <http://www.answers.com/topic/minatitl-n-veracruz>

Minatitlán. (2007). In Britannica Concise Encyclopedia. Retrieved June 18, 2007, from Encyclopedia Britannica Online: <http://geoanalyzer.britannica.com/ebc/article-9052807>

Mishra, R. (1999). Globalization and the welfare state. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Mitroff, I. (1983). Stakeholders of the organizational mind. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morrow, R. & Torres, C. (2000). The state, globalization, and educational policy. In: Burbules, N. & Torres, C. (Eds). Globalization and education: Critical perspectives. 27-56. New York: Routledge.

Mullings, B. (1999). Insider or outsider, both or neither: Some dilemmas of interviewing in a cross-cultural setting. In Hughes, A., & Cormode, L. (Eds.). Networks, cultures, and elite research: The economic geographer as situated researchers. Geoforum (Special Issue), 30 (4) 337-350.

Nagpaul, H. (1972). The diffusion of American social work education to India', International Social Work 15(1) 13–17.

Nagy, G. & Falk, D. (2000). Dilemmas in international and cross-cultural social work. International Social Work 43(1) 49–60.

Navarro, V. (1998). Neoliberalism, “globalization”, unemployment, inequalities, and the welfare state. International Journal of Health Services, 28 (4) 607-82.

Nowlan, P. (1988). A new approach for continuing education for business and the professions. Tappan: Macmillan.

Oakley, A. (1991). Interviewing women. In Roberts, H. (Ed.). Doing feminist research. 30-61. London: Routledge.

OECD. (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). (1994). Reviews of national science and technology policy: Mexico. Paris: Author.

Ohmae, K. (1995). The end of the nation state. New York: Free Press.

Oinas, P. (1999). Voices and silences: The problem of access to embeddedness. In Hughes, A., & Cormode, L. (Eds.). Networks, cultures, and elite research: The economic geographer as situated researchers. Geoforum (Special Issue), 30 (4) 351-362.

Otis, J. (1986). The transferability of western social work education across national and cultural boundaries: Fact or fiction?' Journal of International and Comparative Social Welfare 2(1,2) 37-45.

Parkes, Henry Bamford (1972). A History of Mexico. 3rd edition, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Patton, M. (1996). Utilization-focused evaluation (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Pena, D. (1997). The terror of the machine: Work, gender, & ecology on the U.S.A. – Mexico border. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Penland, J., (2004). The impact of intercultural factors on the planning of theological education in the Dominican Republic. University of Georgia.

Pennycook, A. (1996) English, universities, and struggles over culture and knowledge. In:Hayhoe, R. & Pan, J. (Eds) East-West Dialogue in Knowledge and Higher Education. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Poole, D. (1996). NAFTA, Mexican health, and American health: They tie together. Health & Social Work, 21 3-7.

Popkewitz, T. (1991). A political sociology of educational reform: Power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education, and research. New York: Teachers College Press.

Popkewitz, T., & Brennan, M. (Eds.). (1998). Foucault's challenge: Discourse, knowledge, and power in education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Portes, A., & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants. American Journal of Sociology, 98 1320-1350.

Poza Rica. (2007). In Britannica Concise Encyclopedia. Retrieved June, 18, 2007, from Encyclopedia Britannica Online: <http://geoanalyzer.britannica.com/ebc/article-9061149>

Poza Rica de Hidalgo. (n.d.). Wikipedia. Retrieved June 18, 2007, from Answers.com Web site: <http://www.answers.com/topic/poza-rica-de-hidalgo>

Preston, J., & Dillon, S. (2005). Opening Mexico: The Making of a Democracy. Douglas & McIntyre.

Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of Higher Education: towards a conceptual framework. Policy Futures in Education, 1(2) 248-270.

Queeney, D. (1996). Continuing professional education. In Craig, R. (Ed.). ASTD training and development handbook. New York: McGraw Hill.

Queeney, D. (1997). Redefining competency from a systems perspective for the 21st century. Continuing Higher Education Review, 61 3-11.

Resnick, R. (1976). Conscientization: An indigenous approach to international social work. International Social Work 19(2) 21-9.

Riddle, A. (1996). Globalization: Emasculation or opportunity for educational planning? World Development, 24 1357-1372.

Robertson, M., (2004). Building program theory for evaluation: The process through a political lens. University of Georgia.

Robertson, R. (1992). Globalization. London: Sage Publications.

Roloff, N, & Miller, G. (1980). Persuasion: New directions in theory and research. Beverley Hills: Sage.

Rossman, G., & Rallis, S. (1998). Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Sadler, E. & Gentili, P. (1995). Pósneoliberalismo. Las políticas sociais e o estado democrático. Sao Paulo: Paz e Terra.

Salt, B. (1999). Worker education's responses to globalization: International experts speak. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.

Samoff, J. (Ed.). (1994). Coping with crisis: austerity, adjustment, and human resources. London: Cassell.

Sanders, D. & Pedersen, P. (Eds). (1984). Education for International Social Welfare. Manoa, HI: University of Hawaii School of Social Work.

Sassen, S. (2000). Spatialities and temporalities of the global: Elements for a theorization, in Appadurai, A. (ed.), Globalisation, Special Edition of Public Culture 12(1), 215–232.

Sayer, A. (1985). Industry and space: A sympathetic critique of radical research. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 3 3-29.

Schon, D. (1971). Beyond the stable state: Public and private learning in a changing society. London: Maurice Temple Smith.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design of teaching and learning in the professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schwartzman, S. (1999). Latin America: National responses to world challenges in higher education. In Altbach, P. & Peterson, P. (Eds.), Higher education in the 21st century: global challenge and national response. (IIE Research Report 29). 47-58.

Shawkey, A. (1972). Social work education in Africa', International Social Work 15(1) 3–16.

Sklair, L. (1991). Sociology of the global system. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sklair, L. (1998). Competing conceptions of globalisation, World Congress of Sociology. Montreal.

Smith, M. (1982). Persuasion and human action: A review and critique of social influence theories. Belmont: Wadworth.

Sork, T. (1996). Negotiating power and interests in planning. In Cervero, R. & Wilson, A. (1996). What really matters in adult education program planning: Lessons in negotiating power and interests. 81-90. (New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 69). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sork, T. (2000). Planning educational programs. In Wilson, A. & Hayes, E. (Eds.). Handbook of Adult Education. 171-190. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sork, T., & Buskey, J. (1986). A descriptive and evaluative analysis of program planning literature, 1950-1983. Adult Education Quarterly, 36 86-96.

Sork, T., & Caffarella, R. (1989). Planning programs for adults. In Merriam, S., & Cunningham, P. (Eds.). Handbook of Adult and Continuing Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Specht, H. & Courtney, M. (1994). Unfaithful angels: How social work has abandoned its mission. New York: Free Press.

Spybey, T. (1996) Globalisation and World Society. Cambridge, MA: Polity.

Stewart, F. (1996). Globalisation and education. International Journal of Educational Development, 16 327-333.

Strange, S. (1996). The defeat of the state: The diffusion of power in the world economy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. (1987). Qualitative analysis for social scientists. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stromquist, Nelly. (2007) Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. Higher Education 53: 81–105.

Suskind, L., & Cruikshank, J. (1987). Consensus approaches to resolving public disputes. New York: Basic Books.

Susser, I., & Patterson, C. (2001). Cultural Diversity in the United States: A Critical Reader. (Eds.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers

Swyngedouw, Erik. (1996). Neither global nor local: Glocalization and the politics of scale. In Cox, K., The global and the local: Making the connections. New York: Guilford.

Taylor, S., Rizvi, F., Lingard, R., & Henry, M. (1996). Education policy and the politics of change. London: Routledge.

Tikly, L. (1999). Postcolonialism and comparative education. International Review of Education, 45 603-21.

Tikly, L. (2001). Globalisation and education in the postcolonial world: Towards a conceptual framework. Comparative Education, 37 (2) 151-71.

Tilak, J. (1997). The effects of adjustment on education: a review of the Asian experience. Prospects, 27 85-108.

Tolor, A. (Ed.). (1985). Effective interviewing. Springfield: Charles Thomas.

Torres, B. (1997). La cuestión del medio ambiente en la agenda bilateral (1991-1992). In Vegacanovas, G. (Ed.). México – Estados Unidos – Canadá, 1995 – 1996. México: Colegio de México.

Torres, C. (1990). The politics of nonformal education in Latin America. New York: Praeger.

Torres, C., & Schugurensky, D. (1997). Globalización, neoliberalismo, y educación superior. Revista chilena de humanidades, 17 37-46.

Tyler, R. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Umble, K. (1998). Negotiation of power and interests in continuing education program planning: A case study from public health. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.

Umble, K., Cervero, R., & Langone, C. (2001). Negotiating about power, frames, and continuing education: a case study in public health. Adult Education quarterly, 51 (2) 128-145.

United Nations (1950). Training for social work: An international survey. New York.

U.S.A. Department of State Dispatch. (Vol. 6, Issue 21).

United States. (n.d.). Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. Retrieved June 18, 2007, from Reference.com website: http://www.reference.com/browse/wiki/United_States

Usher, R. & Edwards, R. (1994). Postmodernism and education: Different voices, different worlds. London: Routledge.

Valenzuela, J. (1991). Crítica del Modelo Neoliberal. Mexico DF: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Vellinga, M. (Ed.). (1997). El cambio del papel del estado en américa latina. México DF: Siglo XXI.

Veracruz. (n.d.). The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia, Sixth Edition. Retrieved June 18, 2007, from Answers.com Web site: <http://www.answers.com/topic/veracruz-state-mexico>

Vilas, C. (1995). Estado y políticas sociales despues del ajuste. Caracas: Nueva Sociedad.

Wagner, A. (1997). Social work and the global economy. In M. Hokenstad & J. Midgley (Eds.). Issues in international social work. 45–65. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Walton, R. & El Nasr, A. (1988). Indigenization and authentization in terms of social work in Egypt. International Social Work 31(2) 135–44.

Ward, K., & Jones, M. (1999). Researching local elites: Reflexivity, ‘situatedness’ and political-temporal contingency. In Hughes, A., & Cormode, L. (Eds.). Networks, cultures, and elite research: The economic geographer as situated researchers. Geoforum (Special Issue), 30 (4) 301-312.

Weiss, C. (1998). Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Welch, A.R. & Denman, B. (1997) Internationalisation of higher education: retrospect and prospect. Forum of Education, 52(1), pp. 14–29.

Wells, A., & Oakes, J. (1998). Tracking, detracking, and the politics of educational reform. In Torres, C., & Mitchell, T. (Eds.). Sociology of education: Emerging perspectives. New York: SUNY Press.

White, B. (1996). Talk about school: Education and the colonial project in French and British West Africa. Comparative Education, 29 9-25.

Wijewardena, G. (1967). Humanism and the values of social work in Asia. In Council on Social Work Education. An intercultural exploration: Universals and differentials in social work values, functions and practice. 112–22. New York: Council on Social Work Education.

Wilson, A. (2000). Professional practice in the modern world. In Mott, V. & Daley, B. (Eds.). Charting a course for continuing professional education: Reframing professional practice. (New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, no. 86, Summer 2000).

Wilson, A. & Cervero, R. (1997). The song remains the same: The selective tradition of technical rationality in adult education program planning theory. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 16 84-108.

Yang, B. (1998). Development and validation of an instrument to measure adult educator's power and influence tactics in program planning practice. Adult Education quarterly, 48 (4) 227-243.

Yang, R. (2004). Openness and reform as dynamics for development: A case study of internationalisation at South China University of Technology. Higher Education 47: 473–500.

Yin, R. (1993). Applications of case study research. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Yin, R. (1994). Case study research design: Design and methods. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

APPENDIX A

Case Study Stakeholders, University of Veracruz

Administration, University of Veracruz, Xalapa

Office of the President - Dr. Marco Pardo, Rector

Area of Humanities - Dr. Miguel Alba, Director

Area of Humanities, Institute of Social Historical Research - Jose Cuevas

School for Foreign Students - Matilde Cabrera, Director

School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Minatitlán

Maria Davila, Director and Dean

Francisco Fernandez, Teacher (full-time)

Berta Nieto, Teacher (full-time)

Patricia Romero, Student, School of Social Work, Minatitlán

School of Social Work, University of Veracruz, Poza Rica

Monica Zamora, Director and Dean

Ruth Palmero, Teacher (full-time)

Luz Sanchez, Student

Gloria Gutierrez, Student

APPENDIX B

Case Study Stakeholders, University of Georgia

Administration, University of Georgia, Athens

Office of the President - Dr. Michael Dawn

Office of International Development, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. George O. Z. Zykes, Director

Jane Francis, Assistant Director

Dr. Q. Harold Drucker, (Retired) Director

Office of International Education, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Michael Lawrence, (Former) Associate Provost

Dr. Franco Villareal, (Former) Director

Dr. Roscoe Riding, (Retired) Director

Dr. Mark Zunk, (Retired) Associate Provost

Office of Public Service and Outreach, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Benjamin (Ben) Williams, Vice-President

Dr. Gerald (Jerry) Schultz, (Retired) Vice-President

School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens

Dr. Gertrude Young, (Former) Dean

Dr. Craig Sampson, (Retired) Dean Emeritus

Dr. Jon Walters, (Former) Consultant

Dr. Daniel Brown, (Former) Associate Professor

Dr. Zachary Cohen, (Former) Associate Professor

Dr. Douglas Golay, (Retired) Professor Emeritus

Dr. Robert Hendricks, Professor

Dr. Gilroy Nance, Associate Professor

Dr. Michelle Sanders, (Former) Assistant Professor

Dr. Alice Thomas, (Retired) Professor Emeritus

Jenifer (Jenny) Chambers, Student

Anthony (Tony) Erving, Student

Deborah (Deb) Adair, Student

Maria (Mary) Torres, Student