Voices from the Field
Locating Community Action Outreach Projects in the Scholarship of Media Literacy Pedagogy

Heather Crandall
Gonzaga University

Abstract

This paper compares frameworks in recent critical media literacy scholarship with trends found in eight semesters of media literacy community action outreach assignments to explore how these frameworks can function as curricular tools for media literacy practitioners. Besides potential tools for media literacy pedagogy, this examination of recent literature uncovers new considerations and directions for the field of media literacy education. These include tensions present in the practice of teaching from a critical perspective, observations about student use of newer technologies for social change, and concerns to include in critical media literacy literature.

Keywords: *media literacy, community action outreach projects, critical media literacy pedagogy, graduate students*

For over five years I have taught a graduate level media literacy elective where the final assignment requires students to design and implement a community action outreach projects. Specifically, students reflect on their media literacy education, their values, and what kind of media literacy community action they consider both important and possible within a semester. Recent scholarship on media literacy pedagogy could serve as a useful way to assess the community action outreach assignment. Kellner and Share (2007), whose goals are to improve democracy and reconstruct education, have worked out a Critical Media Literacy (CML) framework to help media educators. Hobbs and Jensen (2009) offer tools and questions as they trace the past, present, and future of the field of media literacy education (MLE) for the *Journal of Media Literacy Education*. Mihailidis and Thevenin (2013) offer a model of MLE to improve engaged

citizenship in a rising participatory democracy. The goal of this exploration is to compare recent MLE frameworks against eight semesters of community action outreach assignments to discover how these frameworks function as tools for media literacy practitioners. Besides potential tools for MLE pedagogy, using recent MLE literature may refine these frameworks and uncover new arguments and directions for the field of MLE.

Media Literacy and Critical Media Literacy Pedagogy

According to Kellner and Share (2007), "The twenty-first century is a media saturated, technologically dependent, and globally connected world," and U.S. media education has not kept pace with this changing context. As a remedy, Kellner and Share (2007) develop CML. In their article, they first describe common and competing approaches in MLE and then use those to build a much-needed "transformative pedagogy" where students can explore the "interconnections of media, cultural studies, and critical pedagogy" to expand literacy. If the pedagogy they propose is integrated across all grades, the outcome is "a reconstruction and democratization of education and society" (p. 4). Their CML conceptual framework emerges from feminist and standpoint theorists and cultural studies with its roots in inquiry about media's role in social control. Kellner and Share (2007) built CML out of the shortcomings of three common approaches to MLE: the protectionist approach, the media arts education approach, and the media literacy movement. They describe protectionism's goals are inoculating students against the addictive and manipulative content of mass media. Protectionism's problems include an anti-media bias that lacks avenues of empowerment and a tendency toward decontextualization. Kellner and Share (2007) describe the media arts education approach as centrally about identifying aesthetic qualities in media and arts and teaching students how to create their own. Problems with this approach, in their assessment, are rooted in the assumption that teachers are focused on individuals rather than the collective and that students could emerge from this type of education without consciousness of "ideological implications or any type of social critique" (p. 7). Finally, Kellner and Share (2007) describe the media literacy movement approach where students learn a neutral set of communication competencies involved in analyzing, evaluating, accessing and communicating about traditional and new media technologies. The problem they identify with the media literacy movement approach is that it does not go far enough. This approach, they argue, will not result in an interrogation of the ways meanings and media maintain power and therefore will not achieve a "democratic reconstruction of education and society" (p. 7). These problems are mitigated in a CML approach. Kellner and Share's (2007) CML is constituted with "ideology critique and analyzing the politics of representation of crucial dimensions of gender, race, class, and sexuality; incorporating alternative media production; and expanding textual analysis to include issues of social context, control, and pleasure" (p. 8). They describe all four MLE approaches as "not rigid pedagogical models, but they are rather interpretive reference points from which educators can frame their concerns and strategies" (p. 9). This exploration takes up their invitation to use these as

"interpretive references points" along with Hobbs and Jensen's (2009) work and Mihailidis and Thevenin's (2013) work.

In the introduction of the inaugural issue of the *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, Hobbs and Jensen (2009) trace the past, present, and future of the field with an eye toward indexing some common understanding, uniting some diverging areas in the field of media literacy education, and identifying some goals for MLE's future. On the present state of MLE, Hobbs and Jensen (2009) express a concern that the excitement over newer technological tools of the Internet and digital media likely distracts scholars and educators from the more "sober topics" of media literacy – "advertising and consumerism; the quality of news and journalism; media ownership and consolidation; media violence and behavior; the representation of gender, class, and race; and media's impact on public health and well being" (p. 5). Considering the future of MLE, Hobbs and Jensen (2009) refer to *The Core Principles of Media Literacy Education* document that serves as a pedagogical model because it is time to look at how MLE is taught. These core principles, they offer, can support educators who are "formulating, creating, refining, and testing curriculum theory and instructional methods, practices, and pedagogy in ways that connect students' experience with mass media, popular culture, and digital media, supporting the development of their critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and communication skills" (p. 7). It is in Hobbs and Jensen's (2009) concern over newer technological tools distracting scholars and educators and in their call to examine how MLE is taught, that an examination of community action outreach assignments over a considerable length of time can yield some answers and insights.

Finally, recognizing that citizenship practices have broadened and changed with the emergence of digital media, Mihailidis and Thevenin (2013) make an argument for a pedagogical tool for media literacy educators. Their tool has three educational outcomes that fit nicely with our students' community action outreach projects. These are to produce "*critical thinkers, creators and communicators, and agents of social change* – that position media literacy as developing core competencies for engaged citizenship in a participatory democracy" (emphasis in original, p. 4). Therefore, there is a mutual benefit to include their model in this inquiry. Together, these three MLE models and concerns are compared with trends from media literacy community action outreach assignments over eight semesters.

Community Action Outreach

To begin with some context is to explain the course, the prerequisites, the program, and the university's ethos. The course is titled "Seminar in Media Literacy." It is a graduate level elective in an MA-only program in communication and leadership studies at a Jesuit university. The MA program is 30 credits in either campus or online courses, and students can choose the media literacy elective after taking their two required courses. One prerequisite is Theorizing Communication wherein students complete a number of readings, discussions and assignments to achieve that course's competencies. The other required course relevant to media literacy is a practicum. The practicum is a skills

intensive course in public speaking, writing, and multi-media. In it, students complete a multi-media project that combines speaking and writing to improve their skills. Relevant to media literacy, then, I can expect students are familiar with theories in rhetoric, cultural studies, semiotics, media ecology, agenda setting, framing, cultivation, standpoint theory, and the spiral of silence. It also means they have basic skills, and perhaps more advanced, with multi-media tools. The Seminar in Media Literacy course uses James W. Potter's (2013) *Media Literacy* text*,* Neil Postman's (1987) book, *Amusing Ourselves to Death,* McLuhan & Fiore's (1967) book, *The Medium is the Massage*, and Ray Bradbury's book, *Fahrenheit 451.* Required videos include*:* James Burke, *The Day the Universe Changed*, Episodes 1 -5 on YouTube, *Dreamworlds III*, George Gerbner's, "*The Killing Screens*", and Robert McChesney's, *Rich Media: Poor Democracy*.

The course is structured in four sections that roughly follow areas in Potter's (2013) textbook, *Media Literacy,* which include these themes: What media literacy is, what it means to be media literate, and what is at stake in not being media literate. In the second section of the course, students use a media ecology perspective to separate medium from content. Students also begin to engage the required videos that foster a critical perspective on the relationship between media effects, media content, and media industry.

For the final project, students design a media literacy community action outreach project on an area of media literacy they feel strongly about. In the context of a Jesuit education, where the value of getting an education is for self *and* other, where social change for improving society is built into curriculum design or implementation, the community action outreach project is appropriate. It asks that media literacy students take an aspect of what they learn and share it with others to make society better. The instructor, course textbook and course materials help students locate the area of media literacy that interests them most. For example, Potter (2013) has accessible overviews of media and children, news, entertainment, advertising, interactive and social media, privacy, piracy, violence, and sports. These topics complement the video's topics of politics, gender, cultivation theory, and cultural values. In all, the community action outreach project has students develop a project to present to an audience of their choice with clear outcome goals in mind. The contours of the project are in line with the four design characteristics Potter (2010) identified from media literacy effects literature: a change agent, a target audience, content, and an expected outcome. Students are given a range of example projects to spark their imagination. Students submit a proposal to the instructor and their peers. The instructor then works with each student to refine the design and implementation phases of the project. Peers voluntarily offer observations and resources. In addition to the outreach projects, students write a paper to illustrate the theoretical underpinning of their project design. At the term's end, students also share a reflection and a self-critique with each other in the online environment.

In reflecting on the course, I examined the corpus of 147 student-designed community action outreach assignment over eight semesters and spanning the years 2008-2012 and 2015. One observation reveals that the majority of students

choose one kind of change over others. Another observation has to do with the way students choose to use newer technologies. This self-assessment also gives rise to a new opportunity to add to the assignment's design.

In terms of the first observation, students choose to make change within their interpersonal spheres of influence. Potter describes two avenues to increase the media literacy levels of others. These avenues are interpersonal techniques and societal techniques. Interpersonal techniques occur on a one-on-one level and are "small-scale opportunities to help others" whereas societal techniques occur at large, institutional levels, be they media industries, school systems, or other large structures (Potter, 2013, p. 410). Our media literacy students engage their social change efforts at the interpersonal level. For example, 71 projects were presentations to specific groups of people the students were connected with in community or in their organizations such as presentations to high school students, presentations to transgendered support groups, presentations to mothers of preschoolers, and presentations to the Rotary Club. 18 projects were film or television viewing and discussions. Examples include watching a Media Education Foundation film or a set of advertisements as a group and then having a structured discussion afterward. 15 projects were lessons and training. Examples of these include: a workshop for Pakistani children, or a 5-day curriculum for middle school students. Also on the interpersonal level, seven projects were targeted informational brochures. Five projects involved gathering people to create media, which is one way to improve media literacy. Six projects were multiple projects in one. For example one student designed hers as a three-day media literacy seminar and a series of opinion pieces in the local news outlets, and a YouTube blog. These multi-projects account for some variation in the whole number of general trends of the projects. In all, interpersonal techniques with this variety comprised 107 of the 147 community action outreach projects.

At the societal level, 12 projects were students writing media literacy awareness articles for newspapers. Examples include: an article about the importance of media literacy in the *Atlanta Constitution Journal*, or an article about stereotypes and mass media in a Hispanic newspaper. Four projects involved outreach by joining and monitoring the media or search engines. Finally, four projects involved pressuring politicians to support issues relevant to media literacy through letter writing.

In examining the variety of student project, I found that only 15 projects used new technologies. This small number may be what Hobbs and Jensen (2009) describe as a disconnect between the way youth and adults use the Internet. This disconnect can lead to a situation where adult educators, assuming youth are more active and tech-savvy then they are, "launch their students into a media production project, [wrongly] believing students to be more familiar with the use of digital media" (p. 6). The community action outreach projects also confirm this disconnect. Students design the delivery of their projects, yet rarely choose media production projects, even though our students are required to take a multi-media practicum course, and I can expect they have some of these basic skills.

To consider student projects chronologically, early projects to most recent, is to see that recent projects do make more use of new technologies like blogs,

websites, and videos on YouTube. However, this increase gives rise to questions of audience because audiences for websites, blogs or videos are individuals searching in spare time by themselves, audiences of one. For example, one student created a website to about educate youth about media literacy and "erase the stereotype" by discussing internalized racism, problematic media portrayals, and masculine and feminine gender construction and identity. http://elevateyourmind1914.weebly.com/about.html. The concern to note is where the onus is. It is now on individuals to visit that media literacy resource. Compare this dynamic with the interpersonal techniques of presentations and discussions to captive audiences within a person's life. These two kinds of audience experiences differ.

I also examined the range of topics that students examined in their projects. In their section on the present state of MLE, Hobbs and Jensen (2009) expressed concern that the excitement over newer technological tools of the Internet and digital media would distract scholars and educators from the more "sober topics" of media literacy. The community action outreach projects do not support this concern. Of the 147 projects, all but two had some form of "sober" topic. Indeed, the 2015 semester of community outreach projects included the use of media and social media to discuss racially biased policing, promoting the work of Common Sense Media, empowering youth through media literacy, examining Internet scams and other schemes such as political and advertising propaganda, research on health and cognitive problems connected to heavy media exposure on adults and younger kids, problematic news coverage of teen suicides, the way news hurts local economies, and the absence of media coverage about caregiving in the 21st century. These are examples of student-designed MLE interventions and topics. An example of a non-sober topic is using LinkedIn to differentiate your personal brand.

In the reflection and self-critique aspects of the assignment, students said if they had a do-over they would extend their original ideas. This means the window of student imagination and creativity is at the inception phase of project design. The norm is to tweak their projects later, but not to re-imagine them altogether based on the initial experience. In the reflection aspect of the assignment students also said they learned more than they thought they would. This is interesting because it suggests that students have an expectation of how much they learn from each class, and perhaps the community action outreach projects alter these learning expectations. Finally, many students vowed to continue this work long after the course.

Media Literacy Scholarship Informing Pedagogy

It is common to create new courses from best practices and similar syllabi rather than from normative published scholarship. The recent frameworks in MLE scholarship seek major changes. One wants a restructured education system for the future of democracy (Kellner & Share, 2007), and the other wants media literacy education to be the center that active, engaged, and participatory citizenship practices emanate from (Mihaildis & Thevenin, 2013). These frameworks help map and situate our MLE pedagogy. My course, as is likely true

of many, was designed prior to these publications, and as curricular tools for practitioners of media literacy pedagogy, this use of MLE scholarship as a curricular tool helps us stay current with the field. The results of this effort follow.

Our community action outreach project is similar to service learning as a MLE pedagogical practice. Service learning is a learning strategy used to connect students and course content with local communities. According to Mennen (2006), "[s]ervice learning is both a pedagogy and a philosophy; The central idea is to provide students with a setting for meaningful learning through a specific, curriculum-based community service activity" (p. 192). Community action outreach differs from service learning in that the student is not confined to a pre-planned service. We situate service learning and community action outreach in similar arenas. Paradise (2000) has upper-division undergraduate communication students implement media literacy service learning projects in an urban after-school program for kids 8-18 and finds pedagogical value in this combination. In her words, "beyond allowing communication students to apply course materials in a real-world setting, the project reflects commitment to civic engagement in higher education, with the goal of promoting personal and social responsibility" (p. 235). Wahl and Quintanilla (2005) report a successful service learning experience and say that "beyond being engaged in community issues, students who apply course material to life outside of the classroom orient themselves to the subject matter and to the community" (p. 89). Like these educators, we are contributing to Kellner and Share's (2007) CML vision. Students learn that audiences are active meaning makers.

Another way the community action outreach assignment aligns with Kellner and Share's ideals is in the importance of learning diverse audience perspectives. They write, "a pluralistic democracy depends on a citizenry that embraces multiple perspectives as a natural consequence of varying experiences, histories, and cultures constructed within structures of dominance and subordination" (Kellner & Share, 2007, p. 14). As students share with each other, they are exposed each other's values and perspectives. Tyma's (2009) media literacy service learning project also underscored the importance of reflection for learning through experiential learning assignments.

The community outreach project is part of education for social change and part of learning to be active citizens in a democracy. In fact, it is likely that our assignment has more of the components and direction of what Mihailidis and Thevenin (2013) call for. Working on MLE and changing citizenship practices, Mihailidis and Thevenin (2013) submit an argument for a pedagogical tool for media literacy educators with three outcomes, critical thinkers, creators and communicators, and agents of social change. These three outcomes are dispositions toward citizenship in Mihailidis and Thevenin's (2013) framework and are learned through four competencies achieved through MLE designed for a participatory culture. These four competencies are participatory, collaborative, expressive, and critical. Since our community action outreach projects have students designing media literacy projects to create change, and to consider the four competencies Mihailidis and Thevenin's (2013) offer in light of our community action outreach projects, it is now legible that our assignment supports

both their critical and expressive competencies. The critical competency involves critically assessing media messages, which the students have to do to design their projects. Ideally you recognize a problem through critical assessment before you can work to solve it. For the expressive competency, the students share content with each other and build shared narratives. When the students share the results of their community action outreach projects they bring excitement and life to the classroom discussion promoting an engaged learning space at a time in the semester traditionally marked by lower energy. It's possible that MLE online more strongly supports the expressive competency than an on-campus course due to its asynchronous learning platform and this possibility should be explored further.

Relevant to Mihailidis and Thevenin's (2013) outcomes is fostering effective creators and communicators who focus on "productive possibilities" beyond reading media texts. Newer forms of active citizenship, much like active audiences, require an ability to "develop and share their unique perspectives on societal issues, as well as developing new approaches to creating and circulating these perspectives" (p. 5). The community action outreach assignment produces this outcome, but of note is that students prefer traditional methods rather than newer forms of engagement, which means the use of new technologies is less ubiquitous than the literature makes it seem and interpersonal techniques are still the main avenues students think to make change. It is possible that students turn to interpersonal techniques because students conceptualize education as separate from their lives of engagement as citizens. This possibility supports Mihailidis and Thevenin's (2013) own observation that the "budding relationship between media creation and communication and political participation is admittedly tenuous" (p. 6). Regarding participation, Bennett (2011), like Mihailidis and Thevenin's (2013), argue that newer forms of participation are emerging. Bennett (2011) describes an intersectional technique where one person can pressure many or share information of personal importance on a "phenomenally large scale" through their social networks. So far, the community action outreach projects rarely use this intersection characteristic of participation in late modernity that Bennett (2011) describes. From the outcomes of our assignment, we see that digital circulation and participation in social change is experienced individually rather than collectively and requires much of individuals who have to do the work of exposing themselves to the media literacy outreach content.

Agents of social change are another of Mihailidis and Thevenin's (2013) outcomes. While historically, the political participation or activism side of MLE community has not enjoyed consensus (Hobbs & Jensen, 2009), the goals of Mihailidis and Thevenin's (2013) framework necessitate a critical, active position. This is achieved when MLE's focus is on classroom cultures that promote autonomy, systematic inquiry, and collaboration in the services of solving social problems. The community action outreach assignment helps students see themselves and each other as agents of social change. Students come away with a tangible project as proof of their efficacy to create change in a culture that can feel fixed and unchangeable. Students see the value of sharing and promoting media literacy skills as evidenced by their intentions to continue

outside of the educational requirement, but they do not yet conceptualize different ways of engagement available to them.

Questions From The Field

MLE's focus, according to Hobbs and Jensen (2009), is on media literacy pedagogy "integrating theoretical and critical frameworks rising from constructivist learning theory, media studies, and cultural studies scholarship" (p. 1). Observations that could help the field have emerged from work that makes use of these frameworks. Kellner and Share (2007), for example, offer four approaches to MLE and identify three areas of concern. This analysis leads to some questions about their concerns. One of their concerns with protectionism is lack of avenues for empowerment. Some of our students' projects have protectionist goals, but our action-oriented assignment offers an avenue of empowerment. Another of their concerns with protectionism is the tendency to decontextualize. Contextualizing takes time. Can contextualizing be accomplished in one class? It is likely that contextualization needs to be built into many courses in an entire program of study, which would be wonderful. Kellner and Share's (2007) concern with the media arts education approach that teaches students how to create their own media is a claim about teachers' focus on individuals rather than the collective, that students could emerge from this type of education without consciousness of "ideological implications or any type of social critique" (p. 7). Our course shares more with Kellner and Share's (2007) CML approach than with media arts education, but the community action outreach assignment gives us reason to carefully think about the evidence they use to claim this concern. This is complicated. For example, media literacy skills are improved through learning how to produce messages (Potter, 2013, p. 24), and Kellner and Share (2007) think some production should be included in CML. They say:

> [W]e strongly recommend a pedagogy of teaching critical media literacy through project-based media production (even if it is as simple re-writing a text or drawing pictures) for making analyses more meaningful and empowering as students gain tools for responding and taking action on the social conditions and texts they are critiquing. (p. 9)

So the question is, how important, in terms of increasing critical consciousness, is the teacher's orientation to MLE? Can learning to make media by itself empower students in critical directions? To ask another way, does learning to make media assume a mimicking of mainstream mass media? Do groups of students making media together in classes support only individual outcomes? This is still unclear.

Kellner and Share's (2007) concern with the media literacy movement approach is similar. They claim that learning a neutral set of communication competencies involved in analyzing, evaluating, accessing and communicating about traditional and new media technologies does not go far enough because it lacks an interrogation of the ways power is maintained. Educating about the workings of power, however, are a whole class and ideally, a whole program if the goal is to restructure education. It is not easy to learn to "see" differently after

a lifetime of conditioning has not equipped one with these skills. Like Tyma (2009), we share the problem that Kellner and Share (2007) identify: there is no solid foundation formed from the k-12 educational system. Students are not in the habit of questioning power and critiquing ideology *yet*. Indeed, Tyma's (2009) pedagogy, based in CML, involved having both graduate and undergraduate students use media literacy literature to design training materials to present to organizations. Tyma's (2009) theoretical interest was partly on the tensions present in the praxis of CML, and he concluded that practicing CML pedagogy is difficult in traditional contexts of institutions and traditional contexts of teacher-centered power.

Kellner and Share's claims about the different approaches are useful because they illuminate what we don't yet know. We should know more about the extent of learning within each approach in light of the teaching approach. There may be empowerment in protectionism, there may be critique in media aesthetics education, and there may be an interrogation in media literacy movement classes given the tools of critical thinking.

Kellner and Share see media literacy as "ideology critique and analyzing the politics of representation of crucial dimensions of gender, race, class, and sexuality; incorporating alternative media production; and expanding textual analysis to include issues of social context, control, and pleasure" (p. 8). After examining the community action outreach assignment here, two concerns emerge to add to their approach. One is about alternative media production. I wonder: is novice media making necessarily alternative since it does not need to profit an industry? In other words, in the context of education, all media making skills might be alternative and alternative media is the kind Kellner and Share (2007) say constitute CML. And, it is possible that there are other means of achieving the goal of "challeng[ing] media texts and narratives that appear natural and transparent" (p. 4). In other words, you don't have to have students make media to challenge the pedagogy of media culture. All of our community action outreach projects are designed to have students challenge media culture in a way relevant to them. The outreach project is created by individual students, their visions for their communities, their comfort level with outreach, and our assignment does not limit them to a form.

The second concern has to do with the student resistance that can come with CML instruction. CML eschews the media education that is apolitical or relativist "in order to guide teachers and students in their explorations of how power, media, and information are linked" (Kellner & Share, 2007, p. 8). This is important, yes. But, according to Hobbs and Jensen (2009):

> [T]here are media literacy educators who push their political agendas onto students, officiering their critique of capitalism as gospel and orchestrating student 'voice' in a mandated form of 'service learning,' coercively enrolling students into a political action project, telling them what to think instead of encouraging them to think for themselves. (p. 4)

Students balk at bias and many either resist education if they whiff perceived ideological manipulation or they lap it up, uncritically. In the latter situation, students don't learn to think for themselves. They learn to be superficially critical and experience that attendant joy but do not learn the tools to discover and critique their personal problems with power. Our media literacy class aligns with those who think you have to begin with student voices and the problems students want to solve, which is why the community outreach projects are designed the way they are. Similarly, our media literacy class is in agreement with Luke (1994) who believes, based in standpoint and feminist theories, that students should be allowed to "come to their own realizations" and that a "student-centered, bottom-up approach is necessary for a standpoint analysis to come from each student's own culture, knowledge, and experiences" (as cited in Kellner & Share, 2007, p. 10). This dynamic common to questions about the power teachers have in the classroom is an issue to explore further.

Conclusion

Educating about media literacy is accomplished in a variety of ways, and according to Potter (2010), "there is not consensus about what is the best media literacy curriculum" (p. 683). There are a number of scholars who offer frameworks for media literacy education, and this article's aim was to examine these with one assignment from our graduate level media literacy course. This examination reveals that students seeking social change do not make remarkable use of newer technologies. This means the use of new technologies is less ubiquitous than the literature purports. Moreover, the audience is dispersed in these social change efforts, so they may be less impactful. Students may not have the abilities to use the newer technologies as evidenced by how rarely they design media production projects. Further, students do not use new technologies toward newer kinds of cultural participation.

In using CML scholarship as a curricular tool to examine the design of service learning or community action outreach assignments strengthens the importance of using the classrooms as a place to share and reflect on social change efforts, together. Students come to participatory identities. They see themselves and each other as people who can make change, as people who are members of communities, and as members of a diverse, collaborative society.

Some pedagogical issues emerged from this analysis in light of recent MLE literature that could help the field of MLE. This exploration confirms the existing that our educational system makes questioning institutions in one course, difficult. We need to change our education system to make that easier. Either student resistance and defensiveness or uncritical acceptance can accompany CML pedagogy. Our community action outreach assignment mitigates this dynamic, but we see it in the literature. Also, MLE scholarship could benefit from interrogating the relationship between what students learn versus teachers' pedagogical motivations about increasing critical consciousness.

References

Bennett, Lance. 2011. The democratization of truth: Communication and the crisis of contemporary politics. Lecture retrieved from http://www.com.washington.edu/2011/11/lance-bennett-to-give-faculty-lecture-nov-30/

Hobbs, Renee, and Amy Jensen. 2009. The past, present, and future of media literacy education. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 1(1), 1-11.

Kellner, Douglas, and Jeff Share. 2007. In D. Macedo & Shirley R. Steinberg 2007. (Eds.), *Critical media literacy, democracy, and the reconstruction of education.*(pp. 3 – 23). Peter Lang Inc. New York.

Mennen, Kathy. 2006. Use service learning to add real-world writing experience to your course. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 69(2), 184-185. doi: 10.1177/1080569906288069

Mihailidis, Paul, and Benjamin Thevenin. 2013. Media Literacy as a core competency for engaged citizenship in participatory democracy. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 57(11), 1-12. doi: 10.1177/0002764213489015

Paradise, Angela, M. 2011. Bridging service-learning with media literacy: Creating contexts for communication students to educate youth on media content, consumption, and effects. *Communication Teacher*, 25(4), 234-239.

Potter, James, W. 2010. The state of media literacy. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 54(4), 675-696.

Potter, James, W. 2013. *Media literacy* (6th ed.). Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Tyma, Adam, W. 2009. Pushing past the walls: Media literacy, the "emancipated" classroom, and a really severe learning curve. *International Journal of Communication,* 3, 891-900.

Wahl, Shawn, T., and Kelly Quintanilla. 2005. Student civic engagement and media literacy. *Texas Speech Communication Journal*, 30(1), 89 - 91.