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Abstract

American institutions of higher education are increasingly utilizing internationalization as a technology of competition. One of the most prominent techniques of internationalization is the promotion of study abroad program participation amongst undergraduate students. On the other hand, students are increasingly demanding opportunities for international education as they seek to make themselves more competitive in the job market. This study uses Foucauldian discourse theory and the concept of governmentality to analyze how the growing importance of study abroad is illustrative of the larger trends of neoliberalism and neocolonial mentalities within U.S. higher education and dominant society. The findings of this study indicate that while the more nefarious aspects of governmentality are in play in study abroad, there are also opportunities for transformative international and cross-cultural learning if particular care is put into program design and content.
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Foreword

“I don’t feel that it is necessary to know exactly what I am. The main interest in life and work is to become someone else that you were not in the beginning.”

- Foucault, 1988, p. 9

Two experiences have inspired this work and pushed me forward, even when it seemed impossible to complete everything in the allotted time. The first occurred my first year of undergraduate coursework at Loyola University Chicago. I was in an introductory class to modern philosophy. In this course I came into contact with Michel Foucault’s History of Sexuality for the first time. As a timid, recently out, queer man - the unabashed confidence with which Foucault attacked such entrenched ideas as morality, sexuality, and resistance shocked me. Somewhere within the convoluted language of this text, I found a voice that paralleled my own experiences of being medicalized, shamed, and othered for desires and thoughts that felt central to my being. At the same time, Foucault confirmed my fear and rising suspicion that recreating oneself in the likeness of a new gay ideal was not a way out of the labyrinth of societal expectations, but rather another game within it. Ever since this class, continuing to grapple with Foucault’s work has given me the confidence and knowledge to move forward with the project of shaping myself into the person I desire to be.

The second experience started several years later when I boarded my first intercontinental flight to live and study in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. Having spent the previous semesters, both inside and outside the classroom, exploring as many of my
social identities as possible, I felt it was time to test what I knew about myself. I naively thought that traveling to the non-White, developing world would give me a view into what it is like to be othered due to appearance or cultural beliefs. What I instead found through my travels in post-colonial, South-East Asia was the global ubiquity of White-Western-male privilege. Rather than being looked at with suspicion or hatred, everywhere I went I was treated as an honored guest due to my gender, light skin tone, nationality, and relative wealth. Like Talya Zemach-Bersin (2008), I returned home frustrated with my own ignorance of the socio-historic webs of power that had kept me always slightly removed from my local roommate and his family. My time abroad was not only a lesson in Vietnamese culture, language, and history, but also in the inherent limitations of what I can and should have access to given my physical, socio-cultural, economic, and epistemological position. My international experiences gave me tangible examples of the inescapable and fiercely interconnected global structures of privilege and oppression that define our lives, what bell hooks and Amalia Mesa-Bains (2006) so astutely named White-supremacist-capitalist-patriarchy. These twin experiences were formative steps towards developing both a systemic understanding of the world, what Foucault (2007) called *savoir*, and the confidence to confront these same systems as they manifested in my own life.

Utilizing Foucauldian ideas in an analysis of study abroad may strike some as an odd choice. Foucault never explicitly talked about travel or multiculturalism and he rarely touched upon topics of formal education in his scholarship. Yet, as James Miller (1994) describes in his biography of the French philosopher, Foucault was specifically interested in the idea of experience, how it shapes the subject and opens up new epistemological
possibilities. All of Foucault’s work, whether it was on madness or Greek stoicism, was drawn out of personal experience and a desire to better understand how individuals fit into larger societal projects (Ettlinger, personal communication). I have approached study abroad in a similar manner, as an experience that has transformative potential and serious implications for how contemporary students are shaped through formal education.

Study abroad, at its best, can be seen as an opportunity to ask how one fits into the historical patterns of past generations and into the rapidly approaching future world. Unfortunately, it is increasingly described through neoliberal and consumerist vocabularies of skills, competencies, and capital at the detriment to this more philosophical and spiritual quest. Simultaneously, few in positions of power are asking questions about the ethical implications of the U.S. academe’s project to globalize its students and our duties as visitors to the communities and individuals we objectify in pursuit of this goal. In invoking concepts such as power, discourse, and governmentality, I plan to do two things. First, I continue Foucault’s project of examining how Western contemporary subjects came to be. Secondly, I add my voice to those who are resisting neoliberal and colonialist forms of international education in calling for more responsible and theoretically grounded practice.

I believe, because of what I have studied and what I have lived, that study abroad can be an experience as deeply personal and revelatory as coming to understand one’s sexuality, religious beliefs, or ethnic heritage. The problem is that we have neither the language to capture this intimacy, nor the knowledge of how to prepare students for such a powerful process. This is my small contribution towards new understandings of research and practice, language and knowledge, written in the hope that more students
walk away from their years of collegiate study with deeper understandings of themselves, others, and the systems that collectively bind us together and tear us apart.
Chapter 1: Normalizing Danger

“Travel has never been an innocent endeavor.”

- Shahjahan in Beck, Collins, Shajahan, & Suspitsyna, 2014

Travel is inseparable from the historical development of the academy. The university emerged as an institution unique in human history due only to the willingness of young peregrinatio to travel to the urban centers of Europe where the greatest studia of the Middle Ages were located (de Ridder-Symoens, 1992). Looking to secure better fortunes for themselves, their families, and their local communities, these young males risked their lives and the fortunes of their sponsors to become a part of a community of scholars. With the rise of the Enlightenment and nationalism in the 17th, 18th and 19th Centuries, the academic pilgrimage became less important after the newly solidified nation states of Western Europe took more direct control of the universities within their borders and limited international travel (de Ridder-Symoens, 1996; Hammerstein, 1996).

As Europe modernized scholars and bureaucrats continued to travel and they implanted European academic institutions deep within Europe’s colonial possessions within Africa, Asia, and the Americas. Through colonial centers of learning, Europeans were able to both come to know and invent the non-Western world (Saïd, 1978), something that helped ensured their domination of the globe for centuries to come. Despite how they are often portrayed as inherently benevolent institutions, the university and the college have long been complicit in these nationalistic and imperial projects.
It is their shared histories as instruments of control and knowledge production that makes academic institutions akin to other social structures that arose in the early modern period such as the asylum, the health clinic, and the prison - all of which were studied and problematized by the French philosopher Michel Foucault. Throughout his career, Foucault (1977/1980e) described how social institutions became crucial to the governance of populations through their position in sustaining truths, compelling populations to accept these truths, and providing a path for individuals to shape themselves in light of acceptable truths (Foucault, 1979/2000c). Universities do not only craft knowledge. They teach people how to live in light of that knowledge.

It is for this reason that between the Renaissance and the twentieth century education can be largely understood as a nationalistic endeavor and that educational leaders feared “religious and political contamination” from outside (de Ridder-Symoens, 1996, p. 419). It is why European leaders dispatched learned men to not only inform, but also to justify their imperial pursuits in foreign lands (Saïd, 1978) and why institutions that confirm and project the West’s natural superiority are still held in such high regard (Lutz & Collins, 1993). It is also why today, critical projects that accept the inherently political nature of education must be undertaken. This study is an attempt to develop novel, critical understandings of international travel as a tool within the historical and contemporary academy through an analysis of one of its most ubiquitous forms: undergraduate study abroad.

This type of inquiry is necessary as a means to reveal the academy’s role in the violence of colonialism and to better understand its continued involvement in sustaining global inequity (for example Spring, 2004). For while decolonialism was officially a
project of the mid-twentieth century, the academic structures of the United States and the American students they enroll and graduate have continuously been on the front lines of international political and economic policy since at least the 1902 founding of the Rhodes Scholarship (de Wit, 2002). After the First World War, the junior year abroad programs became increasingly accepted as a way to promote peace and mutual cultural understanding across the Atlantic and between European borders. As political needs shifted, so did the focus of these programs and new alliances with South American academic institutions were formed in order to secure the hemisphere from Nazi influence.

In the wake of the Second World War, student exchanges were again redeployed to promote the “re-orientation” of Europe to the fledgling U.S. superpower and to “re-education” in the conquered nations of Japan and Germany (Rupp as cited in de Wit, 2002). “Although peace and mutual understanding continued to be a driving rationale in theory, national security and foreign policy were the real forces behind” the expansion of international student exchange (de Wit, 2002, p. 25). World War II and the emergence of the Cold War taught the U.S. government that if it was to secure the world, the world must first be understood (Goodwin & Nacht, 1991).

Since the post-war period there has been a steady call to increase the U.S. academy’s international reach and the number of American individuals participating in exchange and study abroad programs. Starting in the 1970s, significant reports and white papers on the topic of global engagement have been published at the dizzying rate of one approximately every two years (de Wit, 2002). Organizations such as Institute of International Education (IIE, founded in 1919), NAFSA: National Association of International Educators (founded 1948), and the American Council on Education (ACE,
founded 1918) led this process throughout the Cold War and into post-Soviet world of
global neoliberal competition. Contemporary publications - with titles such as *Beyond
September 11: A Comprehensive National Policy on International Education* (ACE,
2002) and *Securing America’s Future: Global Education for a Global Age* (NAFSA,
2003) - continue the rhetoric of global peace and the longstanding need for national
security, but have since the late 1980s also included economic rationales for the
internationalizing of both institutions and individuals (de Wit, 2002). In today’s
neoliberal politics, which depend upon an entity’s ability to manipulate economics just as
much as military strength, individuals must build the skills, knowledge, and social capital
to be successful cosmopolitan, consumer-citizens in today’s global marketplace
(Mitchell, 2003).

International educators working today are the inheritors of this abundance of
literature, which has had the accumulative effect of silencing most debate over the need
to internationalize the U.S. academy. Simple statements such as “Like it or not,
Americans are connected with people the world over.” (ACE, 2002, p. 1) and “The
challenges of the new millennium are unquestionably global in nature.” (NAFSA, 2003,
p. iv) begin nearly every one of the aforementioned reports, papers, and policy proposals.
This has led to a prominent and somewhat paradoxical statement of inevitable action -
globalization is happening no matter what, yet it requires the constant attention and
support of the U.S. academy in order to be utilized strategically. One of the most readily
available internationalizing technologies available to institutions is study abroad, so it is
also portrayed as an indisputable practice.
The large mass of texts that reproduce the rhetoric of inevitable action have led many to an overly simplex understanding of how internationalization relates to issues of power. Depending upon an author’s or authoring organization’s knowledge of history, their philosophical and epistemological positions, and their own goals and interests, anyone of a multitude of discourses may be activated to justify, or caution against, forms of internationalization. Even within the relatively narrow domain of undergraduate academic travel, there is a plethora of political, personal, emotional, and empirical statements that have been set up in opposition and woven into interdependence with one another as individuals, institutions, and governments struggle for influence. The nuances present within these various genres of statements have been veiled, however, by both the frantic certainty that something is to be done and the actions that have been taken to sooth this paranoia. One of the goals for this paper is to resist the urge to endorse or prescribe a course of action and, rather, utilize productive uncertainty to imagine new courses of action.

I contend that it will remain impossible to come to an acceptable answer to the question of how to internationalize until the question of why internationalization is taking place is not answered in a more satisfactory manner. It is for this reason that I have intentionally stepped back from concerns of how to continue internationalization and have refocused on the Foucauldian concerns of how this term has been constructed through discourse and utilized in practice. Globalization is indeed happening, but it has also been happening for a long time. As the 1963 report *The Challenge of a Revolutionary World* by The University of New York and The State Education Department demonstrates, the world has been terrifying for at least the past 50 years. In
this manner, the political milieu of the United States today is not radically different from what it was been historically. Instead of fearing what is *out there*, I believe that the greatest danger for U.S. society is the blind acceptance of the status quo, the absence of healthy debates on ethical obligations to others, and the mass amnesia of America’s role in past international crises. As Foucault (1982/1984a) demonstrated through his studies, it is when structures, practices, and beliefs become so normalized that they are taken for granted that they are most dangerous. The things in our daily lives that are most unquestioned have the most control over our beings and it is for this reason that, while not necessarily bad, “everything is dangerous” (p. 343).

**Situating the Problem by Focusing on Study Abroad**

This poststructural study approaches internationalization of the U.S. academy through the practice of study abroad for four reasons. First, few practices of internationalization are widely accepted as beneficial as study abroad. The vast of majority of university administrators and education policy makers have accepted that study abroad is an inherently beneficial pedagogical practice that should be expanded (Twombly, Salisbury, Tumanut, & Klute, 2012; Wolf-Wendel, 2012) due to its potential to aid with everything from improved international relations to making higher education institutions competitive in the market (Goodwin & Nacht, 1988). Actors as varied as trustees, provosts, university presidents, third-party non-profits, and various federal entities (IIE, 2014a; Lewin, 2009; Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program [CALS AFP], 2005) all continuously perpetuate the practice’s “profoundly uncontested status” (Zemach-Bersin, 2012, p. 89) through pushing for a
continued and strategic growth in the number of students who study abroad each year (also see Stein, 2013).

Additionally, those interested in student development and learning have zeroed in on study abroad as a high impact practice - a pedagogical strategy that has been linked to high levels of campus engagement, which in turn leads to students achieving the desired outcomes of college (Kuh, 2009). The American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U, 2012) has suggested that these outcomes must include a heightened understanding of civic and democratic processes and an individual desire to engage with these aspects of U.S. society. While there is a case to be made for the capacity of study abroad to directly teach students about these issues (see Lewin, 2009), the literature on high impact learning practices suggests that students who study abroad develop the relationships and interests while traveling that will keep them engaged with and learning from faculty and peers after they return home (Kuh, 2009; Gonyea as cited in Kuh, 2009). Through this process, study abroad is thought to be a tool to increase student learning, and encouraged as a result.

U.S. colleges and universities are answering this call through actively designing programs with considerable accommodations and amenities (Woolf, 2007) and deploying advertisements that draw upon students’ consumer mentalities (Zemach-Bersin, 2009). Entities within the federal government (CALSAFP, 2005; Critical Language Scholars Program [CLSP], n.d.; National Security Education Program [NSEP], 2008) and third party organizations (IIE, 2014a; NAFSA, 2008) continue to produce a substantial body of grey literature that faithfully reports the benefits of study abroad, without drawing attention to the empirical questions that remain about its effectiveness in reaching its
purported goals of cultivating global citizenship and intercultural maturity (Twombly, Salsibury, Tumanut, & Klute, 2012). All the while, institutions of higher learning continue to be increasingly measured and ranked based on how substantially study abroad is integrated into internationalization efforts (for example, Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement [CIGE], 2012). This discourse has succeeded in making study abroad the crown jewel of internationalization efforts.

Secondly, study abroad should be studied as a tool of internationalization because participation rates are steadily rising (IIE, 2014d) as more schools develop programs traveling of various lengths and new destinations (Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement [CIGE], 2012). This year nearly 300,000 U.S. American students will leave their college and university campuses to study abroad (IIE, 2014). This cohort of students is part of an unprecedented and still growing increase in the number of young U.S. citizens seeking educational experiences outside of our nation’s borders (IIE, 2012). Due to the relative geopolitical stability since the end of the Cold War, this group is also traveling further than ever before. Eastern Europe, South-East Asia, parts of Africa and other destinations in the post-colonial, under-developed, and post-communist world are increasingly the norm (IIE, 2013b).

How study abroad is practiced is also changing. Responding to the market-driven state of tertiary education, today’s students are cost-conscious and often traveling with organizations other than their home institutions (Twombly et al., 2012) or traveling abroad for shorter periods of time altogether (IIE, 2013a). All of the growth that has been seen in study abroad participation rates has been in short-term programs that are significantly shorter than a semester in duration. At the levels of individual institutions
massive initiatives are being undertaken to facilitate and encourage this growth in student participation.

Colleges and universities are actively designing programs in nontraditional locations and with more accommodating durations in house in order to increase student participation rates (Woolf, 2007). In the past decade the number of shorter-term programs being administered by doctoral, master, and baccalaureate level institutions has increased by at least 13 percent for each institutional type (CIGE, 2012). Today, 90 percent of all doctoral granting institutions have some type of institutional scholarship for student education abroad (CIGE, 2012) and prominent leaders have called for study abroad program fees to be built into every students’ tuition regardless of their participation in order to make international travel more accessible to all (Brustein, 2007). If study abroad should be critically examined due to its ubiquity in internationalization theory and policy, it should also be challenged due to the promise of large-scale implications for a growing number of stakeholders.

Thirdly, despite the depiction of study abroad as inherently beneficial and the race to further its adoption as an internationalizing pedagogy, there are strong and valid critiques of the practice. A group of scholars have asked insightful questions into how study abroad has become commoditized in a way that limits learning (Bolen, 2001), less effective due to shortened stays (Dwyer, 2004; Guttentag, 2009; Medina-López-Portillo, 2004; Kehl & Morris, 2007), and complicit in the perpetuation of imperialistic beliefs and behaviors (Ogden, 2008; Schoroeder, Wood, Galiardi, & Koehn, 2009; Woolf, 2006; Zemach-Bersin, 2009). There are even those who claim “American students abroad can’t be ‘global citizens’” (Zemach-Bersin, 2008) due to the West’s legacy of empire and the
embodied nature of privilege. These voices are ignored because they run contrary to the structures that higher education remains invested in maintaining the status quo or because they, like educational research at large, they fail to link micro-level and macro-level analyses into meaningful tools of resistance (Naidoo & Jamieson, 2007). If these voices are to be heard, the structures that keep them locked out of institutional planning, teaching, and learning must first be better understood.

Fourth and finally, travel in general and study abroad in particular are unique practices in the way they entwine and conflate individual, institutional, and cultural levels of discourse. A study abroad program may be sold as beneficial for students, pursued because of its ability to generate revenue, and supported publically as a form of national foreign policy - and all may be correct. Due to this multisided nature, the interests of individuals and organizations are easily conflated with those of nations and cultures. In this way, study abroad is an excellent avenue through which to better understand how the “social nexus” is manipulated and how, in turn, the will of a population is “crystallized” in socio-political institutions and projects (Foucault, 1991/2000d, p. 343). The slippery and amorphous discursive flows surrounding this particular educational practice make it challenging to study; however, they also provide a landing from which to wade into questions of how we as individuals and groups are controlled via desires, duties, and fears.

**Theoretical Framework and Methodology**

The qualities of the problems surrounding study abroad have led me to approach this study from a poststructural framework. Poststructuralism is a genre of critique that emerged out of postmodern thinking in the mid-twentieth century. The major qualities of
most poststructural works include a concern for the limits of “Enlightenment rationality” and individual consciousness and a suspicion of theories that explain reality in universal ways (Lather, 2007, p. 5). Foucault’s (1991/2000d) views on methodology and knowledge are often recognized as a base for post-structural thought. While there have been a wide range of theorists who have contributed to poststructuralism as a formal epistemological movement, this study draws mostly from Foucault and authors who have continued his projects of analyzing discourse, identity, and governmentality in education, often through a feminist lens (Allan, 2008; Ettlinger, 2011; Gore, 1992; Lather, 1991, 1992, 2007; Suspitsyna, 2010, 2012, 2014; Stein, 2013).

Foucault (1977/1980c, 1991/2000a, 1991/2000e) repeatedly stated that ascending and multiscalar analyses must be attempted in order to accurately understand social problems. This means that data collection must begin at the mundane, regimes of practices in which individuals are involved in daily, and then move upwards through the societal structures that are both made up of these practices and partially control them. The twin criteria of ascending and multiscalar data collection has been obtained through collecting texts at the levels of the individual student, the institutional department, and the field of higher education. The methodology that will be used to select and analyze these texts is critical discourse analysis (CDA), which is a method of analysis designed by Norman Fairclough (1992) and based upon Foucault’s (1972) works on discourse.
Definitions of Key Terms

Foucauldian analysis depends upon unique and interconnected terms that are often used differently by authors positioned in separate disciplines. It is therefore necessary to introduce how these terms will be utilized in this study. A more complete discussion of how these terms relate to one another can be found in the next chapter.

Regimes of Truth and Biopower

The goal of this Foucauldian analysis is to uncover how a *regime of truth*, or a pervasive system of thought, operates and informs the every day practices of the people who exist within and help perpetuate that system. In one of his later lecture series at Le College de France, Foucault (2004/2008) described his project of analyzing historical situations through “undertaking a history of truth coupled with a history of law” or an analysis of “the genealogy of regimes of veridiction … the constitution of a particular right (*droit*) of truth on the basis of a legal situation, the law (*droit*) and truth relationship finding its privileged expression in discourse” (p. 35). In other words, an analysis of a problem through a Foucauldian perspective will not lead to a discussion of when objective truth is or is not spoken. Instead, such an analysis will allow for a description of when given societal truths emerged, how they are sustained over time (*veridiction*), and what structures encourage, persuade, and force individuals into accepting a truth as the truth (*jurisdiction*). Due to the ability of discourse to hold and express veridiction and jurisdiction, it is often the site of Foucauldian inquiry.

Potential truths are constantly proposed, but it is only when a potential truth is supported and entangled in an enforcing structure of jurisdiction that it becomes normalized, engrained into daily life, a force in the way in which individuals see
themselves, and potentially dangerous. Both veridiction and jurisdiction are needed to create and perpetuate a regime of truth. In contemporary society, jurisdiction does not solely take the form of legally enforceable laws, what Foucault describes as **sovereign power** (1991/2000a). Since the 16th Century, a whole complicated and multifaceted body of professional practices, economic considerations, institutional strategies, and cultural norms, along with both federal and state regulations, make up the jurisdictional forces that enforce regimes of truth. This is what Foucault (2004/2008) would come to call **biopower**.

Within the U.S. academy inevitable action towards internationalization has become a widely accepted regime of truth, supported by the various strands of veridiciting and jurisdicting practices such as the maintenance of internationalization’s benevolent status and the tethering of it to institutional prestige (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Study abroad as such a widely adopted technology of internationalization is therefore closely associated with the maintenance and proliferation of this regime of truth.

**Regimes of Practices**

The only way to begin this analysis of regimes of truth from a Foucauldian perspective is to observe how truth has materialized in **regimes of practices**, or the repetitive material and mental exercises that shape the social world and individuals’ identities. This is due to Foucault’s (1977/1980c; 1977/1980d; 1977; 1978) notion of power as not only a restrictive force, but as a creative one that comes to define social reality through relationships. Truths are not imposed on populations from on high, but rather constantly recreated through the everyday actions of a population.
In order to be understood, regimes of practices must be isolated within a locality, or discrete section of society, observed over time, and then compared with other locales, structures, and time periods in order to reveal aspects of a particular regime of truth (Foucault, 1977/1980e). Therefore, according to a Foucauldian understanding of society, any interrogation of academic internationalization within the U.S. must begin from the lowest level of observable practices and within a relatively contained practice if one hopes to understand the prevailing truth of internationalization. Study abroad provides this venue of observation due to the way it makes internationalization real through forming participants who have gone through a relatively concrete experience of traveling and learning abroad as global citizens.

**Discourse and Discursive Structure**

*Discourse* can also be thought of “as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements” or the study of how language is structured, how it perpetuates a regime of truth, and how it affects individuals (Foucault, 1972, p. 90). The term is often used in vague and conflicting ways by the variety of disciplines that have come to adopt it (Mills, 1997). This is due to the fact that in various lectures Foucault (1972) referred to discourse as both a target of analysis and a method for understanding larger societal structures. Additionally, he changed his mind over time as to how central discourse was to analyzing a given problem (Mills, 1997). As a unit of analysis, discourse can be understood as either “an individual group of statements” (Foucault, 1972, p. 80) through which veridiction and jurisdiction are expressed. For the purpose of clarity, this later use of discourse will always be referred to as the **discursive structure**. To summarize, a discourse is a recognizable group of *utterances* (texts, statements, or actions) that are
linked together, while the rules that keep these terms associated with one another is
discursive structure.

In conducting this study, a variety of discourses that are utilized to define,
describe, promote, defend, and critique study abroad have emerged. While these
discourses have originated in a variety of locales and are supported by a diverse cast of
speakers, they are often deployed in ways that perpetuate simple binaries of right and
wrong, effective and ineffective. A juridical statement in one discourse that sustains a
truth about international education may be the antithesis of another discourse’s truth. One
author’s “alternative” perspective is the hegemonic belief that another works to undo.
What keeps the overall regime of internationalization stable, however, is the discursive
structure that permits certain discourses to be heard more clearly and to be accepted more
easily.

**Governmentality**

_Governmentality_ is a framework for understanding how regimes of truth and the
discursive structures that support them are used to control and shape populations and the
individuals who make up those populations. Governmentality is therefore a link between
structural, macro-analyses and individual, micro-level analyses. Mentalities of
governance are lodged within the utterances that make up discourses and discursive
structures and can be studied through discursive analysis; however, discourse can also be
used as a tool of governmentality, at times obscuring analyses of regimes of truth. It is
therefore necessary when using a framework of governmentality to use multiple sources
and sites of analysis to examine how truth “is produced only by virtue of multiple forms
of constraint” (Foucault, 1977/1980e).
Although he never explicitly defined the term or how it should be used, Foucault (1977/1980e, 1979/2000c, 1991/2000a, 1991/2000d, 2004/2008) spoke of governmentality in many places throughout the later part of his life. Foucault (1977/1980e) is clear that governmentality is entangled with power and that in order for a structure of governance to be sustained, average people must believe in and sustain the truth upon which that structure is built. In fact, for governmentality to be effective, individuals must believe a given truth with such conviction that they work to make themselves into a subject appropriate for that truth (Foucault, 1979/2000c). For example, in the case of study abroad, individuals absorb the discourse that internationalization has and must continue to occur within the U.S. academy and society at large. They then strengthen the discursive structure that allows only this reality to be heard through fashioning their own careers and personal lives into exemplars of internationalization through technologies such as study abroad.

It is possible to better understand particular governmentalities through analyzing the ways individuals turn themselves into international or global citizens in an ascending matter and through connecting these regimes of practices to larger policies and programs aimed at entire populations, particular governmentalities can be better understood (Foucault, 1991/2000a). Through this study I have sought to answer how two particular threads of governmentality continue to entangle, divide and bind these discourses on internationalization and study abroad. The forms of governmentality that have been used to frame this analysis are the twin forces of neoliberal governmentality, or the increasing role of economics in the determination of truth and value (Foucault, 2004/2008), and neocolonial governmentality, or the obsessive adherence and
enforcement of rational policies in the governance of the underdeveloped, postcolonial, and post-Soviet world (Spring, 2004). While the presence of both neoliberalism (Rhoades & Slaughter, 1997) and neocolonialism (Spring, 2004) in U.S. institutions of higher learning has been noted before, there is limited research that examines how these governmentalities are grounded in the regimes of practices that make up daily life on university and college campuses.

**Statement of Research Questions**

In order to address the problem outlined above, a more detailed analysis of how study abroad is entangled with forms of governmentality and who benefits from this type of governance must be undertaken. I achieved this through a qualitative investigation guided by the following questions:

- **Question 1**: How do participants of study abroad programs and those who design these programs describe the practices related to study abroad?
- **Question 2**: What traces of disciplinary and biopolitical techniques of power are present in these texts describing the practices of study abroad?

**Significance of Problem**

The significance of this study lies in the unique qualities of its subject, as outlined above, and its application of poststructural theory and research design. Study abroad is a unique subject of study for those interested in how the U.S. academy is internationalizing due to its discursive construction, recent observable changes in its practice, the silencing of legitimate critiques of its practice, and its dual role as both a tool for individual and institutional transformation. There is a need for theoretically grounded scholarship that examines this practice in new ways and that breaks down the silos that have been
constructed around the micro-practices of individual students and the macro-level efforts of higher education institutions and private non-profits (Naidoo & Jamieson, 2007). There is little scholarship explaining how different scales of internationalization discourse and practice interact with one another. This study is a step towards understanding how individuals’ beliefs about globalization and desires to be international persons inform, shape, and contradict larger institutional and national discourses, and vice versa.

There is a dire need to retheorize study abroad because “simple descriptors may no longer accurately capture the complexity of an individual program or its outcomes” (Twombly et al., 2012, p. ix). Much of the literature on study abroad overly simplifies the experience, flattening all students into groups based on one demographic criterion or conflating various goals for international education that have very different theoretical origins. At the same time, there is reason to be concerned that entrenched interests are not motivated to see these problems in the literature on study abroad corrected because they profit from perpetuating a simple and blind narrative of inevitable action towards internationalization. A Foucauldian methodology that utilizes governmentality, with its concern for the power relationship between individuals, populations, and institutions, is particularly appropriate for addressing this lacuna in the research.

This study adds to the emergent literature that approaches study abroad and international education from a critical perspective. While it focuses on “content-issues” such “cultural biases in the curricula, course literature, bedrock assumptions, perspectives and theories” (Stier, 2004), it does not approach these concerns from merely a theoretical place. I firmly believe that any analysis of content would be incomplete without
commenting simultaneously on structure and how individuals may change those structures if they find it necessary to do so. Foucault and the poststructural thinkers who have followed him teach scholars that truth does not exist outside of structure, but rather that truth and structure are dependent upon one another and mutually constitutive. This study took up this lesson and tries to apply it to the closely related, but often segregated, fields of student development and higher education organizational theory. It is a movement towards “messy texts” that focus on the multiple truths and the contested knowledges (Marcus, 1994, p. 567) that help inform ongoing individual and institutional efforts to resist entrenched assumptions and the seats of privilege they serve.

**Overview of Chapters**

Chapter 1 provided an introduction to a definition of Foucauldian analysis and key related terms. I have outlined the current context of study abroad practice, including the processes of veridiction that has generated the single truth of study abroad being unequivocally beneficial and of jurisdiction that has made the practice of study abroad increasingly necessary in order for individuals and institutions to compete economically. Together these processes have led to the uncritical embrace of study abroad and allowed for study abroad to potentially be used as a method of governmentality. The following analysis explores this possibility through a poststructural lens and with the use of a critical discourse analysis methodology.

The remainder of this study is split into four chapters. Chapter 2 is a continuation of themes outlined in this chapter where I have begun to loosen, to examine, and to describe the complicated and often contradictory discourses surrounding study abroad as a pedagogical technique. Chapter 2 will also further explain the Foucauldian concepts of
discourse and governmentality. The framework of governmentality, which Foucault never explicitly outlined, will be explained through an in-depth account of its constituent parts: regimes of practices, apparatuses of power/knowledge, and governmentality. I will then explain how governmentality has been both utilized and critiqued by postcolonial scholars and other authors who are interested in analyzing globalization as a regime of truth. The chapter will conclude with a brief discussion of the epistemological implications of utilizing a Foucauldian perspective.

Chapter 3 will outline the methodology used for this qualitative inquiry, CDA, in further detail and describe in detail the methodology that was used to select and analyze texts. Both written and spoken texts were collected, so methodological considerations for both types of data are given. Due to poststructuralist authors’ concerns with the ethical representation of truths and how that impacts research design (Lather, 2007), I also outline potential issues with trustworthiness and how I addressed these concerns in this chapter.

After presenting and analyzing my data in Chapter 4, a discussion of the collected documents and interviews is presented in Chapter 5. Instead of working from the assumption that study abroad is an inherently benevolent practice, or even that it is a once-beneficial practice that has been corrupted, I remain open to the possibility that the purported goals of global citizenship and international education may be too lofty and that “American students abroad can’t be ‘global citizens’” (Zemach-Bersin, 2008) due to the West’s legacy of empire and the embodied nature of privilege. This critical analysis is followed by a conclusion that expands upon the uses of this study for praxis and where further inquiries into internationalization may turn next.
Chapter 2: Theory, Practice, Critique

“Theory is not inherently healing, liberatory, or revolutionary. It fulfills this function only when we ask that it do so and direct our theorizing towards this end.”

- bell hooks, 1994, p. 61

This chapter serves as a review and introduction to the theoretical work of Michel Foucault and pertinent theoretical and empirical literature on study abroad as an educational practice. It is divided into several sections that alternate between concerns of theory and praxis. In the first half, it is my goal to move from larger, societal-level understandings of study abroad as a cultural practice to smaller, individual-level interactions with each successive section. Once the current national and cultural setting of contemporary study abroad practice has been thoroughly deconstructed through the analytical tools of discourse and power/knowledge, I will then outline how a Foucauldian governmentality analysis can be used to reconstruct a more nuanced understanding of U.S. international higher education. Therefore, this chapter has an overall “V” shape, with the downward stroke of the first half outlining how study abroad practices can be understood through theoretical tools of a regime of truth, discourse, and regimes of practices and the upward strike of the second half forwarding a response to the question of how is this system stabilized and perpetuated.
**Downward from Truth through Discourse to Knowledge**

One of the inherent problems in conducting a Foucauldian analyses is that there is little scholarly consensus on what a Foucauldian analysis is. This is largely due to Foucault’s (1977/1980e) often-disjointed subjects of study, which he referred to as “fragments” that are up to readers to piece together (p. 79). Just in the later part of his career his fragments covered topics as varied as penitentiary systems (Foucault, 1977), human sexuality (Foucault, 1978), and economics (Foucault, 2004/2008). He rarely explicitly outlined what connected these studies in his formal works and destroyed many of his unpublished writings and notes before his death (Miller, 1994). This situation has made it necessary for scholars to rely upon a host of scattered alternative sources, such as the many interviews Foucault granted both popular and academic media during his lifetime (Cook, 1993; see also Foucault, 1980).

Another source of confusion and debate is the fact that there is a dramatic shift in Foucault’s writings from “a nearly exclusive concern with the discursive formations that comprise knowledge (le savoir) to a more articulated historiography focused on the complex relationships between power and knowledge” (Cook, 1993, p. 69). Therefore, texts that are separated by just a few years are dramatically different in style and content. This allows for scholars writing after Foucault to construct multiple and contradictory Foucauldian analyses depending upon which of the earlier author’s works are cited. It is therefore necessary for scholars using Foucauldian ideas to explicitly state from which period of the author’s work they are drawing their ideas.
This study primarily utilizes the perspective outlined in Foucault’s (1977, 1978, 2004/2008) later works and Ettlinger’s (2011) efforts to synthesize these perspectives into a comprehensive epistemology - but this does not mean that the concept of discourse, Foucault’s earlier focus of analysis, is unimportant. Despite later comments that the problem of how knowledge, power, and ethics are interrelated “isn’t a linguistic one” (Foucault, 1977/1980e, p. 198), Foucault continued to speak of discourse in his published works, interviews, and public lectures up until his death in the summer of 1984.

According to a late Foucauldian perspective, discourse is not the sole site of truth. It is rather one of several technologies, or methods of control (Foucault, 1988b), that are deployed to influence people through a system of governmentality, a more encompassing term that will be explained in sections below. Ultimately, discourse is one piece, but an important piece, of a larger picture that must be analyzed alongside material practices to come to a satisfactory understanding of how a particular version of truth is being used within a society’s current regime, or rules, of truth. In this section I will further define the terms regime of truth, discourse, and power/knowledge before utilizing these concepts to deconstruct the current understanding of study abroad as a cultural, educational, and institutional practice.

The Production and Maintenance of Truth

Although Foucault’s subjects of study and methodology changed dramatically over time, his “general concern for understanding and interpreting history and, more particularly, the history of modernity” remained constant (Cook, 1993, p. 72). In various places Foucault (1977/1980d, 2004/2008) describes the overarching force that guides
periods of history as a *regime of truth*, and occasionally as a “regime of rationality” (Foucault, 1991/2000d, p. 230). Foucault (1977/1980d) claims:

> Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth—that is, the types of discourse it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances that enable one to distinguish true and false statements; the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (p. 131)

In other words, truth is neither a historical constant nor something that is external to society. Rather, individuals can only come to know truth through the “mechanisms and instances” that are specific to their particular historical period, society, and societal position. There may be many of these subjective, socially constructed truths on the individual level, but they are all organized and judged according to the larger regime of truth that, while fluid and changing over the long term, is more constant and widely accepted within a given society at a particular moment.

Through his analyses from various social vantage points, Foucault (1977/1980d) came to believe that the contemporary West’s regime of truth shaped, utilized, and sustained individuals’ and communities’ smaller subjective truths through a “‘political economy’ of truth” in five main ways (p. 131). First, subjective truths are shaped by scientific discourse. Secondly and thirdly, they are always judged through “economic and political incitement” and they are diffused and consumed through the “apparatuses of [formal] education.” Fourth, individual and community truths are produced through “great political and economic apparatuses,” and, finally, they are used as the main subject of political debate (p. 132). In other lectures, Foucault (1991/2000d, 2004/2008) suggests
that these actions of the political economy of truth can be categorized into “two axes” of activity (p. 230, 1991/2000d), *veridiction* and *jurisdiction*. When examined together, these two axes produce compelling evidence as to how a regime of truth is sustained.

Together, the forces of veridiction and jurisdiction respectively organize the political economy of truth into processes of “true or false formulation” and “codification/prescription” (p. 230, Foucault, 1991/2000d). In other words, veridiction determines what concepts and ideas it is even possible to speak about. It makes things real. Jurisdiction, on the other hand, lays out the rules, regulations, and procedures that describe what subjects ought to do within the realm of real. It is the ethical impulse that organizes a regime of truth and daily life. The political economy of truth that Foucault (1977/1980d) described – whether taking a scientific, economic, political, or educational form - can be divided into these two streams of creation (veridiction) and rule enforcement (jurisdiction). When analyzed together, the evolution of the veridiction and jurisdiction in language, or discourse, can provide information as to how a particular societal situation or problem emerged.

At the same time veridiction and jurisdiction are being carried out discursively, they are also reverberating through the daily, mundane, and material practices that make up social life (Foucault, 1991/2000d). It is here, “rooted deep in the social nexus” of personal relations and individual actions, or a society’s *regime of practices*, that Foucault (1991/2000d, p. 343) claimed the effects of discourse and other technologies can be observed most clearly. It is in daily life where both discursive and material veridiction and jurisdiction become embodied in the design of college campuses, methods of organizing individuals, and even the ways in which one may alter their physical body or
psychological sense of self. The knowledge of the appropriate way to conduct each of these activities is learned through discourse, but it is also reinforced through the material structures of our lives.

Institutions are important to analyses of society, but they are understood only as “embodied and crystallized” representations of what is already occurring and has occurred amongst the people (Foucault, 1991/200d, p. 343). They are the amalgamated afterglow of the billions of interpersonal interactions that occur each day within regimes of practices. In contrast to structural explanations of society, such as Marxism, this perspective forwards the view that institutions are only real and meaningful because of the faith individuals invest in them. For Foucault (1977), the social body must also undergo transformation (a process that is observable through discourse and regimes of practices) if reform of institutions is to have any lasting effect. Foucault’s theorizing of the relationship between truth production, societal structure, and individuals’ subject forming processes allows for a multiplicity of sites and scales of analysis. Through explicitly bringing forth the simultaneity and fluidity of societal processes, he created new methods of analysis. One of the most prominent new methods, analyzing the connection between truth and power, lies at the heart of this analysis and is explored in the next section.

**Recognizing Power/Knowledge through Discourse**

While the maintenance of truth is both a cognitive and corporal enterprise, the observation of veridiction and jurisdiction over time is often more easily achieved through the analysis of documents. This is due to the inherent ability of discourse to spread widely across the social body, to penetrate deeply into it, and to touch the lives of
individual members. A Foucauldian understanding of discourse is couched in the study of how language is structured, how it relates to power, and how it affects individuals. Mills (1997) stated that two of the clearest ways in which Foucault (1972) spoke of discourse was either as “an individual group of statements” or “as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements” (p. 80). In other words, a discourse is both a recognizable group of utterances (texts, statements, or actions) that are linked together and the rules and structure that keep these terms associated with one another. For purposes of clarity, I will refer to the latter definition as discursive structure in this study.

Foucault was interested in the organization and structure of discourses because language is one of the most prominent ways in which a society’s regime of truth is revealed and maintained. Unable to escape the linguistic systems we are born into, “Discourses structure both our sense of reality and our notion of our own identity” (Mills, 1997, p. 15). As a result of the a priori nature of language and power, Foucault believed there was no such thing as a genuinely “autonomous” person as described in traditional liberal thought, because jurisdiction and veridiction control the laws (nomous) of not only society but reality and will always define how we constitute and maintain our persons (autos) (Marshall, 1996). In contrast to a classical liberal understanding of individual freedom being a natural state that must be protected or negotiated, Foucauldian understandings of individuality stress how the ever-present bindings and restrictions we place upon one another come to define what it means to be a human of a certain gender, class, or nationality. It is for these reasons that knowledge, as communicated through discourse, is deeply entwined with concerns of power.
To Foucault, power is found within the communicative and material practices of social relationships - how individuals are defined, bound together, and positioned in relation to one another within societal systems. Foucault (1977/1980c) claims “power [like language] is ‘always already there’, that one is never ‘outside’ it, that there are no ‘margins’ for those who break with the system” (p. 141). Rather, power “is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society,” a situation that is all encompassing for those involved (Foucault, 1978, p. 93). Additionally, power is described as a “multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization” (p. 92). Power is therefore the ability of systems to self-reinforce, the dependency objects and subjects have upon one another, and the idea that an individual’s identity means nothing without its relationship to the group.

Power and knowledge are so closely related because of the ways that veridiction, the act of creating knowledge, and jurisdiction, controlling people through knowledge, are used to shape, cultivate, punish, and reward individuals. Discourse is also inseparable from this process in contemporary Western society because it is a primary means through which power/knowledge is communicated, adapted, applied, and replicated. As the discussion of internationalization in the last chapter began to demonstrate, the processes of veridiction that define internationalization and those of jurisdiction that point out its necessity are not value neutral. Students, staff, institutions, and the entire field of higher education are being shaped and molded through the power relations of pedagogy, consumerism, regulation, and political pressure. This power is not a brute force coming down from on high. Rather, it depends upon both temporary and ongoing corroborations.
of individual, institutional, and natural interests that are learned and expressed through discourse. In order to be effective, power is dependent upon ways of knowing and being that originate in a regime of truth and are communicated downwards and upwards through various discourses and discursive structures.

These three elements - discourse, knowledge, and power - form a triple helix at the core of Foucauldian social theory. Understanding these elements makes it possible for critical social scientists and historians to approach any Western social practice and to begin uncovering the power relations that govern it. Through examining these linguistic structures, additional institutional, corporeal, and epistemological structures that carry the forces of veridiction and jurisdiction and uphold the Western regime of truth may also begin to be uncovered. In the next section I will begin to do exactly this and start the downward descent from regimes of truth and into discursive structure through discussing a sample of contemporary texts that bracket, shape, and support contemporary study abroad practices.

The Truths and Discourses of Contemporary International Education

Since their formation, centers of higher learning have been intimately involved with the maintenance of the Western regime of truth through their connections to organized religion. It was more recently, during the 17th and 18th Centuries, that newly-empowered European federal governments began to take more direct control over the universities within their borders and use them to advance new regimes of truth that preserved the state (de Ridder-Symoens, 1996; Hammerstein, 1996). In the Anglo-European colonies of the New World, the first colleges of the Oxford and Cambridge model were involved in the political economy of truth from their foundings, called to
simultaneously serve their respective Protestant denominations, their local communities, and the colonial governments (Thelin & Gasman, 2011). Later American universities of German inspiration were equally caught between the needs of the U.S. federal government, the pressures of state and local politics, and the faculty’s commitments to both preserve and advance competing strains of knowledge. The devastation of the World Wars and the emergence of the Cold War fundamentally changed how these existing duties were understood, however, and spawned new discourses on the imperative need to learn about the world outside of the United States’ borders (see also de Wit, 2002).

Ever since these early moments, internationalization within the U.S. academy has been a site of conflict and contestation. Davies and Pike (2009) are correct in their claim that, “Throughout its short history, global education has been characterized - and, some would argue, troubled - by the search for a single, widely accepted definition that encompasses its diverse content, pedagogy, and philosophical positions” (p. 63). U.S. higher education has never ceased serving a variety of interests and its “heterogeneous nature” cannot be ignored when describing the truths that compel internationalization forward (de Wit, 2002, p. 20). Today, immense debates amongst administrators, practitioners, and scholars continue as to what global education should encompass and how it should be operationalized (see Davies & Pike, 2009; Hovey & Weinberg, 2009; Schattle, 2009; Skelly, 2009).

While a great amount of literature explores these topics, I turn to a different question. This section is an exploration of how these current debates on internationalization’s definition and how it should proceed largely reproduce a decidedly Western regime of truth. For example, many analyses of internationalization begin with
or utilize Knight’s (2004) conceptual framework, which describes the political,
economic, cultural, and academic reasons for and methods of internationalization. While
these are important venues through which internationalization functionally occurs,
Knight’s (2004) analysis does not address the deeper question of what fundamental
beliefs lay at the base of internationalization efforts. It does not ask the critical question
of why these venues of internationalization, which are easily mapped onto Foucault’s
(1977/1980d) Western political economy of truth, have successfully supported a rapid
growth in discourse on internationalization since World War II. It is only in turning a
critical eye back unto the structure of knowledge in this particular field that scholars and
practitioners can hope to make progress in providing truly transformative experiences for
the students with whom they work.

The Liberal-Technocratic Regime of Truth in International Education

Toh (1993) astutely describes the primary paradigm that governs contemporary
international education discourse, the liberal-technocratic, and a possible transformative
alternative paradigm. The liberal-technocratic paradigm largely maps onto Foucault’s
(1977/1980d) hegemonic Western regime of truth. Under this set of rules, the
“authenticity” of the developed West’s feelings towards other peoples is masked (Toh,
1993, p. 10). Instead, the West’s continued engagement with the rest of the world through
the academe is left as an obvious fact that does not need to be named, what I earlier
called inevitable action. This void in purpose can be uncovered and interrogated utilizing
Foucault’s (1977/1980d) understanding of how hegemonic truths are created and
maintained through veridiction and jurisdiction. What masks the liberal-technocratic
regime of truth is a continuous process of veridiction that states over and over again an
“appreciation for the cultures of others,” the strategic deployment of the concept of global interdependence, and key assumptions about the nature of human progress (Toh, 1993, pp. 10-12). Vague references to the greater good are taken as truth, but they are then measured and policed through very specific and juridical scientific, economic, and political discourses that measure only how individual institutions are profiting. Given the strength and regularity with which these forces are deployed, it is not surprising that the self-serving liberal-technocratic paradigm has become so entrenched in higher education.

It is not that a liberal-technocratic understanding of truth is incorrect. It is a form of truth that carries validity in our social world. The problem is, rather, that this form of knowledge is incomplete. The liberal-technocratic structure of truth forms a shield around what Toh (1993) and other critical scholars claim lies at the heart of most drives to internationalize - “paternalistic, racist pity” (Toh, 1993, p. 10), the continued exploitation of the world’s peoples and resources, and a deep desire to remake the world in the image of Europe (Saïd, 1978). Knight’s (1997) categories of politics, economics, culture, and academics are all important arenas in which the truth of internationalization is created and contested, but none of these sites of discourse and practice contain the generative interest that pushes internationalization forward.

When a critical eye is taken to how these measures are used, it is always in the pursuit of maintaining the status quo - the dominance of Western institutions and the nations they serve. Continuing to privilege the Western economy of truth as truth itself, simply recenters the ways in which Western society has always evaluated what is good, valid, and worthwhile. It threatens to turn internationalization both into a “meta-
narrative” that truly means nothing (Havel, as cited in Skelly, 2009) and a tool that delegitimizes alternative ways of knowing the world.

Unfortunately, when larger discourses on international education are analyzed they reveal this pattern of vague impetuses towards internationalization and rigid markers of measurement. Since the height of the Cold War international educators have been told:

To meet the challenge of today’s revolutionary world requires the elimination of yesterday’s habits of mind … Cure of our myopia involves understanding peoples and cultures which have been long neglected in American education - but which now insist upon our attention for their growing contemporary importance, their rich contributions to human history, and the insights they give us into our own institutions, problems, and achievements. (The University of the State of New York / The State Education Department, 1963, p. 5)

What this discourse perpetuates is a view of the world in which internationalism is of “growing contemporary” importance and something that can fix the West’s “myopia” through raising awareness of others’ “rich contributions,” “and “our own institutions, problems, and achievements.” The problem with this narrative is that it forcefully splits the past, a shared history of imperial aggression, from the future, a hope of shared prosperity, without any effort to rectify or understand past wrongs. This discourse at worst promotes and at best allows for a historical amnesia due to its resistance to any discussion of how the West’s institutions and achievements are often quite literally built upon the backs of Third World peoples. Instead of understanding where Western society has been, it is easier to fixate on a mythological future.
More recent documents have continued this trend. At the end of the 20th Century the National Task Force on Undergraduate Study Abroad (1990), a group of administrators at some of the United States most prestigious public institutions, still found “abundant evidence that our citizens are not well prepared for the international realities ahead” (p. 1). Yet, there is simultaneously still no clear definition of those realities besides the fact that they will exist in a “global era.” Simultaneously, there are no expectations of what students should learn besides “increased knowledge and competency” (p. 5). Despite this ambiguity, educators and administrators are expected to adopt a host of new initiatives to address the easily measured factors of increasing the number of students who go abroad and the amount of spent on these initiatives.

After the events of September 11th, 2001, there was another push to strengthen juridical measures of how many students are studying abroad and how much money is spent on these efforts, but little effort invested in examining the definition of what international education and study abroad are or should be. Instead, in the American Council on Education’s (2002) report Beyond September 11 the images of the terrorist attacks upon the United States are deployed as a haunting specter in order to remind Western audiences what happens when these initiatives are not pursued adequately. NAFSA’s (2003) Securing America’s Future puts it more bluntly stating, “We are unnecessarily putting ourselves at risk because of our stubborn monolingualism and ignorance of the world” (p. 1).

The authors of these reports provide more details as to how globally educated US citizens should engage with the world - solving the global problems of infectious diseases, poverty and hunger, over-population, environmental degradation, increasing access to
global markets, controlling for weapons of mass destruction, and promoting democracy through learning about foreign languages, cultures, and political, economic, and social systems. There is still little discussion as to why these skills are important, however. Only the vague reasons Toh (1993) referred to a decade earlier and the hovering threats to the nation-state that ground self-interested understandings of internationalism (Jefferess, 2012). Rather than utilizing internationalization to move towards deeper understandings of the systems of thought and action that perpetuate the violence and hatred that made September 11 possible, normative, liberal-technocratic discourses are more concerned with finding improved ways to continue the West’s exploitation of the rest of the world through the continued study of it as a distinct subject to be walled off and managed.

**The Potential of Alternative Truths in International Education**

Toh’s (1993) alternative paradigm of internationalization responds to the inherent gaps in liberal-technocratic truth through deconstructing the Western economy of truth and emphasizing the role that power and self-interest play in West’s dealings with the rest of the world. Rather than depending upon the hegemonic construction of truth, a transformative understanding of internationalization encourages individuals to “understand the structural complexities that determine differential access to the production and distribution of such social, economic, and cultural artifacts and processes” (Toh, 1993, p. 14). This alternative understanding of truth highlights the generative nature of power/knowledge through interrogating not only spaces that have been thoroughly internationalized, but also those that remain thoroughly nationalistic, omitted and protected from the influence of other peoples. Instead of seeing “otherness and difference as eternal to and distant from a homogenous, coherent self” transformative
paradigms see “otherness and difference as constitutive of an inescapably heterogeneous and complex self” (de Oliveira Andreotti & de Souza, 2012). This lens inverts the question of “How are the West and the rest of the world becoming more connected?” to “How have the West and the rest of the world always been entwined in relationships of exploitation and interdependence?”

Due to the transformative paradigms’ reliance upon local knowing and critical reflections on power and interest, what Foucault (1980e) called *subjugated knowledges*, there are few examples of widespread, alternative national discourses on international education and study abroad. Elements of Toh’s (1994) ideas can be found in academic literature that embraces postcolonial perspectives and discusses the pedagogical practices of service-learning, however. Postcolonial literature challenges the idea the assumption that “as an ethics of action the global citizen is defined as one who helps an unfortunate Other” (Jefferess, 2012, p. 27) and strives to make a better world with, not for others. It seeks to engage with discourses that produce “‘their’ poverty and ‘our’ prosperity” (p. 37) and “legitimize, enact and expand, rather than mitigate, the unfettered international power of the US” (Zemach-Bersin, 2012, p. 89). At its core, a postcolonial alternative paradigm questions how and why the knowledge gained during study abroad always return to benefit the home nation state of the sojourner.

Answers to the core question of which communities and which individuals should benefit when relatively privileged students leave the walls of the classroom for experiential learning opportunities have been more aggressively pursued in service-learning literature. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) identified three subject positions that students engaging in service-learning pedagogy can occupy: personally responsible
citizen, participatory citizen, and justice-oriented citizen. If an individual were to move through each of these three positionalities in the order given above, they would move from concerns of caring for the self to increasingly complex concerns of how systems of injustice are perpetuated and how to care for a community. Justice-oriented individuals are concerned with implementing “collective strategies for change that challenge injustice and, when possible, address root causes of problems” (p. 243). Unfortunately, the transformative, justice-oriented perspective is often difficult to achieve given the complexity inherent in connecting personal experiences to political structures and using those experiences to work towards sustained, collective action.

The academic discourse on service-learning has continued to wrestle with these challenges through turning a critical eye inward upon the structures that support these pedagogical practices. In an overview of service-learning’s critical tradition, Gilbride-Brown (2011) traced contemporary students’ involvement in local communities not only to Paulo Freire’s critical tradition of praxis, or “reflection and action upon the world” to help improve the lives of others (p. 29), but also to the more radical and fluid understandings of the self and identity found in feminist and critical race theories. It is in these works, which are underutilized due to their political nature, that students may begin to wrestle with deeper questions of how the Other relates to the self.

Gilbride-Brown’s (2011) epistemological work builds upon the critiques of Butin (2006), who first shifted the conversation away from why service-learning is done. Instead, Butin (2006) questions the structure of service-learning, how and where service-learning is done and who does it, in order to understand how it may be inherently limited, prone to appropriation, and inappropriately measured. Through opening up these multiple
veins of critique into service-learning, what Butin (2003) deemed an anti-foundational approach, it becomes apparent that service-learning is done for multiple reasons: to better understand academic content, to support the local community, and also to garner social capital. All of these motivations, both those more altruistic and those more self-serving, may be in play in a single instance despite the motivations that discourse privileges as the most authentic.

Butin’s (2003) version of a transformative approach is to inject analyses of service-learning with multiple, often contradicting viewpoints, in order to escape from the limits and injustices of a single, foundational approach. While the liberal-technocratic regime is outward looking and foundational in nature through its attempts to measure the rest of the world to a privileged standard, the works of de Oliveira Andreotti & de Souza (2012), Jefferess (2012), Zemarch-Bersin (2012), Westheimer and Kahne (2004), Gilbride-Brown (2011), and Butin (2003, 2006) all provide examples as to how a transformative regime of truth can be used to help students and educators engage in critical understandings of both their own identities and the regimes of practices in which they are engaged daily.

**Dominate and Subjugated Discourses in Study Abroad Literature**

Traditionally the literature review of a study is a place for authors to lay down the truth about a subject. Given this study’s Foucauldian theoretical framework, however, I am more concerned with how dominant and subordinate truths on international education are upheld, confined, masked, and revealed through various discourses on study abroad and similar educational practices. It also important to note that the discursive structure of the academy, which privileges certain speakers and confines the flow of information
through faculty tenure and publishing processes, creates a unique discursive structure that only allows certain voices to be seen as legitimate. It is my goal in this section to highlight not only areas of consensus in discourses on study abroad practice, but also areas of conflict and disjuncture, in order to participate in the “development of a mutual, dialogic production of a multi-voice, multi-centered discourse” (Lather, 2007, p. 112). Through highlighting three major strains of discourse on study abroad and exposing where these strains of language overlap, resist, and propel each other forward, the possibility of developing savoir - or critical knowledge (Foucault, 2007) - of this educational system is preserved.

Global Citizenship Discourse in Study Abroad Literature

In the mid-Twentieth Century U.S. higher education entered a new “golden age” built upon the GI Bill and an influx of federal research money tied to the rise of the Cold War era (Thelin & Gasman, 2011). The discursive shift that accompanied this massive readjustment of material resources was one that embraced the importance of a particular type of mass education, as outlined in the philosophical works of scholars like John Dewey (Reason & Broido, 2011). Dewey’s ideas, such as education for democracy, found receptive ears amongst university administrators and faculty designing new large-scale programs (Reason & Broido, 2011) and also guided new bodies of global citizenship theory (Hovey & Weinberg, 2009). In both its domestically and internationally minded variants, Dewey’s work melded the concerns of the individual to those of the nation state in educational discourse. At the same time, the seismic conflicts of the 20th Century taught both the American government and its people the need to understand the rest of the world (Goodwin & Nacht, 1991), binding education and
foreign policy in a political union that still lasts today within contemporary discourse despite U.S. higher education’s decentralized design.

The historical moment of the post World War Two era has given way to multiple definitions of global citizenship and suggestions as to how study abroad may help students achieve such a perspective. Several perspectives on how global citizenship can be incorporated into study abroad initiatives are outlined in the opening chapters of Lewin’s (2009) *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad*. In these chapters Schattle (2009) defines global citizenship as an awareness, responsibility, and participation that leads to cross-cultural empathy, personal achievement, and international mobility. Skelly (2009) more broadly asserts that this type of education helps students “see the globe as the context, and fundamental referent, for their lives” (p. 22). Finally, Hovey and Weinberg (2012) explain that global citizenship education shares the same foundation as local civic education initiatives in asking “how do we create situations through education for students to acquire the skills values, knowledge base, and interest to do public work that can anchor healthy democratic communities in the 21st century?” (p. 35).

Two areas of consensus have coalesced within these competing definitions of global citizenship that help define this strain of discourse for this study. First, many authors agree that there is a deep-seated need to graduate more interculturally competent students who are aware of cultural differences and can effectively engage with them (Skelly, 2009). Secondly, many believe that study abroad, when done correctly, is one of the best pedagogical tools available to meet this end (Che, Spearman, & Manizade, 2009; Hovey & Weinberg, 2009). Overall, global citizenship discourse situates individuals in a
material world and continues to use Dewey’s ideas of education in the service of democracy to expand an ethic of action from the local community outwards to those who live beyond the borders of the nation state.

Recently, some proponents of global citizenship theory have increasingly taken a critical eye to the ways in which study abroad is practiced, confronting the idea that “any experience abroad for American students would contribute to the general global need for educated citizens and help to foster greater understanding between peoples of different cultures” (Skelly, 2012, p. 22). Skelly (2012) outlines two major problems in study abroad practice. Firstly, students’ “base realities” of the rest of the world are made up of fictional accounts of other places (p. 28) - a fact that Saïd (1978) and other post-colonial scholars spent their careers documenting. Secondly, Skelly (2012) laments the fact that study abroad programs, which would ideally confront students’ fictional accounts of the world, are increasingly prepackaged in a way that prioritizes comfort and leisure at the expense of critical learning. Hovey and Weinberg (2012) have deemed these programs low road - low cost and explain that at best these programs “simply [provide] the American college experience in a different time zone” (p. 36). Both Bolen (2001) and Ogden (2008), although speaking from a more critical perspective that will be outlined below, have similarly claimed that today’s programs are ineffective because of the introduction and unfettered growth of consumerism in U.S. study abroad. The work of these later scholars indicate that the benefits of global citizenship education may have been oversold by earlier authors who did not invest in building the field’s capacity to deliver, sustain, and protect quality study abroad experiences. A second group of scholars
have, therefore, taken up this task through the deployment of empiricism to better understand what students are learning.

**Empirical Discourse in Study Abroad Literature**

Recognition of the power of scientific discourse in the Western political economy of truth is fundamental to Foucauldian analysis. The ways in which a previous nebulous societal problem become known through numbers and consequently controlled through minute interactions is at the heart of Foucault’s (1980b, 2000a, 2004/2008) analyses on economics, healthcare, and other methods of policing populations. In regard to study abroad, empirical research on the educational technique has largely emerged only within the past 60 years as more students participated in international exchanges after the World Wars (de Wit, 2002; Twombly et al., 2012). Today, research that quantifies, measures, and standardizes student learning while abroad makes up a significant portion of the academic discourse on the subject as researchers attempt to both prove the importance of global citizenship education and understand how and why “proclaimed outcomes, while generally positive, are less clear and in some cases may be more a popular narrative than an empirically grounded claim” (Twombly et al., 2012, p. 67). In this way, empirical discourse has been used to both perpetuate liberal-technocratic regimes of truth through statements that blindly support increases in study abroad participation (i.e. CALSAFP, 2005; IIE, 2014a) and as a nuanced challenge to the assumed benefits of the practice.

The body of scientific discourse around student learning in study abroad has largely been organized around theoretical models of intercultural maturity that distinguishes three spheres of student learning: cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). The cognitive dimension involves what information is
known about the world and others, where that information is collected, and how it is assessed as useful. Intrapersonal and interpersonal development occur in different locals - internally and in relation with others - but involve a similar willingness to engage in uncomfortable conversations and be committed to personally chosen beliefs. Due to these similarities, intrapersonal and interpersonal outcomes are often reported together as the studies outlined below demonstrate. Overall, the research on study abroad learning outcomes has largely suggested that students do benefit in several key ways from study abroad, largely in relation cognitive gains. This empirical work also shows, however, that significant affective growth is not as common in students who study abroad, particularly for students who choose shorter programs.

**Cognitive gains.** In the first group of studies examining intellectual or cognitive achievement, scholars have largely analyzed questions of foreign language learning (Freed, 1998; Freed, Segalowitz, & Dewey, 2004; Rivers, 1998; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004; Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009) and, to a lesser extent, cultural knowledge acquisition (Chieffo, 2007; Engberg, 2013; Sutton & Rubin, 2004). Within foreign language learning literature, scholars have found that students who go abroad do generally speak more confidently and more easily than before they left or those who never travel abroad (Freed, 1998; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004; Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009). However, one study found that students who participate in immersion programs at home may spend more time practicing and make more gains in foreign languages than those who simply go abroad with programs that do not have demanding classroom components (Freed, Segalowitz, & Dewey, 2004). Additionally, homestays, which are often the most sought after living accommodation for foreign
language learners abroad, have not always proven to be the most beneficial environment in which to learn and practice (Rivers, 1998). While there is empirical support of the common belief that study abroad improves foreign language skills, it is not a given that students who return home from academic sojourns will be more skilled in a foreign language.

While there are significant limitations to the way that learning outcomes in cognitive areas outside of language are measured, including an over-use of self-reported data (Stone & Petrick, 2013), the scholarly literature examining this realm of learning also indicates generally positive results. Chieffo (2007) found that an overwhelming majority (85%) of first and second year students who travel abroad made significant gains in information about current socio-political issues outside the U.S., the history and geography of foreign countries, and the culture and peoples of other parts of the world. Sutton and Rubin (2004) found statistically significant gains within the similar categories of “functional knowledge” of another locale, “knowledge of global interdependence,” “knowledge of cultural relativism,” and “knowledge of world geography” when comparing students who went abroad to a control group that did not. Overall, Engberg (2013), in a comparison of study abroad with domestic service-learning programs, reported that students who study abroad do in general make more gains in factual knowledge. However, all of these studies also found that students who travel abroad do not make as many gains in the affective domain, intrapersonal skills, and interpersonal skills as often expected.
**Intrapersonal and interpersonal gains.** The second group of findings commonly cited by proponents of study abroad explores the construct of intercultural maturity, or cross-cultural sensitivity, and global perspective taking, which are viewed as a combination of cognitive, affective, and communication skills or as a general attitude towards other cultures. These concepts are measured through various heuristics designed to assess how contact with those are different, often through international academic travel, affects a students’ sense of empathy and responsibility and their willingness and ability to interact across cultural barriers.

Two common heuristics used to measure these psychological constructs are the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI) (Anderson et al., 2006; Braskamp, Braskamp, & Merrill, 2009; Engberg, 2013; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003; Kehl & Morris, 2008; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Pederson, 2010). The Intercultural Development Inventory plots participants on a developmental trajectory ranging from denying and being defensive of difference to accepting, adapting, and integrating into difference (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). The GPI measures students’ increasing awareness of their own meaning making in the cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal domains (Braskamp, Braskamp, & Merrill, 2009). While studies that use these scales suffer from the same limitation of relying mostly on self-reported Likert scales, they at least are theoretically grounded and provide a more robust analysis of how learning is potentially occurring in multiple domains. Reporting on different types of learning allows for a more comprehensive and nuanced analysis.
Studies that use the GPI (Engberg, 2013; Kehl & Morris, 2008) have found significant gains in students who go abroad compared to those who stay at their home institution. It should be noted, however, that those gains are more significant in semester-long programs than short-term study abroad (Kehl & Morris, 2008) and that gains were seen more dramatically in the cognitive areas of global perspective-taking, rather than the intra or inter personal domains (Engberg, 2013). Out of a survey of studies that use the IDI (Anderson et al., 2006; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Pederson, 2010), Pederson (2010) found that merely participating in a yearlong study abroad program was not enough to promote growth along the IDI. Of three groups, a control group that stayed at home, a group that went abroad for a year, and a group that went abroad and engaged in a special curriculum using intercultural pedagogy, only the last made any type of intercultural gains. In other words, study abroad was effective, but only when paired with other intensive teaching methods. Anderson et al. (2006) found some significant gains in intercultural development after students participated in a short-term study abroad program, but limitations on that study’s sample size (N=57) prevents the results from being generalized.

In the face of mounting concerns over program effectiveness, some scholars have begun to more explicitly challenge the notion that all international experiences are valuable regardless of program duration through the use of the GPI, the IDI, and other measures (Dwyer, 2004; Medina-López-Portillo, 2004; Kehl & Morris, 2007). In contrast to Anderson et al. (2006), Medina-Lopez-Portillo (2004) found that the length of stay was significant and that students tend to over-emphasize the gains they have made in intercultural development when simple Likert-scale questions were compared to IDI
scores. Additionally, Dwyer (2004) found through examining the collected responses of 14,800 Institute for the International Education of Students (IIES) alumni that the “[l]ong-held beliefs that studying abroad for a full year has more significant and enduring impact on students were supported by the data” (p. 161). Specifically, those who studied abroad for a full year were twice as likely to achieve a Ph.D. and maintain lifelong friendships with their hosts. Finally, Medina-Lopez-Portillo (2004) found similarly statistically significant differences using a related scale in 520 students studying abroad for various amounts of time.

Similar to higher education research at large (Naidoo & Jamieson, 2007), researchers attempting to measure student learning while abroad have historically focused on the individual student at the expense of such variables as institutional context and program design. These scholars have also largely relied upon the discourse of global citizenship to answer the question of why educators should assist students in developing intercultural maturity. In this way, global citizenship and empirical discourses in study abroad literature form a symbiotic relationship, with the former serving as a source of veridiction and the latter operating as a form of jurisdiction. More recently, a third discourse that challenges both the foundational assumptions as to why students study abroad and how those study abroad opportunities are assessed has become more prominent. This third, critical discourse draws upon transformative paradigms to reveal the ways in which global citizenship and empirical discourse have been utilized to uphold liberal-technocratic regimes of truth that largely continue to empower the already privileged.
Critical Discourse in Study Abroad Literature

Critical voices in the literature on study abroad and international education draw upon the transformative and subjugated knowledges that exemplify Toh’s (1993) transformative paradigm. These authors use their subject position from within the academy to highlight how “uncritical and celebratory articulations of global citizenship potentially legitimize, enact and expand, rather than mitigate, the unfettered international power of the U.S.” (Zemach-Bersin, 2012, p. 89). They highlight the ways in which the rhetoric of global citizenship is rationalized through liberal-technocratic threats to the nation state’s economic and physical wellbeing (Jefferess, 2012), and not in the legitimate sharing of power, resources, and knowledge. Finally, they ground student learning in not only our present temporality – with the technological advances and challenges that it brings (Grünzweig & Rinehart, 2002) – but, also, within “the imperial legacy of schooling” that is complicit in a larger history of violence against the non-Western world (Pashby, 2012, p. 13). In this section I will highlight some of the most prominent critiques of the current conceptualization of study abroad from this critical perspective and some alternatives that have been suggested by these authors.

Zemach-Bersin (2008, 2009, 2012) is a prominent example of a scholar who has utilized the transformative paradigms found in postcolonial studies and applied them to research on study abroad. In The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad, Zemach-Bersin (2009) challenged the ways in which study abroad offices and third-party providers utilize advertisements that appeal to “American students’ sense of entitlement, consumerism and individualism” (p. 303). Through analyzing study abroad advertisements and interviewing students, Zemach-Bersin (2009) found that “strong
monetary connotations” (p. 306) are often used to describe students’ “investments” into their education, which supports a consumerist mindset and the belief that the purchase of an international, cross-cultural experience will transform one’s identity through the power of money.

These themes support the findings of other authors, such as Bolen (2001) who has drawn strong parallels between the commoditization of study abroad education to larger consumerist tendencies in the field of higher education. Ogden (2008) places these problematic practices in the historical context of the violence of colonialism, demonstrating how without intentional design study abroad programs physically and psychologically recreate a colonial mentality. Ogden’s (2008) colonial students want “to be abroad and take full advantage of all the benefits studying abroad offers,” but avoid “the less desirable side of being there,” including psychological discomfort and reciprocal care towards the host community (p. 37). In an empirical analysis Nyaupane, Teye, and Paris (2008) found that when students’ expectations of what type of amenities and service they will have abroad were not met, that the students’ perceptions of host countries and peoples declined, supporting Ogden’s (2008) critique of consumerism in study abroad.

Grünzweig and Rinehart (2002) in their collection Rockin’ in Red Square ask similar critical questions from a more programmatic perspective. Contributing authors Engle and Engle (2002) ask several critical questions of study abroad programs. First, they posit if “the foreign worlds to which we send our students increasingly seem to meet certain base expectations of young people raised in America’s comfortable consumer wonderland” (p. 27), than what is truly the difference between studying at home and abroad? Secondly, they raise the question of how a single study abroad experience is
supposed to teach American students empathy and relativism in a year after nearly two-decades of being taught in individualistic and universalist ways? In the same volume, Citron (2002) suggests that study abroad educators may be better off giving up on an ideal of immersion due to these reasons and begin exploring how American students create third-cultures while abroad that may also be conducive to learning. Additionally, Schroeder, Wood, Galiardi, and Koehn (2009) suggested that students should not have unfettered access to a local community because their presence may have negative impacts on local peoples and environs, including promoting economic inequality and dependency, increasing tensions between locals and visitors through disrespectful behavior or perpetuation of stereotypes, and destroying fragile habitats through increased exposure.

Finally, a third group of authors have challenged how the normative design of many study abroad programs silence issues of personal and social identity that may be important for underrepresented students to explore while away from home. Talburt and Stewart (1999) found after an ethnographic study of students studying in Spain that an African-American participant had a more negative experience abroad than her White peers, and that when she attempted to discuss the racially and gender based harassment, she was commonly silenced rather than engaged in conversation. A study by Savicki and Cooley’s (2011) comparing two groups of students, one that went abroad and a second that stayed at home but took similar identity-based coursework, found that while the students who stayed at home did not experience any change in their sense of identity, the overwhelmingly White group of students that traveled abroad actually regressed from a more exploratory sense of American identity to a more foreclosed one. The authors
conclude their study by asking if this is a result of facing the challenge of going abroad and not being adequately debriefed.

What each of these authors’ work demonstrates is that study abroad, as it is currently practiced and theorized is often not enough for those seeking to change students’ beliefs and the ways in which they engage with the world. Critical discourses challenge “the magic” that is the blind faith in the benefits of study abroad (Engle & Engle, 2002, p. 25) regardless of critical questions of design and content. This work does not critique without offering solutions, however. A strong example of what study abroad design could look like from a critical perspective is given by Kiely (2004, 2005) whose research explores an international service-learning experience explicitly centered upon topics of identity and social justice. Kiely (2005) suggested that a certain amount of “high-intensity dissonance,” the type “that is political, economic, historical, and social marks the initial change in the way students see themselves and the world” (p. 12). It is not enough to experience “low-intensity dissonance,” such as problems navigating or communicating in a foreign county according to the author’s longitudinal data. Only significant exchanges with the people and environment in a foreign country that cause study abroad participants to rethink their own home contexts will promote lasting changes in perception.

This process of consciousness-raising is neither linear, nor complete once students return home. Another study by Kiely (2004), using similar methodology, found that students who have these intense experiences abroad often face moments of isolation when they return home, a phenomenon the author calls a chameleon complex. Due to the fact that most of their home worlds still adhere to dominant ideology and that the people
they come into contact with still embrace narrow views of the world, students returning from critical experiences abroad often find it difficult to express their newly developing perspectives and struggle to not forget what they have learned. Scholars building off Kiely’s (2004, 2005) work have also found similar findings of uncertainty and productive discomfort in short-term immersion programs focused on service (Jones, Rowan-Kenyon, Ireland, Niehaus, & Skendall, 2012). These findings suggest that educators’ work is more complicated than simply espousing a counter-narrative to dominant ideology and that ongoing sustainable contact with students must be made after they return from experiences abroad as they continue to grapple with new understandings of how “otherness and difference [are] constitutive of an inescapably heterogeneous and complex self” (de Oliveira Andreotti & de Souza, 2012, p. 2).

Overall, what critical academic discourse on study abroad demonstrates is that there are increasingly available theoretical alternatives to global citizenship discourse that can be used to ground and interpret empirical measures. While the liberal-technocratic regime of truth still drives and organizes the discursive structures of the academy, the work of authors like Zemach-Bersin (2008, 2009, 2012), Grünzweig and Rinehart (2002), Kiely (2004, 2005), and others show that space is increasingly being carved out for critical perspectives on international education and study abroad. This study is a contribution to the body of work outlined above, but it also struggles to push towards a better understanding of how critical spaces can be protected and expanded upon. In order to accomplish this goal it is necessary to not stop simply at discourse, but to also question the ways in which discourse and discursive structures are used politically to reproduce material structures of inequality in society. In order to achieve this more ambitious goal,
it is necessary to return again to the latter theoretical works of Foucault. In the next section I begin utilizing Foucault’s analytical tools that go beyond language in order to develop a new model of how both language and material practices are used to govern study abroad practices.

**Upward from Practices to Apparatuses and Governmentalities**

Amongst scholars who study Foucauldian theory there is a widely recognized shift in the French author’s thought between 1972 and 1977 (Cook, 1993). Within these five years Foucault moved from focusing his analyses upon questions of knowledge and discourse to the ways in which power physically and psychologically shapes individuals. Governmentality is part of this shift to a larger project of understanding the world through “a form of history which can account for the constitution of knowledges, discourses, domains of objects, etc., without having to make reference to a subject which is either transcendent … or runs in its empty sameness throughout the course of history” (Foucault, 1977/1980d, p. 117). In this stage of his scholarly work, Foucault began to dig further into the social fabric, looking at how smaller subjectivities shape and challenge the “knowledges, discourses, domains of objects” he researched. While little of Foucault’s old work was completely abandoned, it was reutilized for this new purpose and with a new understanding of how power is related to knowledge, how it forms subjects, and when resistance is possible.

For the purposes of this paper, I have drawn heavily from Ettlinger’s (2011) explanation of governmentality as geographical epistemology. In Ettlinger’s (2011) work and this study, governmentality is understood as a framework for understanding how regimes of truth, and their constituent forces of veridiction and jurisdiction - as
communicated through discourses and practices - are used to control and shape populations and the individuals who make up those populations through the strategic use of power. Foucault (1977/1980e, 1979/2000c, 1991/2000a, 1991/2000d, 2004/2008) spoke of governmentality in relation to power in many places throughout the later part of his life - a scattering of definitions and critiques that Ettlinger (2011) has assembled into analytical anchor points in order to form a more coherent whole.

Another crucial element of Ettlinger’s (2011) Foucauldian perspective is the use of scale to manage and orient the complex project of understanding society. This section marks the beginning of the ascent from practices towards a larger scale in understanding of the way that international education is organized by the US academy. Having laid out Foucaudian theories of discourse and knowledge in the last section, the following pages will delve into the ways in which power/knowledge is used to control individuals, why this is of concern in international education, and how new ways of learning and teaching may be possible. I will conclude by exploring how authors writing from similar disciplines have used governmentality to ask critical questions similar to those I am raising within the realm of international education.

**Starting with the Regimes of Practices**

Foucault’s focus on the individual, micro level continued his fundamental reversal of traditional liberal understandings of society and power. Until Foucault, societal power was almost universally thought of as a substance that key individuals and groups possess and use to control the relatively powerless masses (Ettlinger, 2011). Instead, per Foucault (1991/2000d), if one is seeking to understand power and change society, all analyses must concern themselves not only with those who are discursively positioned as experts.
or rulers, but also with the common people who carry out and constantly sustain the ideas and practices that make up a given regime of truth.

It is the embodied nature of truth that makes it necessary for all empirical analyses of a social problem to begin with societal “blocks” (p. 338) or “local struggles” (Foucault, 1977/1980d, p. 125), such as the enactment of discipline at a particular boarding school (Foucault, 1977), the practices of sexuality in Western Europe (1978), the economic regulation of post-World War Two Germany (2004/2008), or, as in this study, the study abroad practices at a particular U.S. research university. Problems for investigation are conceptualized through an understanding of a regime of truth, as communicated through discourse, and how that regime of truth does or does not align with regimes of practices. Due to the power of regimes of truth to shade analysis, however, the investigation of the problem must be conducted in a reverse matter from the ground upwards toward a new understanding of truth. In this way, regimes of practices serve as bedrock from which novel understandings of society are built.

Today, study abroad maintains many vestiges of the history of the Grand Tour (Brodesky-Porges, 1981; Towner, 1985) but the practice has also changed radically, particularly in recent decades. In 2015 nearly 300,000 U.S. American students will leave their college and university campuses to study abroad (IIE, 2014d). This is a significant increase from just ten years ago when in the 2001-2002 term, 160,920 U.S. American students participated in academic travel abroad (IIE, 2013d). The impressive 176 percent growth of study abroad in recent decades is often celebrated, but when contemporary study abroad practice is critically interrogated and examined in light of measurements beyond gross participation rates, more nuanced trends become intelligible. A deeper
understanding of these material practices at the national level are necessary in order to build a reliable critical understanding of study abroad.

First, while the number of students studying abroad has increased, so too has the number of students enrolled in higher education institutions overall. As Ziguras (2011) demonstrates with UNESCO (2009) data, similar celebrations of international student mobility may be immature. Ziguras (2011) found the global number of students studying in foreign countries for at least a year has increased significantly in recent decades as well; however, when increases in overall enrollment in higher education are also taken into account the percentage of students studying in foreign institutions has remained constant at nearly two percent worldwide. Within the United States, the number of students enrolled in post-secondary education has increased from 15,927,987 in the fall of 2001 to 20,994,113 in the fall of 2011 (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2013). This means that while the number of students participating in study abroad is at a record high, the percentage of all students enrolled in post-secondary education that study abroad has made a modest increase from 1.01 percent in 2001 to 1.35 percent in 2011. Sources that further disaggregate the data estimate that approximately 9 percent of all students enrolled in associate and bachelor’s programs study abroad (IIE, 2014a).

Second, suggestions that study abroad is becoming more accessible due to increasing numbers of participants is contradicted by continuing discrepancies between what types of students do and do not study abroad. Female students today continue to be one of the, if not the only, historically disenfranchised groups that today are overrepresented in study abroad statistics. During the 2011-2012 academic term female-
identified students made up 57 percent of all U.S. students (NCES, 2013) and 64.8 percent of students who went abroad (IIE, 2013c). White students continued to be the vast majority of students who studied abroad in the 2011-2012 term at 76.4 percent (IIE, 2013c) - a percentage that has dropped by only five percent over the past decade despite White students now only making up 59 percent of total enrollment in 2011 (NCES, 2013). Students with reported disabilities only make up five percent of those who went abroad in the 2011-2012 year (IIE, 2014b), and currently no data is being collected at the national level that tracks at what rates students of non-normative sexual orientation and gender identity, lower socio-economic status, or various religious traditions participate in study abroad. Despite rising numbers, study abroad remains an educational activity most easily accessed by the relatively privileged.

Third, the reported remarkable growth in study abroad has been largely limited to particular types of programs. While traditionally students committed to a junior year abroad, the recent increase in study abroad participation has been limited to short-term programs with durations of less than a semester. At 58.1 percent of all sessions in the 2010-2011 academic year, short-term programs are now the majority of all study abroad trips (IIE, 2013c). This percentage has increased from 47.7 percent in just nine years. At the same time, the percentage of students committing to an entire year abroad has fallen by over half. While this does not necessarily mean that the overall number of students studying abroad for extended periods of time has decreased, it does indicate that these students are increasingly a minority in a field that has made a decisive shift towards programming for shorter engagements.
Fourth and finally, non-traditional study abroad locations outside of Western Europe have become more popular and now make up nearly half of all international academic travel (IIE, 2013b). Although the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, and France are still the top four study destinations for U.S. students, China is now number five and other non-European nations in the top fifteen destinations include Costa Rica, Japan, India, South Africa, Brazil, and Mexico. Many of these nations have been slowly growing in popularity over the past decade, but regions such as Asia and the Middle East have seen the number of U.S. students studying abroad double since 2000 (IIE, 2013b).

Study abroad participation within the United States has recently risen to levels never seen before, but the continuation of problematic patterns has accompanied this growth. Study abroad largely continues to be an activity for the culturally and economically elite. Simultaneously, students are participating in shorter programs than ever before and traveling to places outside of the historic Grand Tour. These latter developments pose new challenges for international educators, but are rarely critically examined in most discourses on study abroad (Twombly et al., 2012). The remainder of this chapter utilizes Foucauldian theory to shed new light on this regime of practices and to further a possible answer as to why these patterns are being seen in study abroad education.

**Study Abroad as an Apparatus of Power/Knowledge**

Over time, discourse, knowledge, and power solidify into recognizable patterns of social, psychological, and material processes. Foucault (1977/1980a) called these patterns *apparatuses of power/knowledge* and described them of taking various forms, such as the mode of economic rationality (2004/2008) or the social construction of sexuality as a
discrete personal attribute (1978). Apparatuses are “always inscribed in a play of power” and contested (p. 196) due to their ability to control perception, or access to a regime of truth. Apparatuses that uphold the liberal-technocratic regime of truth in international education are stronger because they mimic the dominant political economy of truth through relying solely on scientific discourse, “economic and political incitement,” formal education, and other, external political and economic apparatuses (p. 132). A given apparatus “is also always linked to certain coordinates of knowledge which issue from it but, to an equal degree, condition it” (p. 196). They are therefore the tent poles of social reality, structures that rise up from regimes of practices to regimes of truth and connect discourse to action.

Apparatuses, such as the social construction of sexuality, economics, or pedagogy, as bodies of knowledge and fields of practice, are only useful in “a play of power” or relationship between two individuals. Knowledge can be transferred through these relationships, such as when a teacher and student engage in learning; however, the amount and type of learning is also defined by the additional knowledge of societal norms that are shaped by prevailing discourse. It is important to remember, however, that Foucauldian power is no longer be merely a repressive force, as it had been largely depicted in the Marxist state (Foucault, 1977/1980d) and the Freudian superego (Hutton, 1988). Instead, power/knowledge is a field of omnipresent relations that is just as productive for the individual and social groups as it is for the state (Foucault, 1978). Through various apparatuses, and the discourses they both use and are shaped by, power/knowledge is how one comes to understand what it means to be a student, teacher, citizen, and even a person. Power is both liberating and binding, for “We are subjected to
the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth” (Foucault, 1977/1980e, p. 93).

Within the apparatuses of international education in particular, participation in programs such as study abroad is not merely the outcome of power relations, but rather a channel through which power relations shape individuals and individuals shape themselves in the image of a global citizen. Through appropriating the discourses of study abroad and the material aspects of apparatuses of power/knowledge, U.S. students go into these programs and emerge as a new, globalized person through the productive capacity of power/knowledge. The leaders of institutions reimagine their colleges and universities as globalized spaces through a similar process of yielding to external pressures and actively changing their organizations from the inside.

The productive capacity of power is not found only through the external relations of different entities, but also pierces through subjects that were previously monolithic. In this way, individuals are the “vehicles of power,” the “threads” that hold the social body together (Foucault, 1977/1980e, p. 98). Different aspects of one’s being are pulled into play simultaneously as individuals “are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising power.”

The reasons behind recent changes in the regimes of practices of study abroad are not fully understood by researchers and many hypotheses as to why study abroad is changing have been forwarded. I believe, however, that through using Foucault’s understandings of power and apparatuses of power/knowledge, a more coherent picture of international education trends can be presented. Previously, many authors, often writing from undergraduate business programs, have taken an array of different
approaches in an effort to document dramatic changes in study abroad practices from the perspectives of students. Often this research has a stated goal of understanding student participation in order to increase enrollment numbers in study abroad. The existing literature covers students’ motivations and intent (Lane-Toomey & Lane, 2012; Nyaupane, Paris, & Teye, 2011; Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2009; Sánchez, Fornerino, & Zhang, 2006; Stroud, 2010), willingness to participate (Hackney, Boggs, & Borozan, 2012), perceptions of value and risk (Albers-Miller, Prenshaw, & Straughan, 1999; Luethge, 2004; Relyea, Cocchiara, & Studdard, 2008), and choice-making processes (Salisbury, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2011) regarding studying abroad. At the core of all these various studies, however, is a question of how students interact with various truths about study abroad, education, and how to best prepare for adult life.

These authors’ findings indicate that current students’ truths about study abroad are being heavily influenced by veridiction in the form of economic incitement, which in turn is having a juridical influence on how students are being rewarded for engaging in education abroad. In the following sections I have highlighted three trends from the description of how study abroad practice has changed given above. It is my goal to analyze these trends through the Foucauldian lens given above in order to provide a final, theorized context to the original inquiry outlined in Chapter 3.

Trend one: Greater participation. Many studies have found that when students are asked about their views on study abroad they understand its significance as a practice that will help them develop social capital. Pierre Bourdieau (1972/1977) is the most well known theorist to write on social capital and defines it as a knowledge of the dominate social group’s *habitus*, or “the universalizing mediation which causes an individual
agent’s practice without either explicit reason or signifying intent to be none the less ‘sensible’ and ‘reasonable’” (p. 79). Knowledge of the dominant class’ habitus, or social capital, allows individuals to more easily engage in the processes of accumulating economic capital that the dominant class controls.

Despite the different ways they materialize, social and economic capital are tightly interwoven and mutually defined by one another. These academic discourses that connect the pedagogical exercise of study abroad to conversations of social and economic capital can be understood as an example of economic incitement, another one of the five aspects of the political economy of truth given by Foucault (1977/1980d) and another type of veridiction and jurisdiction. This body of scholarly literature is producing more truths in relation to the perceived benefits of study abroad, but in relation to economic return for participants rather than in relation to knowledge acquisition. Additionally, it illustrates how individuals are rewarded and sanctioned through social expectations, which often serve as juridical structures. As will be demonstrated below, these processes at the individual level make up, are complemented by, and inscribed in the norms that dictate what institutions should do with study abroad programs.

Questions of opinions related to economics may not accurately describe what will actually transpire in the market, but they are still important examples of economic incitement because so much of contemporary economics depends upon consumer attitudes. Generally, student attitudes in regard to study abroad are very positive, with most studies indicating that students believe these experiences will make them more competitive job candidates. In a somewhat dated survey of 656 students at a variety of institutions, over 80 percent of students knew that study abroad would be beneficial to
them and “a good experience” (Albers-Miller, Prenshaw & Straughan, 1999). Relyea, Cocchiara, and Studdard (2008) found that a belief that study abroad would help one’s career after graduation increased the self-reported likelihood that students would participate, regardless of whether or not they perceived study abroad as risky. Hackney, Boggs, and Borozan (2012) similarly found that “perceived personal and professional benefit” significantly increased students’ self-reported likelihood of participating, and Sánchez, Fornerino, and Zhang (2006) found students in the U.S. participated in study abroad for “new experience” and to improve their “professional and social situation” (p. 45).

Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, and Pascarella’s (2009) investigation of the student choice process in regard to study abroad demonstrates how students learn of these benefits through the social capital imbedded within their relationships with others. Of a variety of factors related to social capital (including family’s socio-economic status [SES], parents’ educational attainment, race, area of study, and institutional type), students’ family SES was by far the most significant factor impacting their intent to study abroad. Students from lower SES families were much less likely to report intent to study abroad (31%) than students from higher SES backgrounds (81%). Additionally, students whose parents had lower educational attainment levels and those who attended community colleges were even less likely to intend to travel internationally for school.

What these studies suggest is that the most affluent students on college campuses understand the social capital that is imbedded in international travel. These students by and large know that the experience of living and learning overseas will help them find employment and social opportunities after graduation, and this form of veridiction is
being mirrored and amplified in discourses on campus, within the larger field of education (IIE, 2014; CALSAFP, 2005; CIGE, 2012; NAFSA, 2008), and in texts produced by the federal government (CALSAFP, 2005; CLSP], n.d.; NSEP, 2008). At the same time, the promise of social and economic success and the simultaneous threat of failure is an example of jurisdiction being carried out through informal means. While these studies do not speak to the question of if study abroad truly does prepare students to be better employees, they demonstrate how the perception that this is the case may be strong enough to explain the surge in study abroad participation in recent decades. The economic belief in these activities is strong enough to produce truth about them regardless of the empirical strength of the economic incitement that is being undertaken.

**Trend two: Non-traditional destinations.** A second trend in study abroad that needs to be addressed is the steady and continuing increase in non-traditional study abroad locations. Similarly to how many organizations and groups both within and outside the field of higher education have called for an increase in study abroad in general, the same entities are often encouraging students to travel to Africa, Asia, and South America for political and economic reasons (CALSAFP, 2005; CLSP, n.d.; NSEP, 2008). Again, students have noticed the increased attention that these non-traditional locations have received through the discourses these organizations are producing. As a result of this veridiction regarding the differing worth of these new destinations, studying in these developing nations have become associated with increased social capital and is often seen as more valuable.
Nyaupane, Paris, and Teye’s (2011) study of student motivations and decision-making in traveling abroad collaborates this perspective, through arguing that students’ choices in where they study abroad are motivated by the way students’ understand their social reference group. These researchers found that since “the students participating had no prior experience traveling with the particular study abroad program, their destination choice and pre-trip attitude formation was based on a frame of reference developed from other sources of knowledge,” such as the family members and peers that make up one’s most immediate social reality (pp. 214-215). For these students, close relations, who in turn are immersed in a variety of discourses regarding study abroad, served as an agent of verification.

An additional mixed-methods study by Lane-Toomey and Lane (2012) found similar results when examining why students decide to travel to destinations in the Middle East and Northern Africa (MENA). While responses to the survey instrument showed that students were motivated by academic considerations, such as a desire to improve language skills, other survey responses and follow-up focus group interviews also indicated that social capital played a large part in the decision to travel to MENA locals. In addition to seeing MENA destinations as more academically rewarding, students thought that these places would fill a desire for an “out there experience” according to Lane-Toomey and Lane’s (2012, p. 318) responses.

In follow-up focus groups, the students who traveled to non-traditional locations in Lane-Toomey and Lane’s (2012) study stated repeatedly a belief that studying abroad in these places would help them stand out from their peers. This belief was supported by the fact that MENA locals were seen as unique and risky. The authors described how
students were disappointed in the fact these locations were becoming more accessible in the following way:

Towards the end of focus group sessions, the increasing numbers of study abroad students in the region would often be discussed and there was often a sense of disappointment among the students when this topic came up. It was as though this increase made their experience less unique, a quality that was a draw for them.

(p. 324)

These findings by Lane-Toomey and Lane (2012) demonstrate how non-traditional locals have become imbued with additional social capital, their perceived scarcity and exoticness tied to a perception that students who embark on and complete these trips have proven their own special qualities.

As Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, and Pascarella (2009) found with study abroad in general, there is an indication that students’ ability to recognize this additional layer of social capital promised upon completing a MENA program is tied to the social capital that students have already accumulated. Lane-Toomey and Lane (2012) found that those students who traveled to MENA locals had significantly more social capital, in the form of exposure to international issues and experience traveling. These same students “were more than twice as likely (as their common destination counterparts) to cite [economic cost] as a factor in their choice to study in their location” (p. 323), however, demonstrating that a high level of social capital does not always correlate to excess economic capital.
Nyaupane, Paris, and Teye’s (2011) and Lane-Toomey and Lane’s (2012) work shows that social capital is not only tied to a general eagerness to study abroad, but also to a desire to travel to locations that are perceived as more rewarding, dangerous, and risky. In other words, economic incitement regarding the truth about study abroad is not only producing the truth that certain locations are more valuable than others, but also subtly coercing individuals into selecting these destinations over others. Nyaupane, Paris, and Teye’s (2011) and Lane-Toomey and Lane’s (2012) work also shows, however, that while students who travel to locations outside Western Europe are unique, there are both multiple reasons why an individual student may chose a non-traditional local and potential internal differences within the cohorts of students who chose these locations.

**Trend three: Shorter sojourns.** The literature on student motivations to participate in study abroad has demonstrated that there are often multiple and contradictory reasons for students to seek international experiences. Issues of social capital, material resources, personal interest, degree completion requirements, and other factors all interact. Many studies have made sense of this process through utilizing an economic rationale to explain why students gravitate towards certain programs over others. This framework fits due to the fact that study abroad is in demand but also still a relatively expensive and inaccessible pedagogical strategy. Depending upon the destination and program selected, study abroad can be significantly more expensive for students remaining on campus, especially if program fees and college tuition must be paid simultaneously. In order to balance the increasing necessity of study abroad participation and the growing financial commitment needed to graduate with a baccalaureate degree, it is likely that many students are not only traveling to cheaper
destinations, but also turning to short-term programs with durations significantly less than a semester.

Albers-Miller, Prenshaw, and Straughan (1999) found that while students knew study abroad is beneficial, nearly half of respondents were concerned about the time and financial requirements study abroad posed and thought that participation would delay their graduation by at least a semester. With the cost of tuition, fees, and room and board tripling over the past four decades (College Board, 2014), it is reasonable to believe that many students hold similar beliefs today as they did in 1999 and that the rising cost of college attendance is why some students prefer to go abroad for shorter, rather than longer, periods of time (Hackney, Boggs, & Borozan, 2012). As Luethge (2004) demonstrated, study abroad is a risk-laden purchase. In today’s financial environment it may not be worth it even for students who are committed to go abroad to risk significant time and money in a longer sojourn.

Experiences outside of class that have additional financial and time commitments, such as study abroad, may be seen as a luxury and be given up or augmented as a result. This perception could explain the shift from junior semesters abroad to short-term programs of several weeks. According to Mapp, McFarland, and Newell’s (2007) analysis, “[a] short trip can allow students to gain international experience without sacrificing other demands on their time” (p. 41), such as intensive curricula, part-time work, and extracurricular opportunities (Brubaker, 2007). Short-term trips also tend to be designed to fulfill academic requirements due to home institution faculty often leading the trip (Brubaker, 2007; Engle & Engle, 2003; Sachau, Brasher, and Fee, 2009), which can make them more economically feasible for students. Increasingly encouraged to
participate by staff and faculty, but unable to support a full semester or year abroad, short-term programs may be all that is financially accessible to many students.

Support for this line of thought is seen in the clear decrease in the number of students traveling abroad during the 2008-2009 financial crisis (IIE, 2013c), but it is also complicated by the fact that rates of participation in study abroad for students of color, who often have fewer economic resources to contribute to learning opportunities outside of class (Brux & Fry, 2010), have remained disappointingly low despite the rapidly increasing availability of short-term programs. This continued divide between students of color and White students in study abroad indicates again that social capital is a significant factor that impacts students decisions to go abroad.

Salisbury, Paulsen, and Pascarella (2011) argued that while finances remain an important factor in the ongoing inequality in study abroad rates across student racial groups, gaps in academic preparedness and social capital between White, African-American, Asian-American, and Latino students more directly lead to various levels of actual participation. No one racial group is motivated or hindered by the same factors to the same extent. As a result, institutional plans to recruit study abroad participants may actually deter certain minority students’ involvement through highlighting parts of the experience that are not seen as socially and professionally beneficial by students of color coming from a different home context (Brux & Fry, 2010).

More research that examines how student resources, both financial and social, impact student decisions in regard to study abroad participation needs to be done in order to understand these trends better. What can be extrapolated from existing research is that the ongoing disparity between White and racial minority student participation in study
abroad is a multifaceted phenomenon. Additionally, the narrative of reduced cost leading to more students choosing short-term programs, while having some validity, does not fully represent the experiences of all students.

**Three trends, one pattern.** Overall, what the research addressing all three recent trends in study abroad participation shows is that students are thinking of study abroad in economic terms. The recent surge in participation rates and non-traditional destinations can be linked to a corresponding belief in the value of having had an experience abroad, particularly in destinations that have historically been difficult for Westerners to access. Various discourses within and surrounding higher education institutions have positioned studying abroad as a symbol of belonging to a particular class of students and future employees who are ready to take up the challenges facing the United States.

What the simultaneous rise of short-term study abroad demonstrates is that this discourse does not operate in isolation from other trends occurring within higher education. The increasing cost of obtaining a diploma is making it difficult for many students to achieve the additional credential of being educated abroad. It is reasonable to suspect, however, that the juridical social norm has become so strong, at least for White students, that these students are compromising time abroad in order to put some type of international experience on their resumes.

While financial considerations certainly impact students’ decisions about study abroad, particularly how long they will commit to living and learning overseas, these same students are aware of how participation in study abroad communicates their social ambitions. Students are making their own subjective truths in relation to the larger societal truths around international education and policing their own collegiate
experiences in relation to these societal truths. These networks of perception and expectation are the form that power takes in education. Not all players in the network are positioned in the same manner or to the same effect, however. It the systematic use of power relations by those in control of society that Foucault sought to understand through developing the idea of governmentality and its constituent parts: biopower and discipline.

**Governmentality in International Education**

The productiveness of power and the ability of individuals to shape themselves and impose definitions upon others lay at the core of governmentality. Together, they make up the two halves of governmentality as a practice and analytical tool: biopower and discipline. During the Enlightenment governmentality emerged as a practice with the shifting role of the state in both social life and international politics (Foucault, 1988a, 2004/2008). As nations moved from absolute monarchies, that were primarily concerned with questions of legitimacy, to republics and constitutional monarchies, the issue at hand for the state turned to “governing with sufficient intensity, depth, and attention to detail” (Foucault, 2004/2008, p. 18) or, in other words, “Governing [as] the right disposition of things.” (Foucault, 1991/2000a).

The new governments of the early modern period depended upon harvesting and controlling the power imminent in the relations of a healthy, growing, and obedient social body. European and North American governments achieved these ends through “disposing things” or “employing tactics rather than laws, and even of using laws themselves as tactics - to arrange things in such a way that, through a certain number of means, such-and-such ends may be achieved (Foucault, 1991/2000a, p. 211). In other words, governance began to be carried out through all means available, not only the
official structures of government. Today, the form and function of Western society depends upon these larger, less concrete tactics of governmentality (Ettlinger, 2011; Foucault, 1988a).

At one point, Foucault stated that there are four possible tactics, or technologies, of power/knowledge that shape the ways in which humans come to know themselves and are governed: technologies of production, or capital; technologies of sign systems, understood as languages and symbols; technologies of power, such as laws, social norms, and the institutions that support them; and technologies of self, or the regulation of “bodies and souls, thoughts conduct, and way of being” (Foucault, 1988b, p. 18). While Marxism and its followers are primarily concerned with the first technology and other theorists such as Freud and Derrida would focus almost solely upon various sign systems, Foucault’s project in his later works was to understand how discursive structures and power/knowledge allowed for and promoted the intersection of the latter two technologies.

**Biopower.** Foucault (1988b, p. 19) was clear that “This contact between the technology of domination of others and those of the self [is] governmentality,” The first half of this system, technologies of domination, or biopower, are the totalizing aspect of governmentality that target entire groups or populations of people. One of the most common sites of this contact are the discourses and practices of “the human sciences” such as criminology, economics, and fields that have directly influenced pedagogy, like psychology and medicine.
Foucault (1976/1980b) was particularly interested in the ways that healthcare was used as a tactic of governmentality through positioning disease as a social and political problem. A new regime of veridiction, the redefining of concepts such as “disease” and “wellbeing” in the discourses of the 18th and 19th Centuries, transformed health into a new substance to manage, “at once the duty of each and the objective of all” (p. 170). Then, through jurisdiction, entire groups, most often the poor and disposed, were defined in relation to how well they were perceived to take up this mantle of responsibility for their own health and the health of their families. Simultaneously, tactics of segregation, administration, and forceful education were used to enforce these discursive norms.

Overall, healthcare is just one example of many types of biopower that were deployed by the leaders of Western society in the early modern era. Foucault (1978, 2004) also dealt extensively with issues of sexuality and economics in his later work. One aspect that remains constant throughout all of these analyses is the role of targeted education in making the goals of biopolitics a reality. At the level of a population, institutionalized education, its form, content, and delivery, are all crucial to sustaining a healthy, sexually moral, and economically astute citizenry. This is just as true today as it was in the 18th Century. Today, however, the regime of truth governing society has shifted and efforts of biopolitics are centered on the questions of globalization. Through the deployment of veridiction, in the forms of discourse, compulsory education, and societal norms, the creation of global citizens has become a prominent biopolitical project of our era.
**Discipline.** Education is a particularly useful site to discuss governmentality because it unites biopolitics to the second half of governmentality - technologies of self, or discipline. Foucault (1977) described discipline as a type of power relation that “makes’ individuals; it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise” (p. 170). Foucault (1977) gave detailed descriptions of the wide array of ways that discipline is deployed to split individuals into observable constituent pieces, which are in turn used to make individuals docile and malleable, a full discussion of which are beyond the scope of this paper. It should be noted, however, that many of these techniques, which include regularly distributing individuals, constant surveillance, the control of physical activity, and the use of small penalties, all have a role in Western education. Just as the curriculum and institutions of education are used to control populations, every classroom is set up and designed to discipline children until they are ready to absorb and accept the relationships that have been laid out before them.

The most pertinent aspect of Foucault’s (1977) discussion of discipline for an analysis of study abroad involves its ability to normalize individuals through subjection. This process of subjection/normalization begins through first making an individual observable through constant surveillance. Our most basic societal institutions are built upon the principle of surveillance according to Foucault (1977), not only the school, but also the factory, the prison, and the city itself are all designed in accordance with the principle of panopticism - the constant unverifiable threat of surveillance. Not only do those in positions of power attempt to watch our every move, but individuals also watch each other, constantly making sure that everyone “‘holds’ the whole together” (p. 177)
through doing their expected part. In higher education graduates are made observable through the generation of transcripts and other reports, the public giving of academic awards, and the creation of honest job application materials. These expectations are not enforced only from the top down, but also laterally through becoming embedded in a peer culture.

No system of discipline or surveillance is perfect, however, for not every individual can be watched constantly with the same intensity. Therefore, for discipline to hold the societal whole together, it must be internalized. Individuals must come to desire to discipline themselves, to normalize themselves. For governmentality to be effective, individuals must believe a given truth with such conviction that they work to themselves into a subject appropriate for that truth (Foucault, 1979/2000c).

According to Foucault (1977), “In discipline punishment is only one element of a double system: gratification-punishment” (p. 180). Those who adhere to the expectations of norms, which are generated through mass surveillance, are rewarded. These individuals are rewarded with the illusion that they are not being watched as closely, the illusion that they have made their own lives on their own. This reward is so highly prized in our society that gratification is much more common than punishment and individuals will do anything to achieve the norm. Everything that is done to achieve normalization falls under Foucault’s (1988b) concept of technologies of self. Ideas found in prominent discourses are internalized and restated. Truths produced through veridiction and consumed through formal institutions are accepted. Actions are governed according to prevailing forms of jurisdiction.
In many ways, the student who successfully studies abroad in a social desirable location is achieving this position as the normalized individual in contemporary higher education. These students fulfill the promise made in the discourse of higher education that a globalized, intercultural, and democratized world is possible through constant self-improvement (Mitchell, 2003). At the same time, these students have accepted the truth being provided to them through their institutions and peers that international education is beneficial through electing to participate in these programs. Finally, the most useful of these individuals will recruit others to the very programs in which they participated, strengthening the currents of jurisdiction within their alma mater. In this way, study abroad can be understood as a technology of self that individuals utilize in order to align themselves with a current regime of truth.

Foucault’s turn away from discourse and towards power provided social scientists with a rich array of analytical tools. A revolutionary conceptualization of power, a comprehensive scheme for how social structures are controlled and reproduced, and a detailed account of how individuals internalize societal norms can all be found underneath Theoretical umbrella of governmentality. What I have done in this section is begin to outline how these concepts can be applied to study abroad practice within the U.S. academe. What remains to be explored in the concluding section of this chapter is a more complete picture of why study abroad has been deployed as a tool of governmentality and a fuller discussion of what specific governmentalities are driving this practice.
Evidence of Neoliberal and Neocolonial Governmentalities

Foucault (1988a, 1991/2000a, 2004/2008) spoke of the birth of governmentality being tied to a particular set of problems and conditions that Western Europe faced at the beginning of the modern period. This specific emergence is not reflective of the diverse ways in which governmentality has been deployed, however. At any one site that may serve as the beginning of a Foucauldian analysis of practices there are a whole array of tactics and programs that are in play, which in turn may be directed in accordance with multiple governmentalities. Foucault (1991/2000d) described his method of analysis as “rediscovering the connections, encounters, supports, blockages, plays of forces, strategies, and so on” and “indeed effecting a sort of multiplication or pluralization of causes” (p. 226-227).

At the site of higher education in the United States, the reality of multiple governmentalities is highlighted by the diverse conclusions different authors using a Foucauldian perspective have reached about what governs contemporary academic life. This section will explore some of this current work through surveying two of the most prominent schools of Foucauldian analysis in international education: neoliberal and postcolonial governmentality. These examples of critical poststructural analyses of education have guided the design and execution of this study, which is explained in the next chapter.

Neoliberal Governmentality

as a prolonged reaction to various forms of large-scale state action that occurred in both Europe (in the form of Nazism) and the United States (as the New Deal) during and after the Second World War. Despite the vastly different nature of these two events, according to Foucault, they together served as examples of state overreach to conservative European economists and their American peers, who felt that the nation-state had demonstrated its “intrinsic defects” through the outbreak of the two world wars and the rise of Nazism (p. 116). In response, these individuals laid down the foundation of a new type of governmentality that would strive to actively shrink the formal structures of state governments while encouraging constant legal intervention that would ensure ongoing competition in the market.

Whereas the government is corruptible in the neoliberal mind, the market is an arbitrator of truth through its ability to produce price equilibriums when perfect competition is achieved. Perfect competition, or freedom, is not natural, however. It must be actively created through the state, which offers “permanent vigilance, activity, and intervention” in the name of protecting the market (Foucault, 2004/2008, p. 131). This new set of biopolitical strategies has resulted in institutions situated in liberal economies being subject to the “double arbitration” of the “consumers, who decide … according to their preferences” and “the state ensuring the freedom, honesty, and efficiency of the market” (p. 162). Since the 1980s the field of higher education has increasingly come under this double arbitration as more stable sources of support from the government is erased in an effort to preserve perfect competition amongst higher education institutions (Davies & Bansel, 2007). On one side, U.S. higher education institutions are underfunded and regulated into behaving in the ways the market demands by the federal and state
governments, and on the other, they are increasingly reliant on student-consumer tuition to operate.

The disciplinary mechanisms of neoliberal governmentality involve streams of veridiction and jurisdiction that compel individuals to accept market truths and shape themselves in their image. This is done primarily through discourses and practices that situate higher education as a private good meant to raise the social capital and earning potential of a single individual, as opposed to a public good that benefits entire communities (Tilak, 2008). Foucault (2004/2008) described human capital as the extension of economic analysis into previously unexplored domains or giving a strictly economic analysis of a domain previously thought of as not economic. Through this process the individual or “the worker himself appears as a sort of enterprise for himself” (p. 225). Everything, from childcare, to healthcare, to education becomes an investment that is made in the individual so that they can realize their full potential as an economic actor.

**Neoliberal biopolitics.** Scholars of higher education have outlined major ways that both biopolitical and disciplinary techniques of neoliberal governmentality are impacting the academy and students. At the level of discursive biopolitics, Suspitsyna (2010, 2012) has demonstrated that neoliberal discourses are not only endemic in texts produced by higher education’s leaders, but also are often used as a tool of governmentality. In a critical discourse analysis of 164 U.S. Department of Higher Education speeches made between 2005 and 2007, Suspitsyna (2012) found that conceptions of higher education as a tool to increase economic competition far outnumbered instances of education as a tool for engaged citizenship. In the same set of
speeches, Suspitsyna (2010) also found that discourse is used as a direct tool of juridical biopolitics through demonstrating and justifying the “potent powers” of economic accountability, which is needed to “bring progress, high academic achievement, and success” (p. 574). These discursive juridical statements are accompanied by the material biopolitical practice of defunding higher education institutions and implementing legally binding regulations.

Rhoads and Slaughter (1997) suggested that the U.S. government has used biopolitical practices to turn colleges and universities into tools of the market. Through cutting funding and allowing the privatization of publically funded research, scholars are increasingly pressured to pursue private market partnerships in order to continue their research. At the same time, departments that produce knowledge that is not as easily commoditized are left behind and underfunded as non-academic entities decide what research is valuable (Harris, 2005). Similarly, within the subfield of U.S. community colleges, institutions have already been forced to aggressively redefine their missions and services in order to be better aligned with what local markets dictate (Ayers, 2005). Building upon these lines of thought, Boden and Epstein (2006) stated concerns that the influence the private market will have due to these relationships will limit the “research imagination” of the academy, hindering future innovations. They point out that in order to promote a regime of governmentality, the imagination of a population must be captured.

**Neoliberal discipline.** At the level of the individual student, it is possible that the disciplinary aspects of neoliberal governmentality have thoroughly captured students’ imaginations and understandings of themselves to the point that they participate in
educational programs for no other reason than to build social capital for the inevitable and all consuming workplace. As I described above, when students are asked why they desire to participate in programs such as study abroad, the answer is very often tied to cultivating social capital and skills that are perceived as socially valuable (Albers-Miller, Prenshaw & Straughan, 1999; Hackney, Boggs, and Borozan, 2012; Relyea, Cocchiara, and Studdard, 2008; Sánchez, Fornerino, and Zhang, 2006). Just as statements of education being necessary for a healthy society or democracy are missing from larger filed-wide discourses (Suspitsyna, 2012), they are absent from students’ statements.

Additionally, when today’s students select study abroad programs they are used to wielding the arbitrating power of an economic consumer in the neoliberal age. As Bolen (2001) described, study abroad programs today:

include arrangements for food, lodging, and visits to popular attractions in the country, and then add the educational components … The passivity embedded in this process relates to the way some study abroad participants view programs view study abroad programs as serving them a foreign culture on a plate, laid out like fast food ready to eat (p. 186)

Students are not bothered to move away from this consumerist view of study abroad because professionals at home continue “to consider the essence of our students’ overseas cultural and linguistic experience the mysterious result of a kind of alchemy somehow activated by the sheer fact of being abroad” (Engle & Engle, 2002,p. 26). These discourses, which are in turn cemented in place by the institutional reliance of appearing to have accomplished internationalism or globalization are the beginning of the cycle of inevitable action, which focuses all eyes on the question of how to increase study abroad
participation and away from the question of why the adoption of this technology is being pursued so aggressively.

**Neocolonial Governmentality**

A second form of governmentality that often works in tandem with neoliberalism in international education is the governmentality of neocolonialism, which guides the West’s interactions with the postcolonial world at various scales. The global institutions that now help ensure that the neoliberal market remains free of all state intervention, such as the World Bank, have become particularly involved in educational systems of the developing world (Spring, 2004). At the state level, developing nations that have not already had Western education systems imposed on them by war or colonialism are increasingly striving to align with, connect to, and mimic the more prestigious educational systems of North America, Europe, Australia, and New Zealand. Finally, at the individual level, students and other young people engage with the postcolonial world through study abroad and other travel, which often includes service components that solidify preconceived notions of how backward the non-Western world is (Harley, Wearing, & Neil, 2010; Ogden, 2008; Sin, 2009; Snee, 2013).

**Orientalism.** It is impossible to fully understand the neocolonial system of governmentality without returning to the systems of thought and violent practices that gave birth to its particular regime of truth. Edward Saïd (1978) was one of the first to extensively explore the damaging sources of veridiction and jurisdiction that led to the development of postcolonial governmentality in his seminal text *Orientalism*. Building off Foucault’s (1978) *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and paralleling the concept of power/knowledge, Saïd’s (1978) main project was to show not only how the East is
depicted as an object of Western discourse, but how Europe created the concept of Asia through discourse to suit its own needs.

Orientalism is defined by the author as the “distribution of geopolitical awareness into aesthetic, scholarly, economic, sociological, historical, and philological texts” (Saïd, 1978, p. 78). Saïd (1978) was very clear that “it is, rather than expresses, a certain will or intention to understand, in some cases to control, manipulate, even to incorporate, what is manifestly different” (all italics in the original text). Through his various examples of how orientalism was institutionalized through the Napoleonic obsession with Egypt and the British domination of India, Saïd demonstrates the incredible power of discourse to limit and control what Westerners thought of other peoples, but also to create the social structures, or apparatuses of power/knowledge, that would be used to dominate the rest of the world.

The key here is not that the East became known, but that it was reinvented through scholarly and academic intervention “as a set of values attached, not to modern realities, but to a series of valorized contacts it had had with a distant European past” (Saïd, 1978, p. 107). Privileged Western men and women traveled to their colonies set this post-colonial gaze into motion through studying, documenting, and representing, they created the fantastical and dangerous world that they had always feared laid east and south of Europe. These depictions had more to do with what Europeans detested in their own societies, as the Orient was transformed through the Western gaze into a “surrogate” and “underground” self (p. 71) to project outward the undesirable traits of those Western sub-populations Foucault often studied in his work.
As the number of depictions of Asia and the Middle East grew and attracted the “mass” and “referential power” of scientific knowledge (p. 86), the double lie of orientalism, the depictions and what they meant, grew stronger. More recently Saïd (2000a, 2000b) and others (for example Lutz & Collins, 1993; Spurr, 1993) have demonstrated repeatedly how the lies of Orientalism, built up over the centuries, are not simply a mistake of the past, but rather still have force and regularly manifest in the abysmal treatment of Palestinians, representations of Islam in Western news media, and the ways in which Westerners consume the postcolonial world through popular media. Spurr (1993) alone demonstrated a dozen separate ways in which orientalist utterances work together to form a discursive structure that overlaps, contradicts, collaborates, and repudiates itself in an effort to serve as a source of veridiction and jurisdiction for the institutional and individual actors who carry out the power relations of biopolitics and discipline.

**Neocolonial biopolitics.** At the supra-state and state levels the biopolitics of postcolonial development involves policies, practices, and tactics that reinforce the idea that the non-Western world is a place of negatives and backwardness through insisting that it develop following a “correct” and rational model of European and North American development. Colonial governmentality is unique in the way it combines issues of sovereign power, or the right to rule, with tactics of control (Dutton, 2009). While the topics that Foucault (1976/1980d, 2004/2008) often wrote and spoke of, such as healthcare and economics, were intra-cultural if not intra-national, colonialism involves the direct subjugation of entire nations to others. In order for this system to preserve itself, its real purpose of violent domination must be hidden and justified in the

This masking of power relations is seen in Western responses to a host of international problems. Natural disasters and disease outbreaks are treated with utilitarian logic and humanitarian responses are created in response to the greatest calculated need (Dutton, 2009). Educational systems are retooled in order to fit into the unquestionable and sanitized ideal of “a global economy based on open markets where people and companies compete to maximize their economic returns” (Spring, 2004, p. 54). Meanwhile, the West produces discourses that mask and “downplay [global] asymmetries such as American dominance” (Sparke, 2003) and hide the history of colonialism upon which institutions such as the World Bank were founded (Spring, 2004). These structures and discourses simultaneously force those living in the developing world to adhere to a severe biopolitical regime of economic austerity, hide a history of extreme violence, and justify both these processes to Western populations.

**Neocolonial discipline.** This biopolitical structure influences and is constituted by a complimentary set of at least three disciplinary actions that inform how individuals, including students studying abroad, interact with the postcolonial, developing world. First of all, it has been demonstrated that individuals traveling from the developed to the postcolonial world to carry internalized assumptions about the people they are interacting with while abroad and validate these beliefs through their experiences. The sociological literature on Western tourists suggests that brief cross-cultural contact may actually increase stereotypical assumptions on the part of tourists even when visitors come with
the intention of helping and learning from local populations (Griffin, 2013; Guttentag, 2009; Lyons, Hanley, Wearing, and Neil, 2010; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Snee, 2013).

Guttentag (2009) in a review of studies done on volunteer tourism found that within many programs designed by Westerners that the needs and desires of locals are often ignored, that work done by volunteer tourists is often so unsatisfactory that it must be redone by locals, and that orientalist myths that rationalize poverty are often perpetuated. Raymond and Hall (2008) found through a case study analysis examining ten different organizations that send volunteers abroad that, while volunteers feel they returned home with a better understanding of their hosts, the travel and service in which the participants engaged did not change their behaviors and that none of the participants had maintained close relationships with the individuals they visited. Similarly, Griffin (2013) found that students were focused on traveling for their own benefit, but came home with stories that perpetuate old colonial myths, such as the noble savage, an expectation for others to act like Westerners, and stereotypes around the work ethic and abilities of people in the developing world. Finally, Snee (2013) found parallel themes in analyzing online travel writings from students who had recently traveled abroad and commented on how travel experiences perpetuated an exoticism of the other.

Secondly, Western individuals have been shown to use their international travel experiences to normalize themselves as ideally globalized neoliberal actors. Lyons, Hanley, Wearing, and Neil (2010), working from the assumption that “Tourism is not simply a neutral exercise involving someone taking a break but must instead be understood in terms of a power relationship, particularly when this tourism involves a privileged, ‘first world’ tourist visiting and volunteering in a developing country” (p.
371), demonstrated that volunteer tourism has become more about the tourist developing skills that can be spoken about in future job interviews than helping those in the host community. Additionally, Sin (2009) demonstrated that volunteer tourists’ motivations for travel were more about performing a desired version of their selves, a self that could successfully navigate the world and embody an idealized cosmopolitan and altruistic world citizen.

Third and finally, the combination of Western student consumerism, advances in communication technology, and the rapid development of the postcolonial world is making it possible for U.S. students to travel abroad without any type of immersion experience. Ogden (2008) named these individuals *colonial students* and described them in the following manner:

The colonial student casts a striking likeness with the early colonial travelers … [they] yearn to be abroad, to travel to worlds different from their own, to find excitement, to see new wonders and to have experiences of a lifetime … Like children of the empire, colonial students have a sense of entitlement, as if the world is theirs for discovery, if not for the taking. (pp. 37-38)

What communicates this to students and allows colonial attitudes to perpetuate is the hidden curriculum embedded in the structure of study abroad. The three recent trends in study abroad practice, mass enrollment, shorter sojourns, and a rise in new destinations, explored above are all on some level responses to students being seen as customers who expect a variety of options.
Ogden’s (2008) hypothesis is that a colonial attitude then follows into the actual experience abroad, allowing privileged students to move through their experiences without every feeling discomfort or being asked to confront the difficult questions necessary to reach the desired outcomes of study abroad. Instead, students can hide behind luxury amenities, courses led by their home faculty, and short-term programs that make learning local languages and customs unnecessary. These observations have been collaborated by other authors who have noted how “International educators, especially in the United States, are under intense pressure to make study abroad safe not only from physical danger - real or perceived - but from all kings of risks and inconveniences” (Grünzweig & Rinehart, 2002). Others have questioned if true cultural immersion is even possible in a world where email, and now social media, allow for constant interaction with students’ home contexts and communication in native tongues (Citron, 2002).

In this section I have demonstrated how Foucault’s concept of governmentality was applied to analyze two different but entwined sectors of society, the global economy and postcolonial relations between nations. Using Foucault’s (2004/2008) own description of neoliberal governmentality, a variety of authors (Ayers, 2005; Boden & Epstein, 2006; Bolen, 2001; Harris, 2005; Rhoads & Slaughter, 1997; Suspitsyna, 2010, 2012) have applied these concepts to the ways that higher education institutions and student, staff, and administrator populations are governed biopolitically and how individuals normalize themselves through disciplinary power.

Additionally, I have demonstrated how scholars building off of Saïd’s (1978) notion of orientalism have developed a comprehensive understanding of the ways in which developing nations are controlled through a governmentality of neocolonialism.
The discourses involved in the larger biopolitical tactics are simultaneously impacting and made up of a variety of individual disciplinary tactics that encourage and reward individuals for engaging in the postcolonial world in superficial and potentially harmful ways (Citron, 2002; Griffin, 2013; Grünzweig & Rinehart, 2002; Guttentag, 2009; Lyons et al., 2010; Ogden, 2008; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Sin, 2009; Snee, 2013). Moving forward into my own empirical analysis, these documented and established forms of governmentality will be useful tools in answering the research questions regarding guiding this study.

**Conclusion: Power and Resistance**

Reading and writing about governmentality, with its immense scale and all-encompassing nature, can easily lead one to paranoia and nihilism. As Cook (1993) states in her overview of Foucault’s scholarly evolution, “The charge of nihilism is, of course, supposedly the most damning one that has been made against post-structuralists” (p. 122). What commentators such as Cook (1993) and Foucault (2000b) himself in his interviews and public lectures have clearly demonstrated, however, is that a Foucauldian poststructural framework is designed to liberate individuals to the fullest extent possible.

Analyses of governmentality are designed to liberate in three broad ways. First, it makes the invisible, taken for granted, and normalized aspects of life highly visible through theoretical tools of discourse and power. Secondly, it seeks to understand the processes that stabilize these aspects of life through a discussion of how power and discourse are used and what interests they protect. Third, although not always included in analyses, fully realized works on governmentality will explore possible ways to move
away from the ways normalized life restrains and traps individuals. The process is never complete or fully realized, however. As Cook (1993) explains:

Complete emancipation, or the realization of a society where the individual is entirely free to define him or herself, is not possible for Foucault. What we are emancipating ourselves from is a particular, historically instantiated, dispositive of power and knowledge … What we are emancipating ourselves for will be another dispositive - one which may not be “better” than the modern one.” (p. 116)

The inescapable untidiness of Foucauldian analysis comes from Foucault’s (1977/1980e) understanding of power and how it is “exercised through a net-like organization” and how individuals “are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power (p. 98). People are not only power’s “inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of its articulation. In other worlds, individuals are the vehicles of power not its point of application.” Where there are people there is power. Where there is society there will be a regime of truth. The good new is that as power/knowledge seeks to divide human subjects into smaller and smaller units of understanding, the possibility of resistance grows with each additional point of contact between the apparatuses of governmentality and their subjects (Foucault, 1978).

From a Foucauldian vantage point it is necessary to make the ways in which power invisible travels through individuals because discourse obscures this fact. Power “is tolerable only on condition that it mask a substantial part of itself” (Foucault, 1978, p. 86). Those whose interests are served most consistently must hide this fact behind the ideas of the free market, a developed world, or learned student. There must always be something more that compels people to accept biopower and enact discipline. I have
demonstrated above in the chapter that in the U.S. academy this more, the current regime of truth, is the aura of globalization, which promises more success for individuals and more understanding between groups if it can only be realized. It is from this source that the powerful streams of veridiction and jurisdiction that direct study abroad practice originate, but it is also the genesis of large discursive practices that may hide who really stands to benefit from an internationalization of the student learning experience.

Upon describing a specific field of practice and discourse, a Foucauldian analysis then begs the question of how does this local situation relate to other locales, histories, and ways of knowing. As Foucault (1977/1980e) described it:

> a genealogy should be seen as a kind of attempt to emancipate historical knowledge from that subjection, to render them, that is, capable of opposition and of struggle against the coercion of a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse. (p. 85)

In describing the normal or status quo in new ways, its relativity comes to light. This leads to the possibility of exploring alternative worldviews and understandings, subjugated knowledge that seems to be repressed for logical reasons.

When it comes to study abroad practice, adjusting analysis to not only include the considerations of the individual students, but also of the institution, the field of higher education, and those who host U.S. students allows for an array of new questions to be asked. In recentering this analysis upon how multiple levels of practice interact, I have allowed for a more holistic conversation on how not only student development theory, but also neoliberal and postcolonial governmentality impact practice. Moving forward,
constantly asking whose interests are served by this current arrangement in my analysis will allow a further understanding of what historical knowledges must be emancipated.

Finally, after a Foucauldian researcher has begun to uncover these knowledges, it becomes necessary to work with participants and other stakeholders to explore ways out of the detrimental and nefarious aspects of the current regime of governmentality. One, as the researcher, must be careful not to assume what form resistance will take, however. As the result of the fracturing and multiplying of sites of possible resistance, resistance can no longer always be recognized or thought of in a traditional fashion (Cook, 1993). Resistance may be apolitical, it may take the form of retreat or self-preservation, and it may never manifest outside of individuals’ psyches. As Foucault (1980/2000b) stated:

I think there are a thousands things that can be been done, invented, conceived by those who, recognizing the relations of power in which they are involved, have decided to resist them or escape them. From that viewpoint, all my research rests on a postulate of absolute optimism. (pp. 294-295)

It is this spirit of possibility and optimism that I bring into my data collection and data analysis stages moving forward.
Chapter 3: Methodology and Ethics

“The essential political problem for the intellectual is not to criticize the ideological contents supposedly linked to science, or to ensure that his own scientific practice is accompanied by a correct ideology, but that of ascertaining the possibility of constituting a new politics of truth.”

- Foucault, 1977/1980d, p. 133

The methodology chapters of research projects have historically been viewed as “a technical arena” (Lather, 2007, p. 70), where many social scientists have attempted to mimic the methods of the physical sciences in order to make claims of accuracy and validity. Drawing on the work of postmodern and poststructuralist thinkers (Allan, 2008; Deleuze and Guattari, 1983; Foucault, 1977/1980c, 1977/1980d, 1977/1980e, 1991/2000a, 1991/2000d; Lather, 1991, 1992, 2007; Marcus, 1994), this paper continues to challenge and complicate this practice. It is impossible for social researchers, as historically situated individuals studying other people, to escape the orders of discourse and regimes of truth that make up the social realities in which every person is imbedded.

Foucault’s (1978) notions of productive power/knowledge and resistance, however, offer a way to begin moving towards something new and more just. As a researcher interested in this particular conception of resistance, it is ethically imperative that my empirical work is concerned with how scientific discourse perpetuates harmful power imbalances and restricts individuals’ agency. I am interested in not only adding
new information to the current politics of truth (Foucault, 1977/1980d), but also critiquing the structure upon which those truths lay.

The additional epistemological and ethical concerns of poststructuralism do not free scholars who utilize some type of “post” perspective from explaining what they claim to know and how they know it at a basic level. In fact, it is crucial that issues of methodological trustworthiness and analytic coherence remain central to poststructural projects (Lather, 2007). In this chapter I outline how the purpose of this study informed the epistemological perspective, methodology, methods, and data analysis techniques used. Additionally, I describe how I used poststructural perspectives to ensure validity and ethical research practice. The thread that connects these elements is a concern with how language and daily practices serve as constitutive and binding forces of relation that shape our identities and social positions.

**Epistemological Premises**

Poststructuralism is often situated within the larger ontological perspective of postmodernity, or the belief that what constitutes truth and the self is relative, unstable, and contested (Lather, 1991). Lather (2007) described poststructuralism in the following way:

Poststructuralism refers more narrowly to a sense of the limits of Enlightenment rationality. It particularly foregrounds the limits of consciousness and intentionality and the will to power inscribed in sense-making efforts that aspire to totalizing explanatory frameworks, especially structuralism with its ahistoricism and universalism. (p. 5)
It is from this poststructural perspective that the postmodern project makes the most sense and begins for me as a researcher.

Instead of attacking the practices of all sciences and claiming absolute relativism, poststructuralism advances a critique of the “traditional philosophy of science” and suggests thinkers must bracket their ambition as researchers due to the limiting natures of language, identity, and thought (Lather, 2007, p. 64). Within the discursive structures of our social reality, there are pieces of knowledge that will always remain “inaccessible blankness circumscribed by an interpretable text” (Spivak, 1988, p. 294). The poststructuralism in which I am situating this analysis acknowledges limits; but it is also an attempt to engage with the limits inherent in all research, whether relativist or objectivist in nature, through the creation of “situated knowledges” - or texts and statements that are aware of their societal, historical, and epistemological position (Haraway, 1988).

In describing his own particular form of poststructural analysis, Foucault (1971/1984b) stated that the researcher “refuses to extend his faith in metaphysic, if he listens to history, he finds that there is ‘something altogether different’ behind things: not a timeless and essential secret, but the secret that they have no essence” (p. 78). The search for this contradiction or fabrication, the analysis of disjuncture and accidents lies at the core of Foucauldian and broader poststructural analysis. Rather than fear the loss of a unified narrative that describes how the U.S. academy has succeeded to benevolently globalize, it is my goal in this study as a poststructural researcher to use the boundaries of our knowledge, the power relations that define subjectivity, and a reciprocity between subjects and objects to focus on “the development of a mutual, dialogic production of a
multi-voice, multi-centered discourse” (Lather, 2007, p. 112) that is appropriately positioned to receive the objects of research as active entities (Haraway, 1988).

Instead of viewing the results of empirical work as definitive and transparent, I contend that this work is positioned in my own experiences, which constrict as well as guide and enlighten my analysis. Despite my experiential and theoretical knowledge of the practice of study abroad, this study is bound in the discursive systems of power that define it, for they also define me as a subject and author. Therefore, instead of simply stating something is the Truth, I desire to “double” the scientific efforts of this study (Lather, 2007). My goal is to both say something that is truthful, new, and useful for those who work with me as participants, but also to complicate the process of inquiry in a way that challenges potentially harmful power imbalances that persist within study abroad practice, higher education, and society.

The question becomes “how can I intervene in the production of knowledge at particular sites in ways that work out of the blood and spirit of our lives” (Lather, 1991, p. 20), rather than what can I say about this group of people that adds to a mythical accumulation of objective knowledge. Through this recognition of my own limitations, the need for collaborative and participant-focused research takes on a new primacy, as the inclusion of an array of voices is one effective way to begin to tug at our own limits of subjectivity. At the end, there will still be questions to answer, but this project will have been an intervention aimed to impact material practices of study abroad through engaging in what is taken for granted in both the shaping of related problems and the offering of solutions (Allan, 2008).
Purpose of Study

This study is grounded within poststructural and Foucauldian concerns of how knowledge is generated and used to influence individuals and populations. Its purpose is to more fully understand and complicate study abroad practices that are currently taken for granted through a critical discourse and governmentality analysis of two types of texts. The first set of texts consists of written, publically available texts produced by a public, land grant, university, The Ohio State University (OSU). Employees use these texts to describe, plan, advertise, administer, and evaluate study abroad programs offered by the university. The second set of texts consists of a collection of recorded and transcribed interviews with undergraduate students who have participated in study abroad trips of various lengths and destinations.

The following research questions have guided this critical discourse analysis (CDA), as defined by Fairclough (1994) and Allan (2008), and a subsequent governmentality analysis of both sets of texts:

Question 1: How do those who design and administer study abroad programs and those who participate in these programs describe the practices related to study abroad?

Question 2: What traces of disciplinary and biopolitical techniques of power are present in these texts describing the practices of study abroad?

Analyzing texts that are authored by individuals and groups positioned at various institutional levels has allowed me to carry out a more holistic analysis that examines not only what societal discourses and mentalities are being reproduced in study abroad practice, but also how these discourses and mentalities relate to embodied practices and
institutional structures. This doubled analysis of the texts, one discursive and one
governmentality focused, will suggest how study abroad practice is imbedded within a
system of governance that would remain invisible if not for a Foucauldian approach to
this topic. I contend that it is only through this type of poststructural, holistic analysis that
scholars can begin to understand how study abroad has been and continues to be
constructed as an entirely benevolent practice, despite serious flaws and ongoing
questions of effective practice, and why voices critical of current study abroad practices
remain largely ignored.

**Methodology**

work represents a fundamental turn away from the structural theories, such as Marxism,
that defined critical analysis in the first half of the Twentieth Century. Rather than
approaching a topic through privileging one mechanism in society, such as the economy,
Foucault (1977/1980e) proposed that analyses begin by studying an idea or process
within various localities or blocks of society, examples of which include discipline
(1977), sexuality (1978), and healthcare (1980). Once the focus of analysis has been
located, data collection must begin at the smallest social scale possible - the regimes of
practices that replicate societal processes on a daily basis. From here, at the observable
level of physical practice and interaction, an “ascending analysis” from the individual, to
the community, to the state, and to the regional and global scales can be made (Foucault,
1991/2000d). Only from this grounded position can the entire scale of the societal project
be viewed with minimal interference from *a priori* structuralist understandings of how
the world should be.
Ascending analysis is particularly important given the Foucauldian understandings of power as relational and productive (1978, 1982/2000e). If all social relationships that define individuals as students, teachers, Americans, are simultaneously “power relations [that] are rooted deep in the social nexus,” it is important to begin analysis here rather than at “a supplementary structure over and above ‘society’ whose radical effacement one could perhaps dream of” (Foucault, 1982/2000e, p. 343). At the level of the regimes of practices that individuals perform daily, the full impact of governmentality and its constituent pieces of biopolitics, disciplinary power, and discourse are felt. Foucault (1982/2000e) is clear that “This is not to deny the importance of institutions in the establishment of power relations but, rather, to suggest that one must analyze institutions from the standpoint of power relations, rather than vice versa” because of the fact that institutions have only “embodied and crystallized” power relations rather than generated them (p. 343). It is therefore important to not only begin within the social nexus, but also to visit the structural aspects of social problems, something Foucault (1991/2000a) called multiscalar analysis.

I incorporated Foucault’s (1977/1980c, 1991/2000e) notions of ascending and multiscalar analysis (1991/2000a) in situating the research problems that are explored in this paper and in the methodological design of its empirical components. It is common for researchers who are interested in the governmentalities of education to narrow their focus to aspects of discipline and discourse (see Gore, 1995) or biopolitics and discourse (see Ayers, 2005; Stein, 2013, Suspitsyna, 2010, 2012). While this is often necessary for reasons of clarity and scale, some of the explanatory power of governmentality is lost when both aspects of discipline and biopolitics are not explored within the same analysis.
The promise, after all, of a Foucauldian analysis, is a method of linking the individual, event, structure, and historical development into a coherent whole, something I am attempting to do for the multi-sited practice of study abroad.

Foucault (1971/1984) claimed that a successful analysis “depends on a vast accumulation of source material” (pp. 76-77), ideally including both the observation of regimes of practices and the analyses of discursive practices that teach and enforce these practices. One of the unique challenges posed by researching study abroad practices, however, is that they are carried out across the entire globe. If not impossible, it is highly unfeasible for a researcher to observe enough students and programs to make a reliable claim about the regimes of material practices imbedded in study abroad even at a single institution. It is therefore necessary to turn to discourse and discursive practices of knowledge production, which can be understood as examples of disciplinary and biopolitical power in their own right, and may also carry traces of the material practices and techniques of power.

**Critical Discourse Analysis**

Foucauldian discourse analysis goes beyond the question of how a false-consciousness may hide structural inequality, the idea upon which critical and neo-Marxist pedagogues focused (Lather, 2007). It is also concerned with more than a narrow analysis of language and texts (Fairclough, 1992). Instead, a Foucauldian conception of discourse addresses “the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth” (Lather, 2007, p. 100). The problem is that in Foucault’s efforts to challenge the ways in which identity and subjectivity are produced he never clearly outlined his methodological perspective and strategies. This makes it impossible to simply “apply”
Foucault’s ideas on discourse to new contexts (Fairclough, 1992, p. 38), despite the extensive list of his empirical works that rely upon discourse as a site of analysis. Therefore, other authors have taken up the issue of methodologizing Foucault’s work. This section explores Fairclough’s (1992, 2001) attempts to do this through critical discourse analysis (CDA), while the next section demonstrates how this methodology has been previously been applied to educational systems, policies, and environments.

Fairclough (1992) developed a specific type of critical discourse analysis named textually oriented discourse analysis (TODA) in response to the methodological gaps in Foucault’s work. The purpose of this variant of CDA is to illustrate how various levels of discourse interact, shape one another, and interact with societal practices. While Fairclough (2001) was careful to demonstrate that CDA is not a unified methodological perspective with “a party line,” he did claim some similarities across approaches. He stated:

These approaches have in common a concern with how language and/or semiosis interconnect with other elements of social life, and especially a concern with how language and/or semiosis figure in unequal relations of power, in processes of exploitation and domination of some people by others. (p. 25)

The questions CDA asks, inspired by the work of Foucault and other critical theorists, are attempts to demonstrate how language is not only restrictive and political, but also creative, productive, and tied to action. Language is a field through which power/knowledge moves. Therefore, just as with power/knowledge itself, where language indicates that there is oppression, there is also the possibility of resistance, agency, and action (Foucault, 1980).
Fairclough (1992) contended that we could understand the ebb and flow of oppression and possible resistance through analyzing the connections between three levels of discourse. These include: a first level of utterances within a text; a second level between the text and the discursive practices that produce, reproduce, distribute, and consume the text; and a third between the social practices, or the regimes of truth, that allow actions to go unchallenged. This three-dimensional and social view of discourse requires a broad method of analysis that looks both into the text and outside to the power relations that make the utterances within the text bear weight. It is through this conceptualization of texts as multifaceted, networked, and malleable that the process of governmentality can be understood from a discursive methodology.

**Methodology Rationale**

Fairclough’s (1992, 2001) outline of CDA provides a solid foundation from which to understand systems of governmentality and to critique the ways in which various governmentalities have shaped study abroad practice. Having developed methods for discourse analysis directly from Foucault’s (1978, 1977/1980c, 1977/1980d, 1982/2000e) notions of power/knowledge, Fairclough’s (1992) three levels of textual analysis allow for a window into how individual actors, groups, and systems are all liable in the preservation of the status quo. In general, poststructuralism brings “a theory of dynamic and contradictory subjectivity” to policy analysis, which has traditionally been understood as positivist and rationalist (Allan, 2008, p. 8). While twenty years ago it may have been rare to find reference to Foucault’s concepts in educational literature (Anderson & Grinberg, 1998), there is now a growing number of researchers applying
CDA in a variety of ways and a multiplicity of sites (see Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, & O’Garro Joseph, 2005).

What is particularly interesting about the way in which scholars studying educational practices have utilized Fairclough (1992) and others’ methods of CDA is the fact that these researchers are applying the methodology to data gathered through interactive collection techniques, such as focus groups and in-person interviews (Rogers et al., 2005). Traditionally, CDA has been used to address “the kinds of meaning encoded in public, media and often written texts produced by institutions and people in positions of dominance” (Rampton, 2001, p. 84). Scholars interested in studying discourse in education, however, have utilized Fairclough’s (1992) CDA to examine microdiscourses and micropractices through the analysis of interactive data. Published articles that are relevant to this study, either due to the topic of analysis or methodological choices, are situated in research contexts and utilize data sets as diverse as interviews with: US community college administrators (Ayers, 2009); US primary and secondary school teachers (Collins, 2001); low-income middle-school teachers in Australia (Comber & Nixon, 2009); students, parents, and staff at a Silicon Valley primary school for English as a second language (ESL) students (Gebhard, 2002); English second-year undergraduate students enrolled in a critical social psychology course (Peace, 2003).

Simultaneously, a group of scholars researching higher education have continued to use CDA at various macrolevels of institutional, media, and governmental discourse to interrogate the discursive practices that frame concepts and subjects such as institutional leadership (Allan, Gordon, & Iverson, 2006), women leaders (Gordon, Iverson, & Allan, 2009), strategic globalization plans at Big Ten institutions (Stein, 2013), economic
policies (Suspitsyna, 2012), and representations of China in higher education media (Suspitsyna, 2014). While the topics and research sites of these studies vary greatly, they are valuable examples of methodology and data analysis from the viewpoint of CDA. Due to my interest in pursuing critical discourse analysis at two levels of discourse, the institutional and the individual, the rest of this chapter draws upon both groups of existing studies utilizing CDA in educational research. In the subsequent sections of this chapter I outline my process for sampling, data collection, and analysis for both institutional documents and individual, interactive interviews with student participants of study abroad programs.

**Sampling and Data Collection**

Fairclough (1992, 2001) described critical discourse analysis as not particularly concerned with the methodological issues of sampling. In order to preserve the flexibility of the methodology, the author provides only two organizing concepts regarding data collection, the *corpus* and the *archive* (Fairclough, 2001, pp. 226-7), which can be understood as the sample of texts and the population of all the texts within a discourse respectively. Therefore, in developing sampling criteria for this study I utilized some limited aspects of other qualitative research traditions as outlined in methodological works such as Allan (2008), Creswell (2013), Jones, Torres, and Arminio (2014), Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Patton (2002).

Within critical discourse analysis, Fairclough (2001) gave three suggestions as to how to construct a corpus from the archive. First, the author stated “research projects in discourse analysis are … most sensibly defined in terms of a question or questions about a particular social practice, and their relations to social structure” (Fairclough, 2001, p.
I have outlined my questions as to how study abroad is practiced in the proceeding pages. Secondly, data selection for the corpus can only be done “in the light of adequate information on the ‘archive’” (p. 226), which I have provided in the literature review. Thirdly, it is suggested that the corpus is enhanced through supplementary data sources, such as follow-up interviews, expert interviews, and member checks, that offer new insights on the ways the text, discursive practice, and social practice intersect and support one another.

I met this last criterion through the data collection processes outlined below. I have collected texts at two different levels, the institutional level of documents that describe, plan, advertise, administer, and evaluate study abroad programs at The Ohio State University and the individual level of study abroad participants who have recently returned from their sojourn abroad. I then cross-analyzed these two levels of discourse to come to more trustworthy and complex conclusions. To borrow a phrase from Creswell’s (2013) description of grounded theory methodology, I engaged in a “‘zigzag’ process” of data collection and analysis (p. 86), starting with institutional documents, turning to individual interviews, and comparing both of these sets of data to each other and theoretical literature.

**Research Site**

This study was conducted at The Ohio State University (OSU), a large, public, land grant university. The research site was chosen due to the fact its study abroad practices, at least when summarized, appear to be representative of many of the national trends discussed in the literature review. The Ohio State University has highlighted its commitment to internationalizing its multiple campuses in recent years through the
creation of a new senior administrative office focused on internationalization (Academic Affairs Office [AAO], n.d.) and study abroad has maintained a central role of strategic importance throughout this transition (Office of International Affairs [OIA], 2012). In the 2013-2014 academic year the university sent 13 percent more students abroad from the previous academic year (OIA, n.d.). Consistent with national trends far more women participated in study abroad than men, European destinations were the most popular, and the majority of students traveled for a period significantly shorter than a semester (OIA, n.d.).

**Document Sampling and Collection**

In sampling for institutional documents regarding study abroad at The Ohio State University I closely followed the sampling criteria outlined in the existing literature utilizing critical discourse analysis in a higher education context (Allan, 2008; Allan, Gordon, & Iverson, 2006; Gordon, Iverson, & Allan, 2009; Stein, 2013; Suspitsyna, 2012, 2014). I conducted a search of the OSU website utilizing the search function and the keyword “study abroad.” This search resulted in over 100 findings with links to other subpages and documents that were also logged. Web pages and documents were selected from these result pages for the corpus only if they described practices that relate to all study abroad programs at OSU regardless of program focus, duration, or destination. Given the ways that educational disciplinary practices change from one context to the next (Anderson & Grinberg, 1998) and that I did not sample student participants from a particular study abroad program, it was important that the discourses analyzed at the institutional level are relevant to all student participants if any claims about the overall system of governance are to be made.
Once I determined that a particular document describes study abroad practice for the whole of The Ohio State University, I added this document to my corpus, which was organized in a digital spreadsheet. A summary of the spreadsheet can be found in Table 3.1 and includes the document titles, authors, dates published, formats, number of words, and brief descriptions. In accordance with Fairclough’s (1992) recommendation that critical discourse analyses are checked against the opinions and readings of experts, I shared my corpus with at least two international education professionals and asked for their feedback as to its scope and completeness. Following Patton’s (2002) suggestion that qualitative studies specify a minimum number of samples, I sampled for at least two externally positioned texts and enough internally positioned texts to describe the entire process of study abroad from planning to evaluation.
Table 3.1: Document Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Lines of Coded Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation of Disabilities</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application and Policies</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Awarded Fulbright</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before you Apply</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing the Right Program</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Evaluation</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAQ</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Study Abroad</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting Started</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting Started Sessions</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Study Abroad</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education Professionals</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University Ranked in Top 15 for Study Abroad, International Students</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed International Goals for The Ohio State University</td>
<td>President and Provost’s Council on Internationalization</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>PDF Document</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Job Training</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Year Transformational Experience Program: Study Abroad Guideline</td>
<td>Second-Year Transformational Experience Program</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>PDF Document</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Year Transformational Experience Program Proposal</td>
<td>[Student Participant]</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>PDF Document</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>PDF Document</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad by the Numbers</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad by the Numbers</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Power Point Presentation</td>
<td>(Tables Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad by the Numbers</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Power Point Presentation</td>
<td>(Tables Only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 continued on next page
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Abroad Expo 2013</th>
<th>OIA</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Website Page</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad Expo 2014</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad in Summer 2014</td>
<td>Office of International Affairs</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad Scholarship</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student Grants and Scholarships: Francille M. Firebaugh Study Abroad Scholarship 2014-2015 Criteria</td>
<td>Office of International Affairs</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student Grants and Scholarships: Jutta and Peter Neckermann Study Abroad Scholarship Criteria</td>
<td>Office of International Affairs</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student Grants and Scholarships: Wolfe Study Abroad Scholarship</td>
<td>Office of International Affairs</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Website Page</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Documents: 32</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview Participant Sampling**

A consensus on sampling methodology has not yet developed within the existing, relevant education literature that utilizes CDA to study interview or focus group data (Ayers, 2009; Collins, 2001; Comber & Nixon, 2009; Gebhard, 2002; Peace, 2003). Ayers (2009) and Peace (2003) utilized all respondents to their recruitment efforts, although they used digital and in-person methods respectively. Collins (2001) used convenience sampling to collect interviewees, while Comber and Nixon (2009) and Gebhard (2002) interviewed participants that were either nominated by others or selected by the researchers according to predetermined sampling criteria. Most authors utilized smaller sample sizes of three to 17 participants for the interview portion of their research,
with Ayers (2009) sample of 40 written interviews serving as a clear counterexample. Although Fairclough (1992) did suggest that the boundaries of a corpus develop naturally over time, I have utilized some additional sampling criteria from other qualitative researchers (Creswell, 2013; Patton, 2002) in light of this methodological lacuna in critical discourse analyses of interactive texts and given the time constraints of this project.

The interviews collected for this study, like those present in other CDA studies with multiple forms of data collection (Collins, 2001; Gebhard, 2002), provided another layer of text that will complement and complicate the level of institutional textual analysis. This second level of data analysis allowed for a more complete description of study abroad practice and for an understanding of how individuals have also been conscripted into the processes of governmentality and resisted it. Given the concerns outlined in the literature review as to how study abroad practice has both rapidly changed and remained an experience largely for privileged students, I found it necessary to engage in purposeful sampling of interview participants (Creswell, 2013; Patton, 2002) in order to develop a well-rounded corpus of interview texts.

In a description of purposeful sampling strategies Creswell (2013) stated, “Criterion sampling works well when all individuals studied represent people who have experienced [a common] phenomenon” (p. 155). Patton (2002) similarly suggested that researchers seek out information rich cases or “those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research” (p. 46). For the purpose of this study, all participants met the criteria of being 18 years of age or older and were enrolled in fulltime undergraduate coursework. All participants also
participated in a study abroad program at The Ohio State University as an undergraduate student.

Participants were deemed potentially information rich cases through responding to an online assessment that gathered basic demographics, information about the study abroad program(s) in which they enrolled, and a brief response to the question “What is one of the most important things you learned while abroad?” A copy of the full intake assessment is located in Appendix A. I recruited participants through personal connections to The Ohio State University’s study abroad office and to student groups that have connections to international or global affairs. This process included asking colleagues to forward my interview recruitment email to their students and student email list serves and visiting two student groups on campus that focus on international issues. The email that was sent to help recruit these participants can be found in Appendix B. Once I began interviewing participants, I also asked participants to refer their peers to the intake survey in order to gather a larger sample. This strategy resulted in a potential interviewee pool of 36.

Of the pool of 36 potential interviewees, 22 were deemed potentially information rich cases and invited to participate based upon their responses to the demographic questions in the intake survey. The goal in selecting which respondents to invite to interview was a diverse sample in terms of race, area of study, length of study abroad program, and destination of study abroad program. As students submitted the initial intake survey, I began to invite those who met the sampling criteria to meet and interview. Ultimately, once the minimum sampling number was reached and signs of data
saturation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) began to appear, I concluded data collection having interviewed 10 students.

For the purpose of this study, a diverse sample was defined as an overrepresentation of students of color, male-identified students, students who participated in long-term study abroad (50 percent of the sample in each category) and at least one participant who traveled to each continent. Despite intentional recruiting with these goals in mind, fewer male-identified participants than desired were successfully recruited to sit down with me for the 60 minute, in-person, semi-structured interview. While selecting participants for interviews, preference was given to participants who had completed their study abroad experience more than three months ago in order to minimize the influence that readjustment to the United States may have had on responses. The demographic information pertinent to these ten students is found in Table 3.2.

**Interview Protocol**

Once student participants confirmed their desire to participate in this study, each was invited via email to meet me in person for a 60 minute, semi-structured, and digitally recorded interview at a public location on The Ohio State University’s campus. In this email, which is found in Appendix C, I encouraged participants to bring two to three photographs they felt represented their trip. These photos were used to prime the participants for inquiry through a modified photo elicitation technique (Harper, 1994, 2002). The interviews focused on the participants’ experiences abroad and what they felt they learned as a result of those experiences. A copy of the interview protocol is found in Appendix D. After reading and signing the informed consent form (Appendix E) together, the interview began with me turning on the digital recording device and asking
the participant to describe the photos they have brought. Through beginning the interview process with the photo elicitation, a potential role reversal was allowed for that encourages the participant becomes an expert who must teach the researcher about the significance of a shared image (Harper, 1994).

**Table 3.2: Study Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Other Salient Identities</th>
<th>Number of Times Outside the Country</th>
<th>Study Abroad Duration</th>
<th>Study Abroad Destination(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abby</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5 weeks</td>
<td>South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becca</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5 weeks</td>
<td>South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Pre-Professional</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Central America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Eastern Europe - Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>American Born Chinese (ABC)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 weeks - 1 month - 2 months</td>
<td>Western Europe - East Asia - East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen</td>
<td>Pre-Professional</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Pell Grant Recipient, Second Generation Immigrant</td>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>1 month - 1 month</td>
<td>Western Europe - Western Europe - Western Europe - East Asia - East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halley</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>Oceania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Christian, Second Generation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 weeks - 5 weeks - 2 months</td>
<td>East Asia - East Asia - East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacky</td>
<td>Business - Foreign Language</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Second Generation Immigrant</td>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>South America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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After the photo elicitation portion of the interview, the remaining interview prompts, as outlined in Appendix E, were asked if the student had not already spoken to those topics. At the end of the interview, each participant was asked if they had any remaining questions for me or would like to say anything else. The interview was then concluded with me reminding the participant that I would follow up via email with a transcript of the interview, a brief summary of my interpretation of the interview, and potentially several follow-up questions and, finally, thanking the participant for their time.

After the interview, I transcribed the digital recordings as soon as possible, removing all information that could potentially identify participants and replacing all names with pseudonyms. All information that is not relevant to the study (including specific locations visited while abroad, dates of travel) was removed. After the conclusion of this study the digital recordings will be deleted. At the same time transcription was done, all identifying information present in any photographs (such as clearly visible faces and the names of location) was blacked out with permanent marker. After the interview, the participants’ statements of informed consent and photographs were stored separately from the transcriptions, in a secure location, to ensure confidentiality.

**Data Analysis**

I began analyzing the written texts according to Fairclough’s (1992) textually oriented discourse analysis once I had gathered, selected, and recorded the initial sample from the search of The Ohio State University website. Once interviews were collected, they were also analyzed simultaneously and in an identical fashion as I moved in a
“zigzag” pattern (Creswell, 2013), altering between the two bodies of texts. As when developing the sampling criteria of this study, I drew heavily upon the existing literature in educational studies that utilizes a CDA methodology to develop this analysis protocol (Allan, 2008; Allan, Gordon, & Iverson, 2006; Ayers, 2009; Collins, 2001; Comber & Nixon, 2009; Gebhard, 2002; Gordon, Iverson, & Allan, 2009; Peace, 2003; Stein, 2013; Suspitsyna, 2012, 2014).

What makes Fairclough’s (1992) method of CDA unique is the utilization of readings at three levels of increasing breadth - the textual, the linguistic or discursive, and the societal practice level. Similar to the analytical methods outlined by Allan (2008), Allan, Gordon, and Iverson (2006), Gordon, Iverson, and Allan (2009), Iverson (2012), and Suspitsyna (2012), all three of these levels of textual analysis were carried out through the systemic and inductive coding of the texts, the deductive identification of critical samples, and the analysis of these samples in this study’s findings chapter. At the textual level, each line of text was coded inductively and placed into increasingly broad descriptive themes in order to answer the first research question: How do those who design and administer study abroad programs and those who participate in these programs describe the practices related to study abroad? From this first reading of the data, I deductively selected one text and one interview sample that demonstrated two or more of the descriptive themes for analysis presented in the findings chapter.

Next at the second, linguistic level a second deductive coding of the data was done according to two criteria. First, following Fairclough’s (1992) suggestion, each document and interview was coded for repeating vocabulary and grammatical structures, internal cohesion, and overall text structure. This type of analysis ideally reveals what
resources, or social structures, a subject has internalized and what social practices are deployed in order to use these resources “appropriately” (p. 81). Secondly, I analyzed the texts at the linguistic level through comparing each individual text to the others and texts in the field of international higher education, looking specifically for manifest intertextuality (Fairclough, 1992). Fairclough’s (1994) defined intertextuality at large in the following manner:

Intertextuality is basically the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth. (p. 84)

In other words, intertextuality is the common elements that texts share, regardless of their authors’ intent to draw upon those elements or not.

Fairclough (1992) stated that there are two major types of intertextuality for which documents can be analyzed: manifest intertextuality and interdiscursivity. Manifest intertextuality, which “is the case where specific other texts are overtly drawn upon within a text” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 117), is divided into three sub-types. First, sequential intertextuality involves marking “where different texts or discourse types alternate within a text” (p. 118). For example, a document may switch between an informal, conversational tone and a more commanding or technical one in order to perk a reader’s interest. Second, a text may have embedded intertextuality, where another discourse type is clearly marked and separated from the rest of the text through quotation marks or, in the case of spoken texts, through a statement, hand gestures, or a change in tone. Finally, there is mixed intertextuality, which involves instances in which a text is clearly referencing another, but it is difficult to separate the two statements in a meaningful way.
Coding for both linguistic elements and manifest intertextuality helped me determine not only which texts have relationships, but also fragmented the texts into new pieces that challenged given assumptions about borders between various texts and discourses (McCoy, 1995). Once themes imbedded within a text are liberated, the quality of the relationships between different written texts, different interviews, across the two types of texts, and between the corpus and external discourse could be reformed into a “constellation of new meaning” (McCoy, 1995, p. 65). In carrying out this second level of Fairclough’s (1994) CDA methods, the structure of both the discursive and material practices that penetrate, restrict, and constitute study abroad programs at the research site became more apparent. This structure had to be well understood in order to begin answering the second research question: What traces of disciplinary and biopolitical techniques of power are present in these texts describing the practices of study abroad?

In order to fully address the second research question, a third reading of the corpus at the level of social practice was undertaken. The final coding of both the written texts and transcribed interviews was done for interdiscursivity. At this broadest level of analysis, Fairclough (1992) encouraged analysts to look at relations and patterns between texts, social practices and actions, and larger societal beliefs. The general idea of Fairclough’s (1992) strategy is to examine the silences of texts in addition to what is overtly said by the authors. After locating these silences and mapping how they change from text to text, it was possible to begin examining and challenging the ideological and moral assumptions that various discourses impose upon practice. In this study, I have accomplished this last level of analysis through comparing my corpus to the archive at large.
**Trustworthiness**

Issues of trustworthiness and ethical practice are inseparable from a poststructural epistemological design that is concerned with issues of identity, voice, and power. If “language is a productive, constitutive force as opposed to a transparent reflection of some reality capturable through conceptual adequation” (Lather, 1991, p. 25), every aspect of a study’s design must be constructed with a concern for how language is used to “inscribe” participants in a new way. Therefore, commonly used qualitative validity measures, such as member checking, peer debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and triangulation (Yin, 2008), do not go far enough. These methods must certainly be used, but the voices that come through these processes must also make their way into the final analysis in order to create a “multi-voiced text” (Lather, 2007). As Foucault (1972) stated, “there can be no statement that in one way or another does not reactualize others” (p. 98). The key is to use this conceptualization of knowledge to strengthen analyses, rather than cast doubt on their utility.

**Rhizomatic Validity**

Lather (2007) gave four suggested frames as to how researchers can conceptualize validity that both incorporates these commonly used methods and takes the extra step of preserving the voices of participants. In keeping with my own understanding of poststructuralism and the goals of this discursive analysis, I have chosen to utilize rhizomatic validity. Lather (2007) based her conception of rhizomatic validity upon a work by Deleuze and Guattari (1983) who use the rhizome as a metaphor for poststructural knowledge in opposition to the tree-like shape of structuralism. Deleuze and Guattari (1983) described the rhizome in the following way:
any point on a rhizome can be connected with any other, and must be. This is very different from a tree or root, which fixes a point and thus an order … even when we claim to confine ourselves to what is explicit and to assume nothing about language, we remain inside a sphere of discourse that still implies modes of arrangement and particular social types of power. (p. 11-12)

Rhizoidal knowledge is therefore multidirectional, heterogeneous, densely connected, and entangled in itself. Just as a rhizoid root system sends up multiple shoots, there are multiple ways to enter into a single topic or problem. There is no clear end or beginning to rhizoidal knowledge, just the middle, where these features are most intense.

In order to carry out rhizomatic validity, Lather (2007) explained that inquiries must go through three processes. First, the researcher must engage in “an initial reflexive phase” where theoretical and political investments are put forward for scrutiny and multiple, conflicting discourses about the problem are explored (p. 124). Additionally, in qualitative research, the researcher is the instrument of analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), so it was important for me to fine-tune my own understanding of the topic and foreground my own views and biases as I conducted this analysis. I remained engaged in this process throughout conducting this study by maintaining a researcher’s journal and keeping marginal notes of various questions and observations that came up as I coded the various texts (Allan, 2008). In the attempt to reach a truly multi-voiced text, some of the reflexive writing I have done has been included throughout this document.

The second and third criteria for rhizomic validity include collaborating openly and honestly with participants and being open to messy and potentially contradictory final analysis (Lather, 2007). According to Lather (2007), the researcher must carry out
an empirical phase that focuses on constructing a common sense of work together with participants through various methods. In this study, this criterion has been achieved through the adoption of interview methods that encouraged participants to own more of the interview process by sharing images of their time abroad that are significant to them (Harper, 1994, 2002) and the member checking processes outlined below.

Lastly, in “a final reciprocal phase designed as reflection in action and an extended co-theorizing process” (Lather, 2007, p. 124) the data that emerged from phase two was critiqued from various viewpoints. The final data analysis includes comments on the entire data collection and analysis processes in order to illustrate the multiple, conflicting, and networked understanding of reality. Although I have treated both the written documents and interview transcripts in this study equally and engaged in a back and forth between both sets of texts, the data from the two sets has been presented both separately and jointly in order to approach the findings from different discursive levels.

Document analysis trustworthiness considerations. Both Fairclough (1992) and Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommended that qualitative researchers check their work against the interpretations of others. Fairclough (1992) suggested that researchers who utilize CDA check their own analyses of texts against those of others who regularly interpret the same or similar data. This checking of coherence, or “research into how texts are actually interpreted” is one strategy for trustworthiness. Similarly, Lincoln and Guba (1985) encouraged qualitative scholars to seek out the advice of disinterested peers, or other researchers without a vested interest in ones own study and who still have relevant experience analyzing similar phenomena, to ensure that the interpretation of data is valid.
While analyzing my corpus I have utilized my personal contacts within The Ohio State University to engage in validation checks with two individuals who also research international education, study abroad and/or service-learning. What has made this process rhizomatic in nature is the inclusion of my validation process in the final presentation of the data. While many qualitative studies may outline and utilize trustworthiness procedures, what makes rhizomic validity different is its embrace of disjuncture in the final presentation and analysis of data (Lather, 2007). The multiple and potentially contradictory way in which the same data can be analyzed by individuals who are positioned differently within society is another source of information in poststructural, rhizomatic (Lather, 2007), and situated (Haraway, 1988) analysis that have been used in this study.

**Interview analysis trustworthiness considerations.** Once a transcribed interview was read through and coded as outlined by Fairclough (1992), I shared both the actual transcription of the interview and a one-page summary of my findings with each participant via email. In these emails I asked for feedback on my interpretation and provided three to four follow-up questions in an effort to provide multiple venues for feedback. Keeping true to the description of rhizomic validity given above, the participants’ reactions to the transcripts and my own interpretation were included in the final analysis and served as another way to disrupt my own researcher narrative throughout the data collection and analysis process (Lather, 2007). Of the ten students interviewed, six responded to requests for feedback, which they provided through either phone conversations or a second in-person meeting.
Methods Conclusion

In this chapter I have outlined my poststructural epistemological views, based upon the works of Foucault (1977/1980c, 1977/1980d, 1977/1980e, 1991/2000a, 1991/2000d), Lather (1991, 1992, 2007), Haraway (1988), and Deleuze and Guattari (1983), and how my perspective led me to develop a methodology based upon Fairelough’s (1992) critical discourse analysis techniques. Given poststructural critiques of scientism, this study aimed to not state the objective truth about study abroad, but rather provide a truthful (Lather, 2007), situated (Haraway, 1988) analysis of discourse and practice at The Ohio State University that is useful to scholars and practitioners at a variety of sites. In order to achieve this goal, I relied heavily upon the existing literature that deploys CDA to analyze educational practices and settings (Allan, 2008; Allan, Gordon, & Iverson, 2006; Ayers, 2009; Collins, 2001; Comber & Nixon, 2009; Gebhard, 2002; Gordon, Iverson, & Allan, 2009; Peace, 2003; Stein, 2013; Suspitsyna, 2012, 2014) and utilized rigorous methods to ensure validity.
Chapter 4: Findings

In this chapter I describe the findings from the coding and analysis of the two corpuses of documents I collected, the institutional documents describing study abroad practices and the interviews with students who have participated in study abroad programs while enrolled at The Ohio State University. In reference to the first research question, which asks how do staff and students describe the practices of study abroad, I present the findings from the Textually Oriented Discourse Analysis coding. Second, and to answer the second research question, I present the findings of the discourse analysis proper with an example from each corpus and describe the ways in which the two corpuses of documents interact and reference each other. Through this final analysis of discursive structure, it is my goal to capture and highlight the threads of governmentality that are present in the two levels of discourse examined for this study.

The discourse analysis was carried out according to the methods outlined in Chapter 3. In an initial inductive reading, repeating themes and key words were tagged and placed into increasingly large themes. Secondly, the texts were read again paying attention to linguistic elements, such as repeating supporting words and sentence structures, along with manifest intertexuality. Fairclough (1992) defined manifest intertexuality as the ways in which texts draw upon one another through either explicit references or the absorption of key parts of language. This second reading was done through comparing both texts in the same corpus and texts across corpuses, in the
The results of these two levels of coding are found in tables 4.1 and 4.2. Finally, the texts were read at the third level of interdiscursivity. In this last phase, I deductively looked for evidence of neoliberal and neocolonial governmentalities in both the original documents and the two levels of coding that had previously been done. This final level of coding is presented in the last part of this chapter and the subsequent discussion of the findings in the next chapter.

The results of these three levels of coding are presented below for all themes that had ten or more occurrences. Given the broad nature of the first research question, I combined similar themes and presented them under unifying questions, the answers to which were present in both corpuses. These questions break apart “study abroad practices” into the more recognizable and material factors. The first question asked what motivates an entity to engage and remain engaged in study abroad practices. The second question examined how the world outside of an entity’s sphere of control is depicted, whether that is the “globe” at large or locals that a student came into contact with while abroad. Finally, the third question asks how students are supposed to act in participating in study abroad according to the university and how they reported actually participating while away. The frequencies of themes that relate to these three questions are presented for both corpuses in the tables below.
### Figure 4.1: Frequently occurring themes in document corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes identified in document corpus</th>
<th>Frequency of themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What motivating factors and justifications for actions regarding study abroad are presented in the documents?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university will embrace globalization and encourage international interactions.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university must increase access and funding for study abroad</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university and its students must embrace the market and increase prosperity</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university’s mission compels it to globalize</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How is the world outside the United States presented in the documents?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The world outside the United States is dangerous</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How are the roles of students described and prescribed in the documents?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students must be responsible actors</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have many choices when they study abroad</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will gain many valuable skills through studying abroad</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students must be information seekers</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have many concerns when studying abroad</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4.2: Frequently occurring themes in interview corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes identified in interview corpus</th>
<th>Frequency of themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What motivates students to participate in study abroad and what motivations remained with students as they participated in their study abroad program(s)?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ peers, family, or connections they made abroad</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students hoped to gain something tangible through their time abroad</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students wanted to experience something novel or exciting</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students desired to change who they were or how they saw themselves</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial considerations</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How did students understand the communities and cultures they were visiting?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As material: Students understood the community and culture largely through physical and material practices, artifacts, and images</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As process: Students understood the community and culture through ongoing processes, conflict, and fluid relationships</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As mixed: Students understood the community and culture as complex and changing, but usually only in relation to their home context</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What roles did students describe themselves as occupying while abroad?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normalized student: Students described themselves as occupying the role outlined in the student handbook and were present to learn from others</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist: Students described their choice to participate in certain activities or their interactions with local residents that were transactional in nature, with the local resident providing a service or good to the student</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Learner: Students describe prolonged relationships with locals that led to reciprocal and trusting relationships</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intruder: Students describe conflicts with locals or instances in which they were made to feel unwelcome either because of their actions or appearing physically out of place</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The discrepancies in frequencies of some themes are a result of the uneven nature of the corpus of documents that was collected. While the majority of the 32 documents collected consisted of a single page of text, the Study Abroad Handbook PDF was over 70 pages and accounted for most of the instances of themes presented under the third question, “How are the roles of students described and prescribed in the documents?” In contrast, the similarities in the length and content of the interview texts can be seen through the relative homogeneity in the occurrence of themes in that corpus.

**Review of Emergent Themes in the Document Corpus**

The initial stage of data analysis was done in an ascending manner from individual and local practices to institutionalized and field-wide discourses per the methodology outlined by Foucualt (1991/2000a), but I have presented the findings in a descending manner to more clearly describe the ways in which the discourse of individuals reference higher, more permanent levels of the discursive structure. In the following section, I review themes present in the institutional documents that begin to answer the first part of research question one - how do those who design and administer study abroad programs describe them?

**What are the Motivating Factors for Creating Study Abroad Programs?**

Overall, the four themes that were directed towards this question state that internationalization and study abroad must be expanded, why that must happen, and how it could be accomplished. While it is not within the scope of this study to explore internationalization in its entirety, the documents often spoke of internationalization and study abroad as inseparable. Study abroad, along with increasing the number of international students enrolled and engaging with international alumni, is a key
technology of internationalization and the rate at which it is practiced is often times used as a direct measure of how internationalized the campus is or will become. Therefore, these themes often describe rationales for increasing internationalization overall and the rate of study abroad at the same time. These themes were largely found in documents with an institution-wide scope, such as the Proposed International Goals for The Ohio State University (OIA, 2012). Each theme is briefly discussed below.

**The university will embrace globalization.** The most common answer given in the university documents as to why study abroad should be supported as a pedagogical practice is that globalization is already occurring. In this respect the university and higher education were depicted as having little to no agency over the matter. Rather, it was only through exposing students to already occurring international and intercultural interactions that institutions and the nation could prepare for the full effects of the phenomenon of globalization. There were no instances of the university being presented with a valid choice of whether or not to globalize structurally or within the curriculum.

Instead, a clear commitment to “becoming a preeminent global university, and accordingly preparing its students to succeed in the global marketplace as nationally and internationally informed and engaged citizens” was made repeatedly (OIA, 2014d), indicating that any decision about the manner had already been made. Globalization and internationalization were always depicted as inevitable forces that the university must fully embrace through both the material practices of establishing physical and monetary connections to other parts of the world and the social practices of study abroad, internationalizing the curriculum, and engaging with alumni abroad (OIA, 2012, 2014d; President and Provost’s Council on Internationalization, 2009). The university was
always spoken of in broad ways here, suggesting that globalization is an equal goal for all parts and functions of the university.

In regard to study abroad specifically, the documents present the view that all students, or at least as many as possible, “must be provided with significant international educational opportunities in foreign countries” in order for internationalization to take place (President and Provost’s Council on Internationalization, 2009, p. 3). A goal of increasing the percentage of undergraduate students who have international experiences from 20 percent to 50 percent was given in the 2009 Proposed Goals for The Ohio State University. According to this document, “our goal should be to provide relevant education abroad experiences for our students that can range from one week abroad experiences to double degree programs where a student might spend as much as two years abroad” (p. 3). Various university actors would like to attain this goal through making study abroad more financially attractive to students (OIA, 2012), partnering more with third-party study abroad providers, and encouraging international experiences be embedded into the existing curriculum wherever possible (President’s and Provost’s Council on Strategic Internationalization, 2009).

**The university must increase access and funding for study abroad.** Closely related to the first theme was the idea that the university must financially support students in order to increase study abroad rates. OIA’s (2012) Strategic Plan states, "Given the high cost of going abroad and students' increasing debt burden, OIA will work with other University units to make every effort to sustain and improve on the current support” (p. 13). The problem in reaching this goal, as stated by OIA (2012), is that currently study abroad is not a financially solvent activity at The Ohio State University. According to
these documents, "revenue from program fees do not cover the entire program expenses incurred by Study Abroad programs" (p. 13). Complicating and possibly adding a level of urgency to this issue, a “growing number of students” are reported as choosing to bypass The Ohio State University’s study abroad offerings and third-party agreements, taking a leave of absence at the university, and directly enrolling in foreign institutions (p. 15). Students who decide to pursue this option to study abroad do not pay The Ohio State University tuition or any fees to the Office of International Affairs. Additionally, since there is currently no mechanism to track students who pursue this option (p. 16), the university is unable to count at least some of these students towards its goals for study abroad participation. This situation has created a tension in the university, for study abroad is expensive for everyone yet it has been deemed a necessary activity to remain competitive in national and global markets. The need to globalize both students and the institutions they belong to through international travel can be seen as a sign of the juridical pressure to accept study abroad as a tool of internationalization despite its associated high costs. The unresolved question is from where will the financial resources to continue this practice come.

**The university and its students must embrace the market to prosper.** Tied in frequency with the second theme, the third theme from the document corpus described how higher education institutions must utilize market strategies to compete globally. This includes selecting programs that are already poised to produce successful graduates for further investment (President’s and Provost’s Council on Strategic Internationalization, 2009; OIA, 2012) and choosing to engage with regions of the world that are particularly economically relevant.
Under this theme of discourse, universities are framed as similar, if not identical, to other organizations that must globalize to compete. Rather than highlighting the unique roles of educational institutions, such as socialization and knowledge reproduction, colleges and universities are cast as entities that compete for resources equally amongst economic players. This competition is successfully achieved through the application of economic rationales to both educational structures and to the instruction and care of students (President and Provost’s Council on Internationalization, 2009). For example, study abroad as a practice is shaped structurally to be successful in the face of competition. Destinations that are in demand are highlighted. Lengths of stays that are convenient for student customers are encouraged. It also described and marketed as a pedagogical practice guaranteed to help students develop marketable skills in the face of inevitable globalization. According to this theme, institutions and students are similarly compelled to embrace study abroad because the need to compete globally is a universal and omnipresent problem.

The university’s mission compels it to globalize. The final theme describing why internationalization and study abroad should be expanded demonstrates how The Ohio State University’s land-grant mission of teaching, research, and service can be tied to a need to internationalize the institution. There is a stated desire to make The Ohio State University “the land-grant university to the world” (President and Provost’s Council on Internationalization, 2009, p. 2) through internationalizing the content and scope of the university’s three-part mission. The universities’ mission was clearly interpreted in two separate ways, however. The first reading - that the university should be of service to the global community - is indicative of the quote above. A second reading is that through
internationalizing, OSU will better positioned to assist “[the state] in developing its international economy” (p. 7). Through this dual reading of the land-grant mission, OSU is able to somewhat paradoxically justify strategically placing itself at the center of international projects that may garner prestige and other resources but not have relevance to the local community through its history of service of to the local community.

**How is the World Outside the United States Presented?**

Given the intensity with which internationalization is defended as a necessary practice, there are relatively few times in the document corpus where potential partners for internationalization are described. In the documents that outline the strategies and tactics of internationalization and the challenge of globalization, there are only passing references to the rest of the world as “increasingly interconnected” (OIA, 2012 p. 4) and “strikingly different from what it was just a decade ago” (p. 12). When ideal partners are described, it is in solely economic terms. This mimics the perspective shown above in the internationalization planning documents, that parts of the world are more financially and strategically valuable than others and, therefore, more worthy of partnership with OSU.

The only theme describing the outside world to appear in the corpus more than ten times did not deal with the institution as a whole, however. The most prominent theme emerged largely from the Study Abroad Handbook (OIA, 2013) and other sources for study abroad participants and defined what the outside world is or could be to individuals as they engaged with it through individual travel.

In the instances in which the world outside of the United States is explicitly described, it is depicted as filled with dangers, diseases, and potentially volatile situations. For example, the Handbook states, “sickness is inevitable” (OIA, 2013, p. 30),
“total safety cannot be guaranteed” (p. 33), and that “Posting revealing information about yourself could make you a target both in the U.S. and in the country you are visiting” (p. 63). It is never overtly stated that the rest of the world is more dangerous than the United States and there are several examples of texts stating that students face similar dangers at home. However, the lack of text describing the world in other ways leaves few to no imagined alternatives to all the possible dangers that may be encountered.

It is true it would be impossible for one handbook to describe all the various parts of the world students visit in a holistic fashion, however, there are noticeably few descriptions, even of the most general sense, as to what type of engagement OIA does recommend for students to pursue while out of the country. Instead, all the benefits of study abroad seem to be a substance that simply materializes while abroad, ready for students to collect. From this mindset, the world is presented as an empty yet ominous stage where students are free to pursue their own individualized learning as long as they work to minimize interruptions that may emerge from the shadows.

**What are the Roles of Students who Study Abroad?**

The third and final group of statements describes what is expected from student participants as they prepare to study abroad. The various themes present different aspects and targets of discourse, leading to the impression that they are contradictory in nature. Some of the statements are targeted at students as consumers, while others position young Americans as voyagers setting out into an insecure and unsafe world. When analyzed as a whole and from different vantage points, however, it becomes clear that these fragments actually reinforce one another and support the current regime of study abroad practices.
**Students must be responsible actors.** The most prominent theme by far was the idea that in order to participate in study abroad students must be responsible, individual actors who take the necessary steps to prepare for study abroad. This theme was found largely in the Study Abroad Handbook published by OIA (2013) and supporting documents. Students who hope to study abroad must go through several highly managed processes at OSU. First, and discussed most frequently, students must be financially responsible and promise to pay all of the tuition and fees associated with their programs. Second, students must entirely meet their academic “obligations” (p. 7), which include being in good standing with the university, meeting with the appropriate individuals in their academic departments to access transfer credit and their progress towards degree completion, and participating “fully and enthusiastically in” their study abroad program of choice (p. 58). Third, students must participate in the correct administrative processes that allow them to successfully leave and return to the university and country. Through these processes students make themselves legible to the various governmental organizations with whom they will come into contact and make their process of study abroad more transparent to the university. This includes applying for a passport and visa (p. 14), maintaining and purchasing additional health insurance (p. 30), registering with the federal government’s Smart Traveler Enrollment Program (p. 33), and registering and attending various orientations and meetings with OIA staff.

Students’ obligations to responsible behavior do not end once they depart for their destination, however. Building from the espoused belief that the world is a dangerous place, the OIA documents outline ways in which students must “take personal responsibility for their own health and safety” (OIA, 2013, p. 35). This responsibility is
described largely in two ways. First, there is a litany of activities that students are explicitly forbidden from participating. These include, giving new acquaintances the address at which they are staying (p. 36), hitchhiking (p. 36), going out alone with new acquaintances (p. 37), drinking “excessively” (p. 37), using drugs or associating with individuals who use drugs (p. 40), avoiding “high-risk” activities that involve needles such as injections and blood transfusions (p. 41), and renting or driving motorized vehicles (p. 43). Second, health and safety is closely associated with the continued need for students to make themselves recognizable and legible to the relevant authorities. This includes always reporting travel plans (p. 36) and documenting as clearly as possible and reporting all incidents of physical and sexual violence (p. 38). Again, there is a noticeable absence in regard to what students can do to improve their own learning experiences or to better engage with their hosts. Instead, the documents solely focus on how to prepare for worst-case scenarios.

**Students have many choices when they study abroad.** The second most prominent theme within this category is an example of an apparent disjuncture in the discourse on study abroad. While large portions of the documents outline clear expectations and regulations, a second aspect describes to students the many “opportunities across the globe to fit your interests and academic plans” (STEP, n.d., para. 1). OIA (2014c) boasts over “100 study abroad programs in 40 different countries” offered at OSU (para. 2) and clearly strives to provide students with many choices. For example, OIA (2014a) states, “With so many options, it may be daunting to select the program that best meets your goals” (para. 1) and then goes on to list all the variables that students have options in, including: regional destination, language of instruction, dates of
the trip, length of the trip, housing accommodations, courses, economic development of
destination, host institution, and program services. Students are clearly told, “Despite
what you might think, you don’t need to speak a foreign language to study abroad” (OIA,
2014b, para. 7). OIA (2014d) offers services to help students comb through this
cornucopia of choices in the form of group sessions and individual counseling. Through
promising to participate in study abroad in a certain safe manner, students are given the
opportunity to go anywhere in the world that they desire.

Students will gain many valuable skills through study abroad. Despite the
vast array of options with which students are presented in studying abroad and the
admission that student goals for their experiences may vary, the outcomes for study
abroad are depicted in a monolithic way throughout the document corpus. Various types
of documents clearly promise two outcomes: students will have meaningful, immersive
experiences and students will leave these experiences with valuable, marketable skills.
For example, OIA’s (2012) Strategic Plan states that uniformly “Study abroad programs
contribute to the quality of students’ education generally, and specifically, to the
international learning experience” (p. 13). Similarly, the opening statement in the Study
Abroad Handbook indicates to students, “Soon you will find yourself fully immersed in a
new and exciting environment, gaining international experiences that will broaden your
perspectives about the world” (OIA, 2013, p. i). The same document concludes through
stating, “Study abroad will enrich your life in many ways. Students frequently describe
their experiences abroad as life-altering” (OIA, 2013, p. 72).
The outcomes of these programs are similarly guaranteed online. On the OIA (2014b) website the opening sentence to the FAQ page is, “Whether you choose to study in Africa, Asia, Australia, the Middle East, North America or South America, you will benefit both personally and professionally from this life-changing experience” (para. 1). Often this assertion is supported by the testimonials of students, a form of manifest intertextuality. For example, an exposé by OIA (2014e) on a student studying in Australia quotes the student as saying “The knowledge I have gained from the strength and conditioning aspect … as well as interacting with a wide variety of people and populations, can all be directly incorporated into what I will be doing” professionally (para. 6). An example of a student proposal for funding to go abroad similarly claims study abroad “allows me to work collaboratively in the international community to find universally beneficial solutions to pervasive and pressing issues” (Experiential Learning Grant Program, n.d., p. 1). Overall, these examples demonstrate how study abroad is presented as a guaranteed “investment” in students’ personal and professional selves (OIA, 2014b, para. 2).

**Students must be information seekers.** Closely related to students’ need to be financially, administratively, and behaviorally responsible is the idea that students must seek out information on their destination. Statements supporting the maxim, “A well-informed traveler is a safe traveler” (OIA, 2013, p. 34) are made repeatedly throughout the corpus. Before leaving students are encouraged to gather information from many sources, including pre-departure sessions, OIA staff, faculty overseeing the program, the federal government, international and local news sources, past participants, and individuals who have lived in the country being visited (p. 58). While all of these sources
of information are mentioned at least once, given the view of the world as dangerous, sources that detail perceived threats and possible dangers are emphasized in multiple places. There is no discussion of different sources of information being less or more valuable than others, which leaves the impression that federal, security-related sources are more valuable due to the emphasis placed on them throughout the corpus.

**Students have many concerns when studying abroad.** The final theme found in the document corpus concerns repeating attempts to normalize the concerns and worries that students may have when studying abroad. The Handbook states, “For some students, experiential education is cause for anxiety and apprehension” (p. 57) and that while “Living in a new country and culture can be exciting, fulfilling and stimulating. It can also be frustrating and confusing” (p. 59). The highlighted concerns range from practical worries about navigating a new culture to more personal issues students may face based on various social identities. The Handbook explicitly highlights some concerns students may have based on gender (p. 64), racial diversity (p. 65), and sexuality (p. 66). The solutions to these concerns that are most often given include seeking information, as described in theme above, and emotionally removing oneself from the situation.

For example, in order to deal with racial tolerance, the Handbook suggests that students “Understand that racism is an irrational reaction” and to “Take the initiative to educate others about your own ethnic background” (p. 66). Similarly, women are directed “to learn to ignore [catcalls and similar behaviors] and conduct oneself in a manner in which the attention is not further encouraged” (p. 65). These suggestions indicate firstly that discomforts and confrontations can be avoided and secondly that they should be averted and minimized as much as possible in order to provide more time for the type of
appropriate cultural immersion that is promised throughout the corpus. Additionally, there is no discussion of how the design, destination, and length of students’ programs should be taken into account when deciding how to respond.

**Review of Emergent Themes in the Interview Corpus**

What separates the interview corpus from the document corpus is the fluidity of themes present. While the document corpus is not monolithic in tone or content, it presents a much sturdier image of study abroad due to its institutionalized nature. The different actors involved in writing and publishing the documents that made up the document corpus, with their various subject positions and roles, do create fractures and disjunctures in the rationales and discourses presented, but there are also mechanisms in place to ensure some cohesion in what is presented to readers. The interview corpus on the other hand is made up of ten participants who have participated in sixteen study abroad programs. Diverse in identity, experience, and outlook, these students have provided an array of responses to the questions they were asked. While all students in some way showed signs of having internalized normative discourses, many also presented unexpected and exciting possibilities for resistance and new imaginings of study abroad program design.

Overall, I was reminded time and again of the fluid and contradictory roles that all individuals play in their daily lives, whether abroad or at home, while coding and presenting this second set of data. The data below has been grouped into three larger themes that mirror those of the document corpus in order to answer the second part of my first research question - how do students describe study abroad practices. These questions again deal with factors of motivation, how students described the communities and
cultures with which they were engaging, and finally from what subject positions, or roles, they approached the practices that made up their experiences abroad.

**What Motivates Students to Participate in Study Abroad?**

The first group of emergent themes from the interview data reveals not only what originally motivated students to participate in study abroad, a topic that has been explored before (Hackney, Boggs, & Borozna, 2012; Lane-Toomey & Lane, 2013; Nyaupane, Teye, & Paris, 2008; Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2009; Sanchez, Fornerino, & Zhang, 2006), but also what motivated their continued participation in different elements of their selected programs. Students spoke of a wide range of motivators, some immerging internally and others the result of external influences. Additionally, while some motivators were explicitly named, others were not as immediately apparent to students. Throughout the member checking process, these less salient motivations were brought to a student’s attention and discussed.

**Students’ peers, family, or connections they made abroad.** The most prevalent motivator for students was the influence and encouragement of other people. Becca and Faith, in reference to their first trip abroad, both spoke to the important role their peers’ involvement played in their decision to participate in a short-term study abroad program. For Becca, the supportive environment of her classmates was particularly important because her program was designed for first-generation and high-risk populations and the majority of the participants had never been out of the country. In a similar vein Halley, Chris, Gwen, and Isaac spoke about how hearing and watching their parent’s international travel served to encourage their own trips abroad.
Halley shared, “I really have just always - my mom studied abroad when she was younger and that always - she didn't go to Oceania. She studied somewhere else, but I always had that kind of goal to get out, I guess. And just kind of see the world.” Chris similarly commented that watching his father travel for his position in the military demonstrated that traveling, working, and living internationally are possible and encouraged him to go somewhere “different” by himself. Finally, Gwen and Isaac spoke about their parents’ experiences immigrating to the United States. In her member check interview, Gwen shared that it was her experiences traveling to visit her grandparents in Asia that prepared her to take risks as a traveler during college. Similarly Isaac reflected:

I guess to an extent knowing that my parents aren’t from this country has helped me know that you can live in another country and you can assimilate. And you can, you can make a good life for yourself, knowing that yeah there will be obstacles, but knowing that it is possible.

Diane and Faith also referenced their parents in talking about planning their trips abroad, but from the perspective of wanting to become closer to their family’s ethnic heritages. Although she was uncertain to what extent wanting to explore her family’s European history influenced her decision to study abroad in Southern Europe, Diane spoke about the experiences as highlights of her trip and explained how they motivated her to learn more Italian. Faith, on the other hand, had a clear vision for her second trip abroad, stating:
For my session for one month to go to China, I was like, “I really want to do this. I really want to go back to, like, China and learn about my roots. And, like you know, see the, this country that is like such a rising country right now and such a big part of my family's history.”

For Faith, it was imperative for her to physically see the environments she had heard her parents speak of growing up in order to better understand her own American Born Chinese identity. It is also worth noting how even this intimate motivation was wrapped up in large geopolitical and potentially economic rationales.

Finally, some of the students who were interviewed described how they developed meaningful and engaging relationships with locals that pushed them to work harder to engage in the local community (Faith) and even to return to the same community for additional study abroad trips (Isaac). Faith described how the most meaningful experiences during her third trip abroad were hearing the stories of local residents, particularly those she worked with in her internship site. She shared, “I admire them for being willing to be able to be comfortable enough to share so much. But I think that it goes both ways. And it went beyond work things” and how she still keeps in contact with her former colleagues through social media. Isaac described how he became so close to his host family, whose son he met at OSU before departing, and that he considers them his own family and returned to stay with them a second time the next summer after his initial study abroad program. He also became heavily involved with multiple churches during his three visits to Korea and hopes to seek employment with one after he graduates.
Students hoped to gain something tangible. The second motivating factor that students spoke of was a desire to gain something tangible out of their time abroad. This theme can be split into three subthemes: language skills (Erik, Isaac, and Jacky), knowledge or an experience that pertains to their anticipated career (Erik, Faith, Gwen, and Jacky), or to stand out in the job application process itself (Erik, Halley, and Jacky). Erik, Isaac, and Jacky all selected their study abroad destinations due to having a strong desire to use the local language in their professional careers. Erik was counseled to select his language due to it being classified as a critical language by the federal government and Jacky discussed pursuing Spanish because of its usefulness in business multiple times.

A second sub-theme emerged in students’ desires to gain a particular knowledge set or experience that would make them better future employees. Erik stated:

I want to teach English in Central Asia. And perhaps later I'm going into the Foreign Service, um, depending on how my goals in life pan out. But, I mean, it definitely adds a competitive edge in the market because if you have, um, I mean you often hear about the Ugly American and what that means. So I think that, um, trying to get over that and see, um, and make an earnest effort to actually make friends, um, and make friends, I think that helps.

Interestingly, while Erik is clearly aware of the negative perceptions of Americans as self-centered and tried to disrupt this narrative through authentic attempts to get to know his hosts, he is still motivated to engage in this authenticity by the prospect of improving his own future employability. Jacky similarly sought not only an experience in South
America to improve her Spanish, but the longest experience available because more time meant more improved language skills. She shared:

I chose my program because it was longest program. It was one of the most costly. But I thought more about the benefits of staying for a longer period of time than perhaps two months or three months. Because when I went to South America it took me like a month and a half to get used to my daily schedule. Let alone, if I would have had two or three months I don't think I would have improved as much as I did in Spanish.

While other destinations may have interested her more, Jacky did a cost benefit analysis of her options and made a rationalized choice on which program would give her the most return on her investment of time and money.

Finally, Eric, Halley, and Jacky also spoke to how they hoped that their experiences abroad helped them stand out when applying for positions after graduation. Jacky explained how her experience in South America demonstrates in job interviews that she is both skilled and serious about working in international business. Halley more clearly stated that her study abroad experience “Makes me more well-rounded.” Continuing with, “And, I mean to be honest, I hope it makes me look unique because even though study abroad is very highly promoted here in the, you know, in the States and at OSU. But a lot of people don't take advantage of it.” Erik shared the similar following sentiment:

I think you also hear that, too, in looking for jobs, especially now. Thinking about career options, you hear about how, “Oh, like, we want someone who can, whose been here and done that.” Um, because of, you know, globalization and because
of global markets. They're like, you know, “We want someone who is marketable to these regions and why.” Rather than Joe Schmoe, who has never left the country. And they're like, ok, “Maybe they're not exactly as competitive.”

Here international educational experience is clearly tied to not only the idea of being better suited for a job, but also the identity of a competitive, international economic actor. There is no discussion of particular skills or qualifications, however. The status of being an international traveler alone is what makes one compatible with a position in these newly emerged global markets as compared to “Joe Schmoe,” the traditionally trained college student.

**Students wanted to experience something novel or exciting.** The third theme that emerged from the students’ interviews regarding motivations was the idea that students desired to experience something new or exciting and that study abroad gave them an outlet to achieve this goal. Both Becca and Faith had limited international travel experience before their initial trips abroad. Becca shared, “no one has, no one in my hometown has ever done anything like [going abroad]. Not anyone that I know of. Um, no one has been out of the country. So that was huge, to be able to do that.” Faith similarly commented on how she had always wanted to go abroad to a part of the world that she perceived as significantly different than the United States. She spoke repeatedly about her initial hesitancy in participating in a study abroad trip to Western Europe because she perceived the destination as too “Westernized” and “modernized.”

Similarly, Diane and Gwen described how they had always had a strong desire to travel, but described this desire in relation to the relative boredom, normalcy, or undesirability of home. Diane described how during her sophomore year the romantic
relationship she was in ended, which led her feel like she had no reason to stay at OSU and to think “it would be really cool to study abroad” at that time. Gwen repeatedly spoke of how when she is traveling she feels like she has more of an “adventurous spirit” which she forgets when she’s at home because of “the grind of work.” Erik, Helen, and Isaac all spoke about how the exoticism of their destination played some role in their initial desire to travel. While Erik was drawn to how culturally different he thought Eastern Europe would be, Helen, with her “science mind,” was interested in seeing life in the Southern Hemisphere in the ecologically distinct region of Oceania. Isaac describes how through watching a large amount of South East Asian media he developed an “imagination” of South East Asia that largely motivated his first trip. He shared, “I stereotyped everything. I just, literally, I looked up a South East Asian drama and thought, ‘This is probably exactly how it is.’” What was appealing to Isaac about this stereotype was the wealth and the grandness embedded in how these dramas depicted life in South East Asia. Overall, all the students, whether they were looking inward at home or outward to their potential study abroad locations, saw their destinations as fundamentally different from their home contexts in some way and therefore, at least momentarily, more desirable.

**Students desired to change who they were or how they saw themselves.** The fourth theme in the students’ interview data describes how students were motivated to participate in their study abroad experiences in order to discover something new about themselves or to pursue a new personal identity. Examples of this include Erik’s desire to “be an inclusive person in the larger world,” Halley’s desire to explore independence, and Isaac’s mission to use his international experiences to become closer to his faith and “feel the spirit.”
While Erik was open to discussing the pragmatic reasons one would study abroad, he also described his two trips as “existential” in nature as he attempted to fulfill the role of a “globally literate” student that he felt had been outlined by the university and society at large. Halley spoke repeatedly of how her study abroad planning process was driven by a desire to be independent not only from her family, but also the services offered by the university’s study abroad office. She stated in reference to her discussions with OIA, “Listen, if I’m going halfway across the world, I better be independent enough” to not need the additional support services by the university. Rather, Halley saw her time abroad as a test of how many meaningful connections she could sustain and generally how much she could accomplish due to her own social and intellectual faculties. Finally, Isaac’s experiences becoming deeply involved in multiple spiritual communities while abroad led him to see his experiences as a way to test his own faith and calling to evangelize through a professional music career in the country in which he studied abroad. In this way, Isaac sees himself as becoming a more spiritual person through his ongoing faith practices at an international church.

**Financial considerations.** Finally, students were concerned with both directly funding their study abroad program and with how taking time away from their core studies may negatively impact their degree completion, leading to more educational expenses. Six of the ten students interviewed spoke of financial considerations impacting their decisions on where to study, when to study, and for how long to study. A clear example of this theme was when Chris commented, “I knew I didn’t have the time to take the whole semester off, was a big one. So I’m thinking time and money right now.” Additionally, Becca shared:
The only thing that really had me wondering, “Do I actually want to do this?” was the financial part of it. Like it’s so expensive to study abroad. And of course it’s way cheaper if you go through the university and it’s affordable quote-unquote.

Even students who did go on longer and more expensive trips or traveled abroad multiple times were aware of their financial commitments (Diane, Erik, Faith, Gwen, Isaac, and Judy) and several spoke of how important it was to secure outside funding for their experiences (Erik, Gwen, Isaac).

A notable counter example to this theme is found in Abby, who participated in a newly established program at OSU to give second-year students funding to pursue high-impact experiential learning opportunities. Many students who were interviewed participated in this program, but they did so having clearly determined that they wished to study abroad. Abby came to this program not knowing how to spend her money and decided upon study abroad through a process of elimination. She subsequently made her decisions of where to study abroad based largely upon convenience and where her peers were planning on studying.

**How did Students Understand the Communities and Cultures they were Visiting?**

The second set of themes that the inductive coding process produced is concerned with how students understood and described the communities that hosted them during their stays abroad. Students described the people, groups, and places they encountered in a variety of ways. There was no common theme to what was described, but students did clearly fall along a well-defined spectrum in regard to *how* they described the communities and cultures they visited.
At one end of this spectrum students described culture through fixed materials and practices. A smaller number of statements described students’ hosts in a slightly more complex way, recognizing that culture is made up of ongoing and unstable processes. This mixed view of culture was usually expressed in relation to students’ home context, which served as an anchor to their international experiences. A final group of statements also described culture as made up of processes, but these statements also commented on how processes change over time and are subject to manipulation by vested interests. Although these three levels of understanding are sequentially more complex, I do not mean to suggest that this is a framework to be used to categorize students’ level of cognitive development. Rather, most students made statements representative of at least two of the subthemes, suggesting that their understanding of culture fluctuated during their times abroad and since returning home.

**As material.** At some point in their descriptions of traveling abroad every student described the material acts and practices that made up life in their destinations. This is not a surprise given the encouragement that students receive to observe and participate in physical cultural practices. One could even argue that the value of study abroad is largely based upon the assumption that traveling abroad forces students to physically and psychologically move through the world in a way that they are likely not accustomed. While participating in the world in a new way is a fundamental component of study abroad, not all students made meaning of that experience beyond physical differences in their abroad and home contexts. Many students interviewed did not question the meaning of what they were seeing, doing, or experiencing beyond the initial explanation that was presented to them. Students operating from this perspective became caught in a one-
dimensional understanding of culture, made up of exotic foods and drink, unfamiliar religious practices, and different social customs.

This perspective largely began to emerge in the interviews when students would show me the photographs they had brought as representations of their trips. Students operating from a material view of culture often brought photographs of destinations, either man-made or natural, and artifacts. When asked to expand upon why these physical places or artifacts were significant, students would repeat the generalized statements about their destination they had absorbed while abroad. For example, Becca shared the following about the religious beliefs of the communities she visited:

I think, um, like, just the fact that there, there was the presence of this belief everywhere, like everywhere you go. Whatever they said related to their religious beliefs, kind of. Um, and they just had statues everywhere, everywhere you go. Even if you didn’t believe in the religion, it was intertwined in your life somehow from the food you eat to the places that you go and see on holidays and stuff like that. Um, and I think we have that here a little bit, but not nearly as much as it was there.

Becca’s trip taught her that religious practices are fundamentally different in the places that she visited. From her time abroad she left with the impression that faith is much more important tool for social organization in South America. While this may be true for some communities or individuals, Becca never spoke to the limitations of her statement - how religious practices have changed over time, how they have impacted and continue to impact individuals differently, or how locals perceive their own practices. Instead, faith became a benevolent and omnipresent force in her descriptions of the people she visited.
Oftentimes, when speaking about exchanges or interactions with local peoples, students speaking from a material position would describe conversations about specific differences in physical culture. For example, Abby shared:

Um, most, most of the things they have asked me about America, like, most of our conversations about that were more surface level. Asking us about things like that. Asking us if we actually wore bathing suites that weren’t thongs, like, because they call our bathing suites diapers. Like, just, you know what I mean, just, like, basic things like that. Not really any other differences.

Similarly, Halley stated:

So in our floor kitchen we would have conversations about, I don't know, how French people greet each other. They kiss each other. And Finnish people, they think it's so weird that Americans hug each other. So the cultural differences, I learned a lot from the people I lived with.

What both Abby and Halley are describing is cultural exchange, but it is only the first level of an exchange. There is an understanding and acceptance of difference and even relativism, but no assessment of what the differences in material culture mean for individuals both inside and outside of that social group. Instead having of an experience that asked them to critically engage with how they live their lives, students operating from a largely material understanding of culture experienced their interactions with others as a collection of facts and novelties. This lack of a reflexive mechanism unfortunately led students to report, in the words of Abby, that “A lot of stereotypes were confirmed.”
As process. The second most common ways in which students described the communities and cultures they visited was also the most complex. Students who described culture as fluid and dynamic understood the impact that their social identities, the identities of those with whom they were interacting, and larger, temporarily and geographically specific social forces had on their experience. They sought to understand historical explanations for what they were experiencing and learning. They also spoke to the necessity to access their host communities and cultures from multiple vantage points, not accepting any one explanation for the way things were. Finally, these students learned from and made significant meaning of the conflicts with other individuals and the overall environment they experienced, critically reflecting upon and revising their own belief systems and values due to what they had experienced. Six of the ten students interviewed (Chris, Erik, Faith, Helen, Isaac, and Jacky) described their hosts from this perspective at some point in their interviews, but Faith, Isaac, and Jacky appeared to sustain a process-oriented view more consistently throughout their interviews.

In contrast to material descriptions of people and places, process-oriented descriptions focused on the ways students’ understood their hosts and others worldviews. For example, Erik spoke of how his multiple conversations with a friend he made while in Central Asia that taught him “a lot about the Dutch way of thinking.” Jacky spoke about how she confided in a friend from France who was also of African descent when she faced prejudice in South America and learned more about her world perspective from those conversations. Jacky also commented on how her experiences were different from another Black American student’s because of her experiences living in predominately White places. Finally, Faith described how the European program’s focus on the
“eccentric” side of her host country and the intentional programmatic design in Asia allowed her to “see what we learned in class and apply that through being able to be get to the other side of, the other perspective of the country instead of these preconceived notions.”

Process-oriented students described efforts to engage not only their peers and faculty in conversations about their hosts, but also locals whom they had just met. Occasionally, these interactions would lead to conflicts and moral dilemmas that encouraged the students to reevaluate their own beliefs and values. For example, Erik explained how his hosts called him out for a dualistic approach to world affairs. He shared the following about these conversations:

And so that was the first time I really faced that kind of internationalism of, like, um, you know, “Hey, like it's not just the U.S.!” I definitely heard that a lot. It was definitely implied a lot of and conversation of, “It's not just the U.S.” The U.S. isn't going to solve our problems and it's not just the U.S.' problems. It's everyone's problems. Um, so it was definitely, like, “Ah” for me.

Faith had a similar “Ah” moment during her second trip abroad. This program was intentionally designed to partner the U.S. students with one of China’s hundreds of ethnic minority communities. In this setting Faith became very close to one of the leaders of the school in which the program was stationed. One day this individual made a comment to Faith that stood out as meaningful. She described the interaction in the following manner:

One of the things he said that I felt like stuck with me was when we go abroad we always want to buy trinkets and be like, “This represents France! Here's a little Eiffel Tower keychain.” And people would do the same in his home country, they
were really famous for sewing really beautiful, traditional purses. And he was, like, explaining, “Some people may buy these and just hang it up, but for us it's not like that. It's real. It's an item that we use” … So it was really interesting when he said that, because it made me think, “I'm so superficial!” Like, I want, I want to buy this just because it looks cool and it's really colorful and I'm just going to hang it on my wall. But for them, there's this deeper meaning.

From this experience, Faith not only learned something new about the culture she was visiting, but also gained insight into how visitors’ perception of that culture is influenced by their previous experiences and internalized norms. Confronted with this new knowledge, she reassessed her own actions and views on the places she had visited. Faith’s story is a crucial example of understanding culture as process because it demonstrates a growing awareness of the fact that any one statement on culture is incomplete and subject to dispute.

As mixed. The fewest responses within this theme fell into a middle category where students had begun to ask some critical questions of what they were experiencing, largely through comparing their host culture to the United States. This level of understanding was a mix of the material and process-oriented views. Sometimes students speaking from this perspective would share how one stereotype was replaced by another, still-monolithic understanding of the culture they were visiting. For example, Erik shared:

I kind of had this almost Soviet age, like it's backwards, everything is going to be grey, and everyone is going to be in a line. That was kind of my thoughts on Eastern Europe and I knew it wasn't true, but still it lingered. And so going there,
of course, that's not what it was. It's far from it actually. And I think with Budapest, it was so enlightening because it was so hip.

While there is recognition that Erik’s perception before the trip was flawed, his post-trip description of Budapest is similarly simplex. The difference between the latter and the former description, of course, is that Erik made the latter after his trip. Although simple, this statement is not incorrect because Erik’s experience abroad has presumably given him the expertise necessary to pass judgment on Budapest.

A second group of statements indicated how students would similarly reassess their expectations of a place, but through a comparison of their destination to their home experiences within the United States. For example, Abby compared her time in a major metropolitan area in South America to New York City, Becca repeatedly commented on how the culture she visited was more relaxed than her home, Eric spoke of how different the education system was in the nation in which he volunteered during his second trip abroad, and Jacky spoke to how prejudice against racial and sexual minorities manifested in much more overt ways in her South American host nation. While these statements often required a great deal of insight from the students, they were still made in a way that painted a place, people, or culture as possessing one unchanging characteristic. From the mixed perspective, neither the role of the self nor historical positionality was brought into how students portrayed and judged their hosts.

**What Roles did Students Describe Themselves as Occupying while Abroad?**

Students described themselves as occupying varying roles while abroad as a result of their motivations to participate and engage, but also due to program design and coincidence. These roles, some of which students were clearly cognizant of and others
that they were not, impacted not only what learning and experiences they were given access to, but also how they made sense of these experiences. These roles were not fixed and did not last a student’s entire experience abroad. Rather, they were fluid spaces that students moved between and even strategically deployed at times in the face of shifting circumstances. The four most common sub-themes - normalized, tourist, engaged learner, and intruder - are explained below.

**Normalized student.** The most common ways in which students spoke of their own identities abroad was as an individual actor and learner, poised and ready to receive information about the communities and cultures they are visiting. Students describing this position recalled their own desires and perspectives, what they were gaining from the experience, and what they saw themselves as contributing to local communities and cultures, but never attempted to take on the positionality of those with whom they were interacting. I have titled this role as the normalized because it most closely resembles the student role in study abroad as outlined by the institutional document corpus.

Students operating from a normalized role largely “trusted” in the process and had “faith” that OIA would deliver an educational and safe program (Becca, Chris, and Diane). In large part, normalized students described learning the most from their coursework and planned excursions to local museums and historical sites (Diane, Erik, and Hallie). These same students would describe how after arriving in their host countries, they would often become the center of attention in public spaces and in interactions with local groups.
When asked what surprised her the most about her time abroad, Abby responded, “Probably, honestly, just the positive attention. Um, everyone, like everyone loved us for being Americans, which I like, not that that’s a great thing … I just thought it was kind of cool, like, I wasn’t expecting it at all.” Similarly, Becca described her thoughts in the following manner:

I kind of thought that people would be frustrated with me because I didn’t speak the language. And they would kind of be like, brushing me off, you know? But no one did that. No one did that at all. Um, they were trying to make real social, emotional connections across that language barrier.

Those who described their experience from a normalized perspective continuously described how OIA’s promise for an “immersive” experience was delivered through positive attention and locals who were completely transparent with who they are. In many ways they describe being rewarded for taking the risk or making the investment in going abroad. These students, however, rarely spoke the language of the host culture they were visiting and the interactions they described were largely with professors, tour guides, and host families. The normalized student left these experiences more confident and a greater sense of “open-mindedness” or being “well-rounded,” but they never critically engaged with their own role as privileged visitors and never recognized their hosts’ desires and needs. They remained focused on how the experience benefitted themselves as individuals and what they received from the host community in the form of knowledge or attention.
Two students - Becca and Chris - spoke to how a normalized student role may be perceived by the local community. Becca shared the following:

Our directors, um, were saying that when you do volunteer abroad, sometimes the locals are not as appreciative, because they are seeing it as you’re coming in thinking that they need our help, kind of thing. And even if they do that’s, that’s kind of a dynamic that you won’t, that’s hard to get over. Um, but, doing study abroad, they appreciated the fact that we weren’t there to give them stuff. We weren’t there because we felt like they needed our help. We were there to learn about them and that was it. Um, so I think people really loved that.

Similarly, Chris stated:

I can’t speak for everybody, but just based on, like, being able to talk to a few people about how Americans are perceived abroad, um, especially when they come to these areas as very self-centered, uh, individuals who don’t really respect the cultures, they bring America with them essentially, they bring our rules, our regulations, our beliefs, everything … I think as students we kind of understood, because we had been briefed essentially

In these statements, the students have positioned themselves not only as welcome in the community, but more welcome than other types of visitors. Becca’s comment seems to suggest that any role beyond that of a passive learner may be offensive or so difficult to establish that it should not be attempted at all. Similarly, Chris has demonstrated the logic that makes the normalized student role so appealing. Those American students who are visiting for educational purposes, because of their intentions and preparations, are understood as being incapable of doing harm. The problem, of course, is that students
may still do harm despite their intent because of the historical systems of exploitation international travel is built upon.

**Tourist.** The second most common role that students described occupying was that of the tourist. A tourist role is defined as a direct exchange of goods or services for payment or the consumption of culture through a formalized mechanism, such as participating in a city tour, visiting a museum, paying for living arrangements, or purchasing an item at a store or market. Students were aware of occupying this role to various degrees, but all described some type of touristic activity. For example, when Diane was asked about her most meaningful relationship with locals she stated, “the coffee barista knew my name and what I liked or whatever. And that was kind of fun to be welcomed like that.” Becca, Chris, and Jacky all spoke about how meaningful their home stay experiences were, but only Jacky commented on the financial and transactional nature of this relationship. Chris, however, seemed aware of his precarious situation as an individual who may be perceived to have wealth in the following statement:

… the city, was extremely welcoming. Um, they’re definitely bent on tourism, as well. [chuckles] I’m not saying that’s why they were friendly. You could also tell they were being genuine, but they also needed to make money as well. So I felt extremely safe. I felt comfortable as well.

What these statements reveal is that students’ roles as tourists and consumers often impacted how they felt about the individuals they interacted with and the cultures and communities those individuals represented. While some students, such as Faith, Gwen, Halley, and Isaac, clearly separated out their time being a tourist from their time as
students, other students such as Diane and Becca did not investigate how their roles as customers may have impacted their interactions with local individuals. Finally, Chris and Jacky represent a third group of students who were clearly aware of how they were financially impacting the individuals and community they were visiting, but felt that relationships had either transcended or negated the potential dependency their hosts had upon them to purchase the products and services they were providing.

**Engaged Learner.** Students occupied an engaged learner role when they were in direct and prolonged contact with the local community in a way that encouraged meaningful relationships and reciprocity. Strong examples of this position can be seen in Erik, Faith, and Isaac’s interviews. These students all either worked or volunteered in the communities in which they were hosted and as a result came to form complex and meaningful relationships with those they worked. For example, when Faith detailed how close she became to her colleagues and how she “admired” them for their vulnerability with her, she was occupying an engaged learner role. Isaac’s attempts to connect with the community through immersing himself in a local church and integrating his worship into the specific cultural customs of that place of worship would be another.

Other examples include Erik and Diane’s attempts to meet locals outside of their formal programs through the networks they built either at the hostels in which they were staying or through location-based social media applications. Another slightly more common example of an engaged learner role was when students would partner with local university students and practice speaking each other’s native languages. Each of these students engaged in activities that were not required of them and led to moments of discomfort. The dissonance that this discomfort created is a crucial factor in these
students’ more complex and immersive experiences as it led to students taking on a process-oriented view of the community and culture in which they were engaged.

**Intruder.** The final role in which students described occupying is also one of the most fluid and precarious. The institutional documents held many suggestions for students as to how to avoid standing out from the local population or drawing negative attention, but a sizeable portion of the students interviewed explained how incidents with the local population or their social identities made this goal of integrating with the local community impossible. The students who spoke of more isolated incidents were Abby, Chris, Erik, Faith, and Isaac, while those who described a more constant state of separation from local communities included Diane and Jacky.

The first group of students described experiencing moments of confrontation that abruptly challenged their “right” or sense of efficacy to be present in their host culture as a foreigner. Abby gave an example of someone attempting to steal her cell phone out of her hand, an incident that cemented her host community’s “dangerous” nature. Chris described an incident at the beach where his host mother was challenged by “a bigger guy” and “his friends Thing One and Thing Two” for assisting Americans. Unlike Abby, Chris did not extrapolate this situation to be representative of the larger community, but dismissed it as an isolated incident where one person “had had too much to drink.” Erik retold a story of one of his peers ordering a drink in English and being refused service until they ordered in the local language. A woman riding on public transit with Faith similarly scolded her for touching her belongings without permission, and Isaac described isolated incidents of racial bias. Specifically, Isaac told a story of how a woman in the local community derogatively called him a “monkey” due to his darker skin tone.
Diane and Jacky described more systemic and ongoing instances that isolated them from the communities in which they were staying. Both of these women, like Isaac, are of racial descents that are rare in the national populations in which they were hosted. Diane’s experiences being stared at and avoided in Western Europe were only brought up in her member check, but Jacky’s experience was a central focus of her initial interview. She shared how, “the first month-and-a-half or two months were like such a shock for me, that experience. Um, it was like being stared at … and getting used to and being the foreigner and being looked at.” She continued:

… but I would get comments from men on the street. Specifically older men who would say things like, “marocha,” which in Spanish translates to like “dark-skinned woman.” I would get “negra,” which is basically Black woman. So I didn’t know whether to take that as racist or not. So that was a problem.

Complicating matters even further, Jacky would bring up the way she was being treated to faculty and other students. While they were generally supportive, the faculty did not legitimize her feelings of isolation and she felt her peers grew tired of her reflecting on her experience in group settings.

At one point in her semester abroad, Jacky became so tired of new acquaintances challenging her and asking invasive questions about her race that she started telling people she was from Brazil. She would deflect questions by speaking the Portuguese phrases she had learned while abroad and to “prove to people that, ‘Yep, I’m from Brazil.’” As Jacky commented herself, her story of living in South America raises important questions of the differences in experiences between individuals who can “pass”
as a local and those who no matter how acculturated they become will always be seen as outsiders to the culture by the vast majority of people with whom they interact.

**The Threads of Governmentality**

In this section I briefly outline the elements of governmentality that the process of inductive and deductive coding carried out through textually oriented discourse analysis uncovered and present the two textual examples, one from the document corpus and one from the interview corpus. These textual examples have been selected as representations of both the ways in which the discursive themes outlined above interact within a given text and of the methods of governmentality that these texts have uncovered. Through these textual examples I begin to answer my second research question concerning the traces of disciplinary and biopolitical techniques of power are present in the texts, before moving on to a more robust discussion of what these techniques of power mean in Chapter 5.

In looking for the traces or threads of neoliberal and neocolonial governmentality present in these two corpuses, I again turn to Ettlinger’s (2011) efforts to utilize governmentality as epistemology and a strategy to privilege “neither the discursive nor the material but rather the relation between the two” (p. 538). Ettlinger (2011) isolated key Foucauldian terms in what the author has called analytical anchor points, the comprehensive definitions of which are outlined in Chapter Two. To briefly review, the analytical anchor points that have been utilized in this study include (in ascending order) regime or practices, mentalities, techniques of power (biopower and discipline as exercised through apparatuses of power knowledge), and regimes of truth. Before
illustrating these analytical anchor points in specific textual examples, I will briefly outline how they operate generally at The Ohio State University.

The documents that describe the regime of study abroad practices at OSU include the Office of International Affairs’ web pages (2014a, 2014b, 2014c; and particularly 2014e), the Strategic Plan (OIA, 2012) and the Study Abroad Handbook (OIA, 2013). Within these documents clear trends in practices are present. The increasing participation in study abroad by OSU students, the continued overrepresentation of women and White students, and the consumer choice-based approach through which study abroad programs are selected are some of the most noticeable (OIA, 2014e). The interviews with students reveal that students are engaging in complicated choice-making behaviors that take into account financial, academic, and social considerations.

The mentalities that guide this regime of practices can be seen in the neoliberal and neocolonial themes that TODA revealed in both the document and interview corpuses. The interviews indicated that students saw the experience of study abroad often in a transactional nature, as something that would provide them with either marketable skills or a novel and exciting experience, while fewer saw study abroad as an opportunity to transform their perspectives on the world. The first perspective closely aligns with Bolen’s (2001) description of consumerism in study abroad, where programs provide an additive value to student’s social and economic identities, while the second reveals a willingness to challenge base assumptions of who one is and what identity means.

The result of the transactional mentality being more prevalent than the transformational one is seen in how students described themselves and their hosts. A majority of the time, students described themselves as the passive receivers of either
information (as a normalized student) or of goods (as a tourist). Many students left their experiences abroad with a material understanding of the places they visited - as collections of cuisine, material customs, and physical traits that could be experienced and/or bought for consumption. Actors within the university take advantage of these neoliberal consumer mentalities through deploying techniques of power that are particularly suited towards individual students looking to purchase credentials that will make them more competitive in the neoliberal market. It is for this reason specifically that governmentality should not be understood as a coercive downward structure, but as a system that requires, at least to some extent, the permission or complacency of a population (Ettlinger, 2011).

Neocolonial forms of governmentality are simultaneously present in the corpuses and interwoven in a way that creates a new joint discourse or a form of intertextuality. Neocolonial discourse shows a second form of governmentality that both defines the ways in which neoliberal practices are performed and serves as a rationalization to neoliberal modes of thought. Neocolonial governmentality shapes practices through the historical and ongoing practice of orientalism, or the West’s discursive construction of the rest of the world (Saïd, 1978). Through orientalism the international realm becomes a “surrogate” for the West’s “underground” self (p. 71), or what Euro-centric societies misunderstand and reviled about their own peoples. In this study, orientalism is most clearly seen in the descriptions of the world outside the United States as filled with diseases, ignorance, and physical dangers in the Study Abroad Handbook. It is because of this mental image of the rest of the world as backwards that such care is taken to outline the regimes of practices that will keep students safe and learning in appropriate ways.
It is the “referential power” and the “mass” of orientalist scientific knowledge (p. 86) that allows neocolonial discourse to serve simultaneously as both impetus for this regime of practices and the justification for their continuation. After significant fear of the outside world’s dangers have been aroused, neocolonial and neoliberal mentalities are then deployed to manage these fears through the use of utilitarian logic and rationalized economies (Dutton, 2009; Spring, 2004). Only through the proven effectiveness of economized bureaucracy can the oriental world be staved off and the promise of a new, efficient, and global one be reached. In the corpus specifically, this is seen through the construction of study abroad as a process to be documented and managed. It is only through thoroughly bureaucratizing and economizing an educational process that the outside world can be made tolerable to the institution.

Interestingly, students play with this idea of safety through positioning themselves as adventurers who, despite what work has been done by the institution to make a destination safe, are taking a risk through traveling internationally and exposing themselves to others outside the United States. Through the gaze of the young, American visitor the lives and identities of local individuals are constructed as inherently precarious and dangerous, as something that must be overcome in order to learn, to make study abroad productive. This is done to assert the value and worth of a student who has proven themselves worthy of participating in global capitalism through study abroad. At both the level of the institution and that of the individual, this neocolonial gaze is deployed to justify current internationalization at home and the need for study abroad. The techniques of power that make up this system of dual governance at OSU include both biopolitical, totalizing acts that target entire populations (Foucault, 1988), and disciplinary, acts that
individuals accept or are encouraged to accept in order to better fit into a biopolitical regime (Foucault, 1977).

The biopolitical techniques of power that emerged within the documents include both discursive statements, which act as sources of veridiction and jurisdiction, and material biopolitical processes. The discursive statements made to prime and enforce a view of the world are seen within the veridicting themes that emerged from the textually oriented discourse analysis, which paint the world as rapidly globalizing through economic means and international travel as necessary - yet dangerous - tool in meeting this challenge. The jurisdicting statements present in the corpus - that the university must embrace the market, that the university’s mission compels it to internationalize, and that students are responsible, informed actors with many choices - are used to set a normative program of action that becomes increasingly hard to dispute. Together, these veridicting and jurisdicting statements make up a gaze that is internal to the university, a powerful force that is used to redistribute resources towards efforts that make the university more international and, therefore, more fit for competition.

The material biopolitical processes at OSU that result from this gaze and impact study abroad include the systematic study of international learning at the institutional level, offering students a plethora of choices in where they go abroad, and the creation of a heavily regulated process to prepare students for their travels. Through these three structures internationalization is made a material substance that can be counted (in the number of students who study abroad), propagated (by attracting more students through providing more choices), and managed (through the controlled flow of information about the world and how students are to interact with it). Through the substantialization of
internationalization, neoliberal rationalities can be utilized more easily - as a certain mass of internationalization is worth a correlating amount of money - and neocolonial fears can be abated through the rational distribution of resources to programs that will lead to even more institutional internationalization.

Students, largely unaware of the larger context, become willing partners in this process through their acceptance of the disciplinary mechanisms that are deployed by the university and the embrace of self-disciplining actions. This includes the multitude of ways in which students are asked to responsibly act: making themselves and their travels legible to the university through forms and waivers, meticulously gaining information about the world through the promoted outlets of the federal government and participating in advising sessions and presentations where both their fears and consumer desires are normalized. This process of discipline is not just present within the confines of the university, however. As the interview corpus demonstrated, students are also taught the desirability of being a globalized person and the dangers they must overcome to achieve this goal through familial and peer connections. Before turning to a discussion of what this system of governmentality reveals about the regimes of truth under which contemporary universities are operating in the following chapter, I move to the discourse analyses proper from the document and interview corpuses to further illustrate the points outlined above.

Discourse Analysis of Sample Texts

Fairclough’s (1992) TODA methodology calls for multiple textual samples to be pulled from the corpus and analyses in full as a secondary form of data analysis. In this study, this secondary process also serves as a form of rhizomatic validity (Lather, 2007),
another entry point into the narrative of governmentality I have outlined above. Two sample texts have been selected, one from each corpus. These texts have been selected because they contain the widest variety of multiple emergent themes, they are clear examples of interdiscursivity, and they are positioned at crucial points where different mechanisms in the system of governance, or analytical anchor points (Ettlinger, 2011), intersect. In other words, the samples selected best describe how themes uncovered by TODA operate at multiple levels of discursive structure and are clear examples of governmentality operating through discourse.

**Document corpus sample text.** The first sample from the document corpus comes from OIA’s (2013) Study Abroad Handbook. The text is a letter to students from a senior administrator in the study abroad office. The text is representative of many of the themes found in the document corpus, including: the university will embrace globalization and encourage international interactions, the university and its students, must embrace the market, students have many choices when they study abroad, and students will gain valuable skills through studying abroad. The document is also an example of how neoliberal and neocolonial mentalities and practices are engaged with and encouraged through the use of biopolitical discourse. Finally, the document’s position in the institutional discursive structure, as the opening statement to a handbook that outlines material practices, demonstrates how these themes serve as justifications for the biopolitical and disciplinary practices pertaining to study abroad that are outlined above. Through focusing on different scales of action, the larger community, the individual institution, and the individual student, the same neoliberal and neocolonial
justifications for action can be used in ways that strategically target the enrollment of all players in the project of governance. The first sample from the document corpus follows:

**BECOMING A CITIZEN OF THE WORLD**

Soon you will find yourself fully immersed in a new and exciting environment, gaining international experiences that will broaden your perspectives about the world in which we live. By studying abroad, you are taking the first step to becoming a truly global citizen, a choice that will shape both your life and your future professional career.

In today’s global market, it is increasingly important for students to graduate with critical thinking skills, technical expertise and the ability to communicate effectively in cross-cultural environments. As universities across the nation prepare their students to excel in the global marketplace, The Ohio State University continues to implement strategies that will integrate international themes into the curriculum and across all majors.

Our goal is for every student to attain global competencies, which can be defined as: the ability to work effectively in international settings; awareness of and adaptability to diverse cultures, perceptions and approaches; familiarity with the major currents of global change and the issues they raise; the capacity for effective communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries; and the ability to comprehend the international dimension of one’s field of study.

With your decision to study abroad, you have taken the initial step. When you study in another country, you will be exposed to a whole new way of living and learning. Remember to keep an open mind and embrace the experience.
Please review this Study Abroad Handbook carefully, and be sure to attend all pre-departure orientations so that you are better prepared for both your time abroad and your return to The Ohio State University.

At the textual level, the use of key vocabulary indicates prominent interdiscursivity, as at least two discourses are operating in a mutual enforcing manner. First, words such as “global market,” “technical expertise,” and “global competencies” all indicate neoliberal discourse, with its focus on describing social capital that will make one a better competitor in the market place. Second, words such as “global citizen,” “students,” and “curriculum” situate the practice of study abroad within a larger educational setting and tradition of global education, along with the ongoing efforts to internationalize The Ohio State University. While both of these discourses are present, they are used differently throughout the document.

In the sample, the educational discourse is made subservient to the neoliberal through the ways the author links the two discourses together. Early on in the discourse global citizenship is described as impacting both “life” and “your future professional career.” The artificial separation of all aspects of life that are not career-oriented serves to magnify the economic aspects of neoliberal life through implicitly claiming that everything outside of work is at least equal in value to the productive capacity of an individual. The author goes on, however, to further describe study abroad in only highly economized ways, privileging the economic realm of life and explicitly linking it to international education.
Students are offered a “choice” of whether or not to engage in global issues as a consumer, but at the same time reminded that they risk losing the opportunity to develop valuable skills if they chose not to. It is only through study abroad that a student can be “fully immersed” and a “truly global citizen,” all other activities implicitly falling just short of a complete and worthwhile experience. The various “perspectives” and “competencies” that are “gained” by students who do make the choice to study abroad include “critical thinking skills,” “technical expertise,” an ability to “communicate effectively” and “work effectively,” an “awareness and adaptability” to other cultures.

All of these opportunities are directed outwards towards a management of the globalizing world. The international realm is positioned squarely outside of students’ daily lives and as something that must be “integrate[d]” to typical studies or as an “international dimension” that must be understood. This is a fundamentally orientalist understanding of the world that positions it in opposition, as something wholly new and different to the normality of the home country. It is only through the capitalist skills of production, not through the learning of historical content or self-reflection, that students will thrive and compete in the neoliberal marketplace. It is this linking of neocolonial and neoliberal mentalities that places U.S. higher education squarely at the center of the West’s project to protect and expand capitalist systems of governance across the world.

At the level of the corpus, this text relates to both documents that operate at a higher discursive level (OIA, 2012, President’s and Provost’s Council, 2009) and those that operate at a lower level and describe techniques of power in more detail. It is a lynchpin between these two processes of biopolitical discourse directed at entire populations and the individualized mechanisms of discipline that define every student’s
experience with international education at The Ohio State University. For example, the sample references the increased competition higher education institutions are facing, the use of internationalization as a market tool, and the university’s strategy to leverage study abroad as a tool of market competition by stating, “As universities across the nation prepare their students to excel in the global marketplace, The Ohio State University continues to implement strategies that will integrate international themes into the curriculum and across all majors.” At the same time, through reminding students of the importance of study abroad the document has a coercive tone, pushing students into what has been positioned as the only legitimate way for students to engage in this process of internationalization. Through the creation of this non-choice, university administrators can simultaneously increase enrollment and hold students accountable for acting in the ways that have defined as appropriate.

This sample is also representative of the corpus for what information it omits. The letter, like many other documents, promises a “new and exciting environment” for students to “experience” and learn from, yet it says nothing of the individuals and communities that already occupy these spaces. “Global marketplaces” “cross-cultural environments,” “international settings,” and “diverse cultures” are all vague placeholders that clear away and hide the complicated history of the United States and other Western nations forcibly controlling the physical and cultural spaces that rightfully belonged to local peoples. Absent are the desires, opinions, ideas, or perspectives of anyone outside of The Ohio State University. The loose descriptors present in the sample, in the context of providing students abundant choices as to where and how they study abroad, instead paint the world as open and accessible for Westerners to take and use as they see fit.
Students will gain a “global perspective,” but there is no conversation of from whom that global perspective may be learned - or perhaps forcibly taken.

Finally, at the societal level, this text reflects elements of both neoliberal and neocolonial regimes of truth. Concerning neoliberal thought, the document is a clear example of how student consumerism plays out as an arbitrating force in higher education. Naidoo and Jamieson (2007) described how within a neoliberal, consumerist regime the “student–consumer thus emerges as the focus of competition and a modernizing force that will bring about increased efficiency, diversity and flexibility” (p. 270). In order for institutions to attract student-consumers and the benefits they bring, core functions of teaching and service must be commoditized and marketed. In study abroad specifically, Bolen (2001) described how commoditization means passivity, in the lack of student initiative to plan and manage their trips abroad, and choice, in the ability to travel to any part of the world they deem most desirable regardless of educational fit. The above sample simultaneously uses neocolonial biopolitical techniques in its erasure of the desires of local peoples and the masking of the unequal power dynamics between Western students and the individuals with whom they will interact. Instead, the cool rationality of the “global market” persists.

**Interview corpus sample text.** The second, interview sample text has been taken from Halley’s interview. It is representative of several themes in the interview corpus, including students wanting to gain something tangible through their time abroad and students occupying a normalized role. This sample is also interesting because it is an example of how students would often fluctuate rapidly between complex and process-oriented understandings of their host communities. Examples of neoliberal and
neocolonial discipline also arose from Halley’s narrative in other places and have been used to help analyze this text at the societal level. The sample portion of Halley’s interview follows:

T: And in what situations did you learn the most?
H: I learned the, one of the, I learned a lot from my Ayers Rock experience. Because again, I went in I didn't know what these people would be like. It really showed me that I think I do, I am compassionate and interested in learning about other cultures. Because I also forgot to mention because I was one of the very few people who went over to actually talk to the indigenous people. A lot of people even ... you know ... a couple of my friends with me, they just didn't. They were turned off. People were different. They didn't look that well-kept. And, yeah, they didn't want to, they were more interested in the wine! And that wasn't my thing and …

T: Did you have other experiences where you were able to learn more about the aboriginal population or ....
H: Yeah. I actually enrolled, one of the classes, one of them was an indigenous studies history course. … It was just, I'm in this new country. How many people take Native American history courses? Probably not so many. And that was kind of the equivalent in my opinion. You know, I want to learn about the people here, the culture. And it turns out they have a very brutal history …

They were here first and yet their land was colonized by these English invaders. And then they were mistreated. There was all of this in, um, assimilation. The goal was to get rid of the Black blood, to dilute it …
So to go to Ayres Rock before, before being in this class, gave me - I thought - a huge leg up over all these other people. There were also indigenous students within my class. So to meet them - and they're like totally normal. But then, I mean, you definitely sense a little bit of segregation that exists. There is tension.

T: So what have you done with this knowledge?

H: I guess pass it onto people who are interested in knowing. I'm not one of those to be a motivational speaker sort of thing. But yeah, I like sharing these experiences. People ask me what did I learn in Australia and that's something I bring up a lot.

This sample text is important for how it demonstrates the way in which students use the neocolonial gaze to describe their hosts and to position themselves in the neoliberal market. In the sample, Halley’s role as a student is immediately tied to her compassion and interest in the lives of others, discourse that is reminiscent of Toh’s (1994) description of the West’s attitude toward the rest of the world under the liberal technocratic regime of truth. These benevolent qualities are magnified by the “different” and not “well-kept” nature of the indigenous peoples she was directing her attention, the indifference of her peers who were “turned off” by the locals’ appearance, and the “brutal history” created by local colonists.

This use of confessional discourse serves two purposes. First, it is an example of the neocolonial gaze. Through the act of studying abroad, Halley has earned the right to return home and describe the world she encountered outside the United States in a new way. Often times, as Halley’s discourse represents, this is in a way that reinforces orientalist understandings of the non-Western world as inherently defective and different.
It becomes a negative of the West, against which young Americans are able to prove their worth and value, the second purpose of the confessional discourse. The interviews with students overall showed that study abroad participants walked away not with tangible skills, but with qualities that made them more competitive than their peers. Halley’s comments are representative of how many students would utilize the various positions they occupied, particularly those of the normalized student and tourist, to position themselves as more engaged or learned than their peers. Through engaging in what was thought of as risky behaviors, such as talking to locals or traveling without the large group, students could prove their own initiative.

The irony of students’ positioning themselves as risk-takers and adventurers is revealed when this document is compared to others within the corpuses of this study. Although Halley participated in an independent program not designed by OSU, she described benefiting from the same amenities as her peers. She and other students were placed in living situations that were purchased with their relative wealth. Despite the “risk” of going abroad or the “dangers” of the world outside the United States, no student experienced a situation where they were responsible for procuring their own shelter or food. Additionally, all had the luxury or being able to withdraw from their host communities, either to a hotel room, dormitory, or guest room, when desired. The only time that most students were pushed into provocative situations was in the still relatively safe space of the classroom. The counter-example to this observation are the students of color who described facing discrimination due to their visible difference from their host communities.
The way in which Halley describes herself during her classroom experiences around the issue of indigenous histories - detached and passive - illustrates the limits of a study abroad design that allows for isolation from the host community and the normative student role it encourages. The setting of the classroom simply did not inspire Halley to take ownership over the issues she was learning or to apply these lessons to her own life or country, despite even being presented with the opportunity to build relationships with individuals whose families have directly been impacted by the violence of colonialism. This is seen in the way in which Halley flips from describing indigenous people as “different” to “totally normal” when describing her classmates. The isolation of the classroom has limited Halley’s understanding of how these students’ and their families can simultaneously occupy both the role of the Other and her classmate. The topic of oppression is largely stuck in a historical past and, as a result, Halley may recognize the problems of the present but they are material in nature and detached from her own experiences. An understanding of how individuals can shape and have positive impact, the possibilities for local change, and the connection to continued action (beyond education) at home remain illusive.

At the societal practice level, Halley and other students’ similar stories are representative of the neocolonial disciplinary practices described by authors such as Raymond and Hall (2008), Snee (2013), Lyons, Hanley, Wearing, and Neil (2010), and Sin (2009). These authors describe how students and young travelers have internalized a view of the under-developed world as in need and then act upon this conceptualization in ways that are personally beneficial. For example, Griffin (2013) and Lyons et al. (2010) demonstrated how students are focused upon traveling for their own benefit, cultivating
skills that will make them more competitive in the neoliberal market. Simultaneously, Raymond and Hall (2008) found that these trips often lead to little or no political engagement nor meaningful reactions and Sin (2009) demonstrated that many go abroad to perform a savior identity. While Halley’s narrative is not representative of all of these disciplinary mechanisms, the way in which she described herself as benefitting from her interactions with others, yet feeling little personal responsibility to end the oppression of native peoples is a clear continuation of themes found by Griffin (2013), Lyons et al. (2010), and Raymond and Hall (2008).

**Findings Conclusion**

In this chapter I outlined the most prevalent emergent themes that arose from carrying out the TODA methodology, as outlined in Chapter 3. In grouping themes for both the document and interview corpuses into three categories - motivations, descriptions of the world/local community, and the roles of students - I began to illustrate the connections between these two levels of discourse. The ways in which these discourses carried threads of governmentality were further explained through highlighting the key points, or analytical anchors to borrow Ettlinger’s (2011) phrasing, of governmentality and the selection of key textual samples.

I have presented governmentality as both a comprehensive system, that reaches from high in the administration of OSU down into the daily lives of students, and as a contained mechanism, bound to the university. In the following and concluding chapter I expand upon this explanation of governmentality through demonstrating how this specific system of governance is connected to national and international processes and how this system is imperfect and prone to rupture. In highlighting not only the more frequent
normative behavior of actors within the university, but also the examples of ingenuity and resistance on the part of student participants, I deliver upon the liberatory promise of critical, rhizomatic, and poststructural inquiry.
Chapter 5: Towards an Understanding of the Governmentalities of Globalism

“We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth.”

- Foucault (1977/1980e, p. 93)

This chapter outlines the broader implications for study abroad programming and internationalization efforts at institutions of higher learning within the United States based upon the existing literature discussed in Chapter 2 and the findings outlined in Chapter 4. I do this in several steps. First, I provide a final discussion of how the system of governance uncovered at The Ohio State University is paralleled and subsumed by a larger national and international system of governance. It is here I describe how various scales of governance allow for the simultaneous coercion of entities within universities and students as individuals. Secondly, I comment upon how the less frequent themes in the interview corpus provide insights into possible spaces of resistance and explore what it would look like to build policy and programs from those spaces. Third and finally, I highlight the limitations of this study and suggest future areas of inquiry that could begin answering the questions that remain, before providing a conclusion to this work.

The Governmentalities of Globalism

The goal of this paper has been to uncover the ways in which universities and their students are subjected to economic and political incitement and, as a result of that incitement, coerced into pursuing courses of action that promote the interests of Western elites, despite discursive claims of working towards a greater global good. A broad range
of entities both inside and outside the academy are working from what Toh (1993) named the technocratic-liberal paradigm or the belief in the scientific and economic rationalities. These entities are using the techniques of power at their disposal to compel institutions of higher learning to internationalize commercially, politically, and socio-culturally (Knight, 2004). This system of coercion is upheld by and a constituent part of larger, ongoing governmentalities that reinforce the normative Western regime of truth that Foucault (1997/1980d) began to uncover through his multiple lines of inquiry into modern life.

Foucault (1991/2000d) claimed that the regime of truth defining contemporary life is so engrained into daily existence that observation must be localized and scrutinized from a grounded set of local practices. This study, and specifically this chapter, is an example of how a localized Foucauldian analysis can be carried out and then used to critique larger social projects.

The power from localized and ascending analysis is that it creates new understandings of the ways in which governmentalities have slowly collided and merged over time to produce a specific historical moment, what Ettlinger (2011) called eventualization. This localized analysis has utilized theoretical understandings of the marketization of higher education and student identity (Boden & Epstein, 2006; Bolen, 2001; Davies & Bansel, 2007; Mitchel, 2003; Naidoo & Jamieson, 2007; Rhoades & Slaughter, 1997), the long history of government and quasi-governmental organizations’ reports on international education (see de Wit, 2002; and also, CALSAFP, 2005; IIE, 2014a; NAFSA, 2008; The University of the State of New York/ The State Education Department, 1963), commentary on the catalyzing events of September 11th 2001 (ACE, 2002, NAFSA, 2003), and primary data to illustrate the ways in which the forceful
implementation of neoliberal education has eventualized. What these varied sources show is that new technologies of economic control, the long history of discourse promoting internationalization for nationalistic reasons, and the major geopolitical shift of the early twenty-first century have all played a role in creating our contemporary moment.

Today, perhaps more than ever before, neoliberal and neocolonial governmentalities have coalesced into one heterogeneous, yet related system that controls the domestic international education agenda: the governmentalities of globalism. What makes the governmentalities of globalism different from globalization in general is the way that the international flows of people, capital, and ideas are managed to protect and advance privileged interest. The radical and revolutionary potential of globalization is used as a mask that obscures the continuation and expansion of Western domination and colonialism. Instead of national and cultural borders giving way to a new synergistic society, the non-Western world is broken apart into pieces that can be studied, consumed, and then assimilated into the dominant paradigm of neoliberal capitalism.

Underneath the governmentalities of globalism, higher education institutions and those individuals who belong to them have adopted internationalization as a technology not necessarily because they strive to promote neoliberalism, but because their survival has been tied to its adoption at home. In order to compete amongst each other and advance their own interests, administrators promote neoliberal and neocolonial governance at the scale of the institution and students do the same within the realm of their professional and scholarly lives. This multi-scalar system is kept in check by entities both outside and internal to the academy that contribute to the vice-grip of “double
arbitration” (Foucault, 2004/2008, p. 162) through the strategic deployment of techniques of power at key sites and scales.

To better explain how the governmentalities of globalism are deployed in the bureaucratic landscape of higher education, I have utilized concepts from Dimaggio and Powel (1983). These organizational theory scholars described how pressures external to a field, forces embedded within a field, and actors internal to specific institutions create a compounding effect that forces institutions to respond and adapt. The organizational theories of Dimaggio and Powel (1983) and the concepts of Foucauldian biopower and discipline have different aims and scopes, but they are useful together in this context as the former describes mechanisms of control at the organizational level and the latter does the same at societal and individual scales. The remainder of this section will utilize this theoretical work to demonstrate how the findings of this localized study can be understood organizationally and fit into a larger system of governance.

**Biopolitics of Coercion**

Institutions of higher education are unique social and economic entities because of their historical independence from the economic and political fields of Western society. Instead, colleges and universities compete within the protected realm of academic capital, an institutionalized form of the social capital that Pierre Bourdieu (1977) is known for studying. Due to academic capital, colleges and universities must garner not only financial resources, but also institutional prestige, in order to strategically position themselves within the field of higher education (see Naidoo, 2004). Colleges and universities are capable of achieving financial security only if a large group of investors (both students and wealthy donors) see the institutions as socially desirable. In the United
States institutions gain social prestige through participating in ranking mechanisms such as the US News and World Report and publishing low acceptance rates, but also through aligning their activities with the needs and political zeitgeist of the communities they serve. The structure of the academy allows actors external to the field of education to strategically interfere in what DiMaggio and Powell (1983) deemed coercive intervention. I contend that the coercive pressures that were revealed through this analysis are also examples of how neoliberal and neocolonial biopower works upon institutions of higher learning.

Under the governmentalities of globalism, coercive measures take the form of material practices (the removal of funding and state support of higher education) and discursive strategies (the rationalizing of competition and the construction of the world as dangerous). Materially, the removal of funding and organizational support for higher education has led to a lack of resources and the subsequent reorganization and reprioritization of bodies of knowledge, educational activities, and individuals that can be more easily commoditized in the neoliberal market (Boden & Epstein, 2006; Davies & Bansel, 2007; Rhoades & Slaughter, 1997). Under this new regime, those bodies of knowledge that are able to be commercialized are invested in at the expense of others that do not align with the dominant regime of truth (Rhoades & Slaughter, 1997), faculty within these disciplines are rewarded (Boden & Epstein, 2006), and students who chose to pursue academic and professional careers are presented more opportunities. Overtime, this system becomes self-reinforcing because those disciplines that are most likely to critique neoliberalism and reveal its neocolonial tendencies are those that are being systemically targeted and delegitimized.
What discursive techniques of power have accomplished is to meld issues of internationalization with concerns of competition and to position study abroad as a desirable and necessary institutional practice (Altbach & Knight, 2007). As Suspitsyna (2010) demonstrated in a discourse analysis of Department of Education speeches, the systematic use of terms imbues them with layers of new meanings that make their appropriation desirable. Suspitsyna (2010) showed that “Accountability is endowed with potent powers: it is said to bring progress, high academic achievement, and success” (p. 576). In the case of international education, concepts such as internationalization and global citizenship are positioned as similarly magical processes that will lead to more stable institutions of learning, a competent public, and a secure nation state. This process is simultaneously encouraged by the orientalist discursive construction of the rest of the world as a dangerous space that unchecked globalization will allow to threaten and infiltrate the homeland.

There are clear signs that actors within the larger field of education and at Ohio State are perpetuating these discourses. For example, the most prevalent justifications for study abroad position internationalization as a bulwark that protects American economic and political inadequacy in a world “strikingly different from what it was just a decade ago” (OIA, 2012, p. 12). Study abroad as an educational practice has become a key part of this strategy and depicted as “essential to future employability, earnings potential, and the economic well-being of students and communities” (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2014, para. 4), “integral” to international education (NAFSA, 2008), and necessary “as a means to achieving the broader learning-focused goals of internationalization” (American Council on Education [ACE], 2012, p. 19) in the larger
educational discourse. Coercive pressures outside the field of higher education have positioned study abroad as a clear apparatus of internationalization that reaches from the highest administrative levels into the individual educational experiences of students, and it is for this reason that study abroad has become a lightening rod for both material and discursive biopolitical governance.

**Institutional Discipline in Mimetic Strategies**

Mimetic pressures, or competition between entities within the same field (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), are felt in higher education when institutions fight for the increasingly limited resources provided by the government. In order to survive in this environment, institutions change themselves to be more desirable in the field that coercive pressures have shaped. Organizations are not uniform, however, and this process often takes on a coercive nature within the boundaries of the institution as more powerful organizational entities compel less powerful ones to change.

From a Foucauldian perspective, this process is similar to the idea of the disciplinary gaze. Ettlinger (2011), working from Foucault’s (1977) concept of panopticism, pays particular attention to how the disciplinary gaze is often used to achieve this goal through the enforcement of appropriate behaviors. At The Ohio State University, internationalization can be understood as a mimetic strategy that is making the university more competitive with its peers, but also as a disciplinary practice that is used by certain entities to subvert other parts of the university that are not as easily commercialized and, therefore, not worthy of the funding and prestige that comes from strategic internationalization.
At Ohio State, internationalization is described as a discrete substance, currently isolated from the core functions of the university. It is depicted as a “growing” dimension (p. 1), something to be “implemented” (p. 2), or a responsibility to be cultivated or nurtured (p. 5) in OIA’s (2012) Strategic Plan. Similarly, The President’s and Provost’s Council (2009) describe international issues as something to be “further imbedded” into The Ohio State University through measurable strategy (p. 3). Instead of looking for and investing in disciplines that have always crossed national and cultural boundaries (i.e. art, history, literature), those charged with managing this process are looking for new worthy disciplines ready to be internationalized. This ties back to what disciplines are deemed worthy of funding underneath a neoliberal regime. Internationalization becomes another venue through which to privilege fields that are economically legible and easily commoditized.

The privileging of certain disciplines impacts study abroad practices specifically when administrators seek out new programs to imbed with international education experiences instead of encouraging students to gain knowledge of the world through the courses and disciplines that have traditionally engaged with these questions. In this way, the measure of internationalism becomes a normalizing tool, a gaze that can be used to justify the reappropriation of key resources into new programs, such as business and STEM, that are not historically global in scope but better align with the coercive forces external to the university. This process is then seen as a mimetic force that ensures institutional isomorphism, or converging design, as the same strategies are replicated at different institutions across the field of higher education, leading to fundamental shifts in
where institutions locate study abroad programs, how many study abroad programs are offered, and what students learn while abroad.

The larger societal implication of mimetic isomorphism from a Foucauldian perspective is that it reinforces the prevailing system of governance across an entire field, enrolling organizational leaders into a project that is multi-sited and seemingly organic. This is the danger of biopolitical governance to normalize action. A prevailing regime of truth becomes so engrained in the discourse, actions, and perceived reality of society, that individuals find it difficult, if not impossible, to imagine new ways of being. The organizational structures that define contemporary society and individuals looking to advance their own interests constantly push each other towards a more complete adoption of the imagined ideal, in this case an education system defined by neoliberal and neocolonial thought. As a result, thoughts, practices, and individuals who inherently do not fit this ideal are increasingly pushed out of positions of influence in organizations and the margins of society.

**Individualized Discipline in Normalizing Strategies**

While coercive influences emerge externally to a field and mimetic pressures are felt between organizations within the same field, normative pressures arise out of an institution’s internal constituencies seeking to personally shape themselves into more desirable agents (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). This process is similar to the way in which Foucault (1977) described individual disciplinary mechanisms in the institutions that shaped social life in the early modern era. Today, however, the monastery, boarding school, military, and prison have been joined by the corporate bureaucratic structure that defines the administration of contemporary educational and cultural entities.
Within this study normalizing strategies were seen within both administrative and student populations. In publications similar to those released by the federal government, a variety of policy and trade groups that define career norms for university administrators and staff have utilized a wide-reaching discourse that calls for an expansion of general international education initiatives, and more specifically, increases in the number of students studying abroad (ACE, 2012; IIE, 2014; NAFSA, 2008). Staff and administrators seeking to advance their own interests within an organization then utilize these truths to promote study abroad and raise the profile of international education.

Often scholarly discourse on study abroad is used as a tool in this effort to expand study abroad offerings, but it is applied in a way that preserves the “magical” quality of study abroad (Grünzweig & Rinehart, 2002) and ignores the questions that remain about its effectiveness as a pedagogical strategy. Professionals and institutions that do not respond to the sounding of this “alarm for ‘internationalized’ education at U.S. institutions of higher learning” (Brustein, 2007, p. 382), risk being labeled as either out of touch or obstructionists to U.S. interests not only by outside groups, but by their own employees.

At OSU this behavior is seen in the strategic planning documents that promote the interests of the Office of International Affairs and the departments that have been selected for internationalization. In the neoliberal environment of higher education, not only specific institutions but also individual departments and administrators are competing for the recognition that expanding international education provides. Administrators therefore seek to expand study abroad offerings within their disciplines in order to attract more students, positive attention, and revenue that study abroad programs
promise. Simultaneously, within the document corpus not one research study on international education was cited to support administrators’ claims that students will gain many valuable skills through study abroad. Given the larger climate within which OSU operates, I take this as a sign that the supposed benefits of all study abroad programs have been accepted so universally that individuals seeking to normalize themselves and the units they control do not have to defend their claims with evidence.

There is evidence of similar normalizing forces emerging from the student body. Student-consumers are choosing schools that will allow them to gain the social and social capital that study abroad offers (Ludwig as cited in Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2005). Today, more so than previous generations, millennial students see college as a means to gainful employment (Levine & Dean, 2012). As customers, these students are embracing juridical statements as to what a global citizen, and therefore a worthy and competitive student, does with their time in college. They are seeking out experiences that meet a “desire to be morally worthy, responsibilized individuals, who, as successful entrepreneurs, can produce the best for themselves and their families” (Davies & Bansel, 2007 p. 251). These claims are supported in this study by the motivators that most students reported - social networks and gaining something tangible. In the current socio-economic context of increasing globalization, study abroad has become a necessary tool for developing a productive, global entrepreneurial identity.

In order to stay relevant and attract these students and to ease the normalizing pressure placed upon them, administrators at U.S. American institutions have adopted and promoted study abroad as a method of strategic cosmopolitanism, or cultural learning for personal economic gain (Mitchell, 2003). This is done through the repackaging of
study abroad as a consumer good (Bolen, 2001) and feeding upon “American students’ sense of entitlement, consumerism and individualism” (Zemarch-Bersin, 2009) through valuing student choice in destination and amenities over program quality and practices that provide more opportunities for learning (Woolf, 2007).

This strategy of strategic cosmopolitanism both depends upon a history of neocolonialism and perpetuates it. Through strategic cosmopolitanism, experiences abroad serve as another way for Westerners to act out an idealized version of themselves (Sin, 2009) in the non-Western world. These students return home with new and attractive attributes, but through the strategic retelling of their time abroad and the deployment of only crucial bits of information, they perpetuate a colonial gaze and entrenched misunderstandings of the rest of the world (Snee, 2009). The fact that the most common way students in this study described the world was through a material lens makes these previous studies all the more troubling. The results of this analysis suggest that many study abroad programs are not doing enough to connect what students are witnessing and experiencing abroad to their understandings of their own identities and home contexts.

Overall, this system compels institutions and the individuals that make up those institutions to embrace study abroad as a tool of internationalization without hesitation or critique. As Wolf (2007) outlined, U.S. colleges and universities are able to meet demands to be more prestigious and fit competitors through publishing increasing measures of internationalization, at least in part, through the promotion of short-term programs. This is possible because most institutions engage in the practice of reporting the number of students who travel abroad as an aggregate. Regardless of the time and
resources students and schools put into study abroad programs, colleges and universities are able to easily report an impressive metric regarding what percentage of students choose to study abroad. Administrators’ performance is tied to their institutions’ perceived value and students push the system further through their role as consumers. The two sides of the process, the double arbitration (Foucault, 2004/2008) of the individual consumer student and the market-driven institution, fuel the current regime of practices from the ground up, reinforcing the larger field-wide and society-wide faith in neoliberal ideologies and the neocolonial rationalities upon which those ideologies depend.

**Impacts on Students**

One of the crucial aspects of Foucauldian poststructuralism is that there are no pure victims. In order for the system of governmentality to work, biopolitical power must be partnered with disciplinary mechanisms that enroll individuals into the larger societal project (Ettlinger, 2011). In the case of study abroad, neoliberal and neocolonialist messages are received, internalized, and then redirected by individuals who hope to make themselves better neoliberal competitors and neocolonial citizens. This is not to say, however, that the systems of governance in play do not lead to adverse outcomes for students. In this section I will briefly outline the ways in which the students who participated in this study were negatively impacted by the prevailing system of governance at The Ohio State University.
Managing the Learning Imagination

In their essay “Managing the Research Imagination?” Boden and Epstein (2006) explored how the “covert ideological application of management techniques such as audit, inspection, regulation and surveillance” (p. 224) have been utilized in a way that limits the ways in which faculty can create and engage in new scholarship. The authors argue that neoliberal biopolitics have been successfully made the university subservient to the interests of the market and caused knowledge producers to focus too readily on how research can be monetized and eventually consumed. The quest for knowledge becomes solely about maximizing profit. This structure is then replicated in faculty’s interactions with students. Boden and Epstein (2006) explained this in the following manner:

There is a doubling process here: students, brought under neo-liberal hegemony identify as consumers, with consumption as a necessary, desirable and desired way of life. Simultaneously, the neo-liberal university is discursively framed as a place where students-as-consumers rule curriculum content and styles of pedagogy. This reinforces students’ own self-identification as consumers of education and academics’ identifications as producers of consumer (that is teaching-and-learning) services. (p. 227)

This is the same system that I have described above in reference to study abroad education. Through perpetuating a discourse focused on choice and skills, students at The Ohio State University are discursively situated as customers who control where they will go, for how long they will travel, and what types of interactions they will have with the local community. Larger national studies, such as Levine and Dean’s (2012) survey of
the millennial generation show that this attitude has become largely pervasive in U.S.
higher education.

This study reveals that the problem with consumerism in education is that
students often do not seek out the experiences that would provide them with the most
opportunities for growth. A students’ peers and family, and to a more limited extent
connections abroad, was the single most frequent motivation for students to engage. The
third most frequent motivation was a desire for simple excitement and novelty. Students
were aware that studying abroad could provide new opportunities to develop new skills
and knowledge (the second most frequent motivator), but it is clear from the ways in
which students made meaning of their experiences and the roles that students fulfilled
while abroad that many were not challenged in ways that actually required them to think
and behave in new ways upon returning home. Experiences were simply retold and
retooled in ways that reinforced preexisting identities and beliefs as to why international
travel is useful and what an individual American citizens responsibilities are to the rest of
the world.

Many students walked away seeing the culture they had visited as a material
monolith, capable of being studied and consumed through passive means. These students
were satisfied with their purchase, however, because the mere act of traveling abroad,
with the imbedded association of cultural capital, validated their roles as global citizens.
The university in turn allowed and encouraged this definition of global citizenship
through failing to define it in a more complex or critical manner. It is easier and more
profitable to utilize the term global citizen as a credential to be purchased than an identity
or positionality that one must strive towards. Given the loosely defined goals of study
abroad and its relatively recent mass appeal in American higher education, it is unlikely that the pedagogical practice will be isolated from consumerist demands any time soon as newer technologies tend to be more susceptible to neoliberal forces (Naidoo & Jamieson, 2005).

**Race, Still not the Subject of Study Abroad**

The topics of race and gender are approached unevenly in both the document and interview corpuses. Documents such as the Study Abroad Handbook (OIA, 2013) explicitly deal with social identity in certain sections, seeking to normalize students’ concerns about navigating a new culture. In other sections, however, the same document repeatedly encourages students to remain safe through minimizing the physical differences between themselves and their hosts. There is no discussion of how it is impossible for students of certain races to “blend in” with locals due to the racial demographics of those countries. Additionally, there is no discussion of how students can support each other while abroad to help those who are at a higher risk of facing unwanted attention due to their race or gender. The documents that advertise study abroad to potential participants never mention issues of social identity.

Study abroad is often seen as a luxury to students of color and not something in which non-White or students from lower socio-economic backgrounds participate. Brux and Fry (2010) found that students of color do desire to study abroad, but are potentially under-informed and not encouraged often enough to study abroad. Without an appropriate understanding of the cultural perception of study abroad and historical factors that have prevented many from participating, however, even well intentioned efforts to
recruit students may alienate students of difference (Salisbury, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2011) through perpetuating a consumerist narrative that is racially coded.

Neoliberal discourse in general is racialized in how it actively refuses to speak to racial realities and diminishes the importance of social identities (Davis, 2007; Giroux, 2005; Roberts & Mahtani, 2010). Whereas race and nationality were crucially important to the modernist nation-building projects of the twentieth century, in the current post-modern, neoliberal moment all discourse on identity is replaced by talk of competition and fitness. As Giroux (2005) pointed out, at the end of World War II it would have seemed ridiculous that concepts with such explanatory power as race and class would not be included in social and economic policy. Today, however, the vocabulary of social identity is increasingly replaced by one of economic desirability, social capital, and meritocracy. Davis (2007) has deemed this phenomenon of neoliberalism muted racism, defined as the “vehicles that imply race without direct reference to it” (p. 349). Muted racism can be seen in social situations where “racism is statistically real, but analytically mute” (p. 355), including situations such as the continued racial inequalities seen in the discursive constructions and material practices of social welfare (Davis, 2007), immigration (Roberts & Mahtani, 2010), and access to educational opportunities such as study abroad.

Muted racism is playing out at The Ohio State University and other institutions in how study abroad is being constructed in discourse and materially practiced. This is because explicitly addressing racial concerns would interrupt the discursive construction of study abroad as a good that is available on the free market and therefore equally accessible to all students. The danger in failing to address social identity discursively
comes from the fact it leaves students underprepared to deal with racial and gender realities that may exist in the communities they are visiting. Over 15 years ago, Talburt and Stewart (1999) documented in an ethnographic study of students traveling to Spain how one African-American, female students’ experience abroad became an ongoing trial of microaggressions and blatant racist encounters. When this student turned to her cohort of American peers who were predominately White, she was further alienated for speaking about her experiences navigating Spanish culture as a visible other too often. I discuss this article at length because Jacky had an strikingly similar experience traveling to South America.

Jacky reported that she was often faced with racist name-calling, aggressive staring, and challenges to her nationality. After experiencing this for a prolonged period of time, she felt like she could no longer turn to her peers. She began feeling she “was bringing it up too much” even though it bothered her greatly. In the face of this aggression, Jacky did not withdraw, however. She sought out more information about her host nation’s racial history and why the population of the country today has such a low percentage of people of African descent. Although Jacky’s experience was unique in the interview corpus both for the extent to which she spoke of racism and the intensity with which it shaped her time abroad, Isaac and Gwen also reported confrontations of a racial nature. In Isaac’s story, he recounted being called a racial slur and how this instance stuck with him throughout the duration of his time in East Asia. He found himself actively avoiding the area that the incident took place in hope of not encountering the individual who insulted him.
What these narratives and Talburt and Stewart’s (1999) work demonstrate is that it is crucial that discussions of social identity be given a more prominent space in preparing students to study abroad. Issues of identity are not peripheral to students when they are immersed in a culture that continuously others them. Rather, these experiences go on to shade, and potentially limit, interactions with the host community and therefore what type of learning is available to students of different social identities. The racial reality of international travel is conveniently hidden, however, behind the discourse of choice, consumption, and responsible individual action. As long as identity-erasing neoliberal discourse dominates the ways that students of color will not participate in study abroad at a representative rate. Instead, the White privilege embedded in neoliberal discourse will always hold students of color back, as after-thoughts to be integrated into a colorblind system that has already proven to work for the dominant race (Davis, 2007).

Finding Spaces for Resistance

In Chapter 2, I outlined how Focauldian theory could be seen as resting “on a postulate of absolute optimism” (Foucault, 1980/2000b, pp. 294-295) given its ultimate goal of movement towards more acceptable power relations. Foucauldians have attempted to reach this goal primarily in three ways: making invisible structures visible through empirical analysis, questioning what makes these structures stable through raising questions of power, and exploring new structures that may be more liberating. Given Foucault’s understandings of power as networked and diffused, however, this project is never done (Cook, 1993). One is never fully free. There is only the optimism of moving forward towards a system that is less coercive and more just. In the following sections I highlight the ways in which internationalization and study abroad practices
could be altered, not to free students from all restrictions, but to increase the likelihood of them occupying critical spaces and stretching their understandings of what type of global engagement is possible beyond mere consumerism and the orientalism it demands.

The most common themes in the document corpus were concerned with expanding study abroad participation at the institutional level, regulating how individual students participate in the practice, and describing the choices and benefits students are able to enjoy through that participation. The prevalence of these themes reflect the general attitude of inevitable action within the field of international education, or the need to pursue internationalization purely for means of competition within the field of higher education. In higher education broadly, empirical discourses on the effectiveness of study abroad are often co-opted and twisted in a way to make it appear that any and all international experience is similarly beneficial for students despite the lack of evidence supporting affective growth outside of programs with an explicit focus on social identity and justice.

At OSU, however, veridicting statements supporting the growth of international education and study abroad were made without this additional level of support, indicating the strength of inevitable action as a collective scheme at this particular institution. The following set of suggestions is a place for both students, as either consumers or engaged learners, and faculty and administration, no matter their vested interests, to begin unraveling inevitable action as a justification for action because it is not only an ethically ambiguous but also an unsustainable practice. In order for study abroad to continue more robust discourses must be utilized and more effective practices embraced. While it is possible that any programmatic or policy suggestion may be co-opted by those seeking to
further neoliberalism’s grasp on the academy or those who do not care about the imperial history of the West, it is up to those who do care about student learning and promoting education for justice to deploy the findings of this work and other critical research within what Foucault (1978) called the appropriate games of truth and the right strategical situations.

A number of the students interviewed left their study abroad programs with radically new understandings of themselves and the places they visited, despite the current system of governance. What these students had in common is that they participated in long-term programs or in multiple short-term programs, they sought to learn local languages and develop meaningful relationships with locals and non-American visitors, and they used their own prior experiences with immigration and international travel as reflective tools to make greater sense of their times abroad. In fact, all of the students who mostly spoke of their time abroad in complex, process-oriented ways were second-generation Americans and spoke of their parents’ experiences living an international life. These results suggest three implications for educators: that deeper understandings of globalization take time and effort to develop, that there are educational opportunities beyond study abroad, and that simple metrics of participation are not enough to measure learning.

**Improving Learning in Study Abroad**

In both the existing literature and the results of this study there is strong evidence that educators must do better for their students. The act of traveling abroad alone is not a magical endeavor that will make students better people or global citizens. There are strong indicators that study abroad can be highly effective in teaching students foreign
languages (Freed, 1998; Freed, Segalowitz, & Dewey, 2004; Rivers, 1998; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004; Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009) and in helping student develop knowledge and appreciation of other cultures (Freed, 1998; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004; Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009). There is mounting evidence, however, that this is only true for certain types of programs - those that have demanding classroom components (Freed, Segalowitz, & Dewey, 2004), have durations of a semester or longer (Dwyer, 2004; Kehl & Morris, 2008; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004), and have curricula that focus on identity and intercultural pedagogy (Kiely, 2004, 2005; Pederson, 2010). The results of this study firmly support the latter body of evidence and suggest that higher education administrators and faculty must move away from a foundationalist approach to study abroad. Building from Butin’s (2006) comments on service-learning and bell hooks (1994) remarks on theory in general, it is imperative that international educators must move beyond simple assumptions as to the goodness and utility of study abroad.

Accomplishing a more intellectually transformative vision of study abroad will not be easy. It will include more thoroughly prepping students to engage in meaningful and potentially uncomfortable “high-intensity dissonance” producing situations (Kiely, 2005, p. 12) while abroad and building the language skills and social networks necessary to do so. Students in this study who saw culture as more than material objects and practices and who had more meaningful relationships with the peoples they visited were also more likely to talk about their own social identities. These students knew not only why they had gone abroad, which may have been for purely self-interested reasons, but also who they were in terms of their nationalities, races, genders, and religious beliefs.
Additionally, learning done abroad must be connected to students’ home contexts and other experiential learning opportunities as students continue to make meaning months and years later. Although it may be difficult to add the additional costs of pre-departure and post-return courses and co-curricular experiences to study abroad programs in the current climate of higher education, it is necessary for educators to stand up for this component of responsible and effective international education.

The experiences of Jacky, Isaac, and other students of color indicate that it is important not only for the sake of learning, but also for students’ emotional health that issues such as race and gender are engaged with in ways that are more meaningful than those present in OSU’s study abroad handbook. It is irresponsible to promote study abroad to students of color, who may be entering societies with very different racial histories and customs, and not to provide adequate support for those students. If the goal of study abroad is a prolonged ability and desire to engage in issues of internationalization, it would benefit both participants of majority and marginalized identities to more meaningfully and strategically speak about issues of social identity.

The good news is that students hoped to have meaningful and transformative experiences abroad. While many students sought out tangible benefits, such as skills or credentials, from their time abroad, several others spoke of a desire to be more inclusive, independent, and spiritual versions of themselves. Disappointed by the lack of formal opportunities to continue this quest for self-transformation, Faith and Isaac showed initiative in forming and joining student groups that promoted cross-cultural dialogue on campus. Educators finding it difficult to institutionalize extended learning before and after study abroad programs may find it possible to tap into students’ enthusiasm and
empower more informal peer-led groups to take on the task of interrogating how “otherness and difference [are] constitutive of an inescapably heterogeneous and complex self” (de Oliveira Andreotti & de Souza, 2012, p. 2) through sharing international travel experiences and building connections across different identity groups on campus and in the surrounding community.

**Improving Measurement of Learning after Study Abroad**

Secondly, it is important for institutions to begin measuring internationalization more holistically than the numbers of international students enrolled and domestic students sent abroad. If this study has demonstrated anything, it is that learning is not guaranteed. A first good step forward would, therefore, be to measure learning and not participation. Currently, institutions report gross aggregates of the numbers of students who go abroad (for example see CIGE, 2012). This practice, however, allows for significantly shorter study abroad programs to be counted in the same matter as long-term programs. It may be unlikely that it will become a field standard to study and report on study abroad learning extensively without significant coercive or mimetic pressures, but this should not stop individual efforts to improve study abroad programming.

There are several ways that individual campuses could proceed. Woolf (2007) presented an alternative to the standard practice of aggregate reporting by suggesting that institutions report the amount of time that students spend abroad. While a step in the right direction, this does not measure student learning that has occurred as a result of going abroad. Other options would include utilizing assessments such as Global Perspective Inventory or Intercultural Development Inventory, but again this type of initiative would be expensive for institutions to implement. More cost-effective and direct ways to
measure how students were changed by their time abroad would include collecting data on what actions students have taken after returning home. For example, Engberg (2013) found that community service and study abroad programs provide complementary learning experiences and the results of this study suggest that multiple trips abroad may benefit students ability to think of globalization in complex ways. Through taking the time to measure which and how many students are seeking out these additional learning experiences, educators can begin to understand if study abroad is fulfilling its purported goal of producing a more engaged and aware citizenry.

**Moving Beyond Credentializing**

The ability and motivation of some students to extend their learning beyond their stays abroad is encouraging not only for how it can improve learning, but also because what it means for the construction of global citizenship and international education itself. The prevailing discourse in international education and at The Ohio State University has narrowly defined how domestic students can participate in internationalization efforts through study abroad. All other methods of strategic internationalization do not involve student buy in and are measures that administrators can take on unilaterally. This raises troubling questions for what individual agency for other constituency groups in higher education, including not only students but also faculty and community members, looks like under the governmentalities of globalism.

The potential for abuse under governmentality comes from the ways in which biopolitical and disciplinary measures touch the lives of every single individual within a population. Every action, whether of great social consequence or only personal significance, is shaped by the prevailing regimes of truth. Since every social action has
potential significance, however, there is also great potential for resistance, too. The invasion of neoliberal tactics into the social realm and ubiquity of orientalism has also made individuals’ choices about their educational, social, and economic lives potential spaces for resistance. International educators can begin cultivating this potential for resistance in their students through reframing global education as something more than a one time study abroad experience or a credential that leads to greater competitive potential. Rather, educators can seize upon the rich discourse of global citizenship and postcolonial scholarship and speak to how global citizenship is an identity that is never fully achieved and an ethic that can be incorporated into all life activities.

Moving global citizenship from credential to identity or ethic will not be enough, however, if new constructions of global citizenship do not recognize the problematic context or imperialism and capitalism in which the term emerged and continues to be used. Transformative global citizenship must be self-reflective and tied to action. Students should grapple with how in many ways they cannot be full global citizens in the typical sense of equal participation in world affairs due to their privileged status as Americans (Zemarch-Bersin, 2008). The task for educators is to take a hold of the frustration that may arise in students from this fact and channel it into making meaningful contributions at home that will continue their education about others (Engberg, 2013) and create a more participatory and action-oriented global citizenship.

**Limitations and Recommendations for Future Inquiry**

There are certain limitations in this study that are inherent to discourse analysis generally and to the particular methodology I have utilized. In terms of discourse analysis broadly, any analysis that uses only text is going to be limited by the fact that language is
not action, nor empirical reality (McKee, 2009). In other words, depending upon what discourses are selected, a researcher may actually be analyzing the way a system is perceived to work, rather than how it operates on the ground. I have attempted to overcome this limitation by conducting discourse analysis at multiple levels and with different types of text. Through analyzing how practices are communicated and also received, internalized, or rejected by subjects, a much richer picture of governmentality arises. In the end, however, only language was analyzed and future studies could pair this discussion of discourse and discursive structures with first-hand evidence of regimes of practices gathered through more ethnographic means, what McKee (2009) called “realist governmentality” analysis.

Secondly, any discourse analysis is inherently limited by what texts are gathered and analyzed in the corpus. Due to considerations of time and space, this study only looked at documents that discussed study abroad widely at OSU. Given the strategy on the part of senior administration to embed study abroad programs within specific departments, however, a significant number of documents describing individual study abroad programs at OSU exist and many were excluded from this analysis. This is important because the design of specific programs can prove to be a great boon or hindrance to encouraging student interaction with locals and self-reflection. Just because the overall discourse on study abroad at OSU does not address critical questions often does not mean there are not individual actors and programs doing critical work. Future studies interested in examining pedagogical regimes of practices regarding study abroad could utilize the framework of this study and examine programs hosted by different academic departments. The findings of such a study would provide great insight into how
the epistemological assumptions of faculty and fields of study influence the ways that students make meaning and learn abroad.

Additionally, the makeup of the student participants must be discussed. In this study, the number of White students who volunteered to participate was four times higher than the number of students of color. Given The Ohio State University’s participation rates, this is a representative sample as White students make up over 70 percent of all study abroad participants (OIA, 2014f). What is unique about this study, however, is all the participants of color save one came from a recent immigrant background. Multiple participants discussed how their family’s experiences with resettlement compelled them both directly and indirectly to study abroad. This supports earlier conclusions that students’ decision-making processes regarding study abroad are more complex than simple cost analyses and that issues of culture and capital are always in play (Brux & Fry, 2010). This fact also limits the explanatory power of this study, however, as members of families that have recently immigrated have many unique characteristics - such as experience traveling internationally and foreign language skills - that many racially similar groups who have been present in the United States longer do not have.

Thirdly, discourse analysis and governmentality are useful modes of inquiry because of the flexibility and breadth of analysis they allow. Due to the availability of texts in contemporary society and the potential for nearly any interaction to serve as an example of governance, a great deal of data can be gathered on a given phenomenon or topic. In order to remain manageable in scope, this study focused in on the discursive statements that connect individuals and institutions, but other approaches could be taken to the same question. For example, future studies could look at the way in which higher
education has become increasingly impacted by legislation and litigation, how these processes are used as methods of governance, and the ways that they affect the development of international education and student learning abroad. There are at least two recent examples of two states (Minnesota and New York) exploring what state regulation of study abroad would entail (Redden, 2014) and the fear of student endangerment motivated many of the discursive statement analyzed in this study.

At the other end of the scale of governmentality, other future studies could focus on students’ meaning-making processes and analyze more closely how students engage in the process of self-normalization. One such approach would be to compare Foucault’s (2007) notion of savoir - or the knowledge of a system necessary to critique it and the resolve to build and maintain that knowledge - to widely used models of cognitive develop, such as Kegan’s (1994) orders of consciousness. These future areas of analysis could open up many new understandings into the ways in which institutions are the objects of governance carried out by other parties and the ways in which resistance to governmentality can be cultivated.

A fourth and final limitation that should be addressed is the fact that this study was conducted at only one site. While The Ohio State University is representative of many of the ongoing trends in study abroad participation outlined in Chapter 2, it is still a single institution and, therefore, the analytical generalizeability of this study, or how well it explains overarching systems of governance is limited. OSU occupies a unique role in the higher education landscape, as it is a school that is aggressively seeking to improve its profile and become more competitive in the marketplace. Naidoo and Jamieson (2005) hypothesized that less elite schools are more susceptible to the influences of neoliberal
governmentality due to the fact they do not have a significant amount of social capital accumulated. Given OSU’s recent history, it is possible that neoliberal policies have been adopted at this institution more thoroughly than other schools, particularly those that are not reliant on public funds and those that have a longer history of competing for students on a national scale. Conducting similar studies to this one at different types of institutions would provide a comparison, what Foucault (1991/2000d) deemed external analysis, that could be compared to the internal analysis I have conducted here and continue to clarify how the governmentalities of globalism operate across different educational locales.

Conclusion

This study serves as a point of intersection for many lines of inquiry regarding study abroad education, broader internationalization efforts, and the history of the U.S. academe’s involvement in global affairs. Through bringing these diverse bodies of knowledge together, it has been my goal to demonstrate how micro-practices are shaped by and simultaneously shape the macro-practices that are more often studied in critical higher education research. I have done this through pursuing a Foucauldian study of discourse of a single, but strategically important, practice that is pursued in order to increase the economic, political, and cultural internationalization of institutions of higher learning.

The findings overall indicate that study abroad practices are described in ways that are congruent with neoliberal understandings of the academy and that this view of higher education often simultaneously perpetuates a neocolonial view of the world. The intersecting and mutually enforcing nature of the neoliberal and neocolonial discourses present in the corpus analyzed suggest that these two systems of thought have coalesced
into a larger system, what I have called the governmentalities of globalism. While it may
be daunting to confront this system of governance, and impossible to fully overturn it, the
student interviews for this study and existing critical research have provided useful sites
to begin to deliver upon the Foucauldian promise of “absolute optimism” in critical
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Appendix A: Participant Intake Survey

Hello,

My name is Travis Olson and I am a MA candidate at The Ohio State University in the College of Education and Human Ecology. Thank you for your time and interest in my research study on undergraduate study abroad at OSU.

The purpose of this study is to better understand how study abroad is carried out as an institutional and educational practice at U.S. colleges and universities. After you fill out this initial survey, you may be contacted to participate in an in-person interview that will last no longer than 90 minutes. Your interview will be part of a larger set of data that will also include documents important to the design and administration of study abroad at this university.

If you choose to participate, your identity and any information that you share with me will be kept confidential to the best of my ability. Filling out this survey does not commit you to participating in the study in any way. If you do continue on with the study after this survey, at any point you may leave the study. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are entitled.

Please contact me if you have any questions, comments, or concerns about this study. Additionally, please let me know if you would need accommodations in order to participate. Again, thank you for your time. I look forward to speaking to you about your experiences!

Identity and Contact Information

What is your first name?

What is your last name?

Please answer true or false to the following statement: I am 18 years old or older at this time.

With what race(s) do you primarily identify? (You may select multiple)

   Options: Asian/Asian-American; African/African-American/Black; Native American/American Indian/Indigenous American; White/European-American; Race Not Listed
With what gender identity or identities do you primarily identify? (You may select multiple)

Options: Male; Female; Trans*; Gender Identity Not Listed

What is the best email address to contact you?

What is the best phone number to contact you? (Not required)

Please answer true or false to the following statement: I am or was a student at The Ohio State University.

In what year did you or do you plan to graduate from The Ohio State University?

Information about Travel and Study Abroad Experiences

Approximately how many times have you traveled outside of the country, either alone or with family and/or friends?

Please answer true or false to the following statement: I have studied abroad while enrolled at The Ohio State University.

In what country or countries did you primarily stay during your study abroad program?

What was the duration of your study abroad program?

Please briefly, in no more than 250 words, state one of the most important things that you learned while studying abroad.
Appendix B: Recruitment Message

Email subject line: Recruiting Student Participants for Study Abroad Research

Hello (name of colleague),

My name is Travis Olson and I am graduate student studying Higher Education and Student Affairs (HESA) at The Ohio State University. I am emailing you today to ask for your help in recruiting student participants for my master’s thesis. I am writing my thesis on trends in study abroad program design. This semester I will be conducting my data analysis using publically available documents at OSU and interviewing students who have recently participated in study abroad.

Over the next month I am looking to interview 10 to 20 students and/or recent graduates of OSU who have participated in study abroad programs of various lengths. I will ask these students to sit down with me for a 60 to 90 minute, one-on-one interview where I will ask about their experiences traveling abroad and returning to OSU. This is where I need your help.

I would greatly appreciate it if you could send the message provided below to students who have participated in the study programs you coordinate or students you know have studied abroad while at OSU. I am interested in interviewing students who have participated in the past two years, but have not just returned in the past few months from their travels.

My interview protocol has been approved by the IRB and is being supervised in Ohio State’s HESA program through Dr. Tatiana Suspitsyna, but I would be happy to provide more details including my full research protocol if you have any concerns or questions regarding this study. I may be reached at olson.337@osu.edu or 651.343.5484. Dr. Suspitsyna may be reached at suspitsyna.1@osu.edu or 614.247.8232. You may also contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

Thank you for your time and help! I greatly appreciate it and would not be able to complete this study without it.

Sincerely,

Travis

Please copy and past the message below (including email subject line) to your students: [see Appendix C for email]
Appendix C: Message to Participants

Email subject line: Invitation to Participate in Study Abroad Research

Hello,

My name is Travis Olson and I am a graduate student at The Ohio State University. I am contacting you today to ask if you are interested in participating in a research study about study abroad. I am looking for 10 to 20 students and/or recent graduates to sit down with me for a 60-90 minute, one-on-one interview. At this interview I will ask you about your experiences abroad and listen to you talk about what you believe you learned while traveling and studying outside the country.

You are eligible to participate in this study if you match the following criteria:

- Are 18 years or older.
- Currently enrolled fulltime or have graduated within the past two years from The Ohio State University.
- Studied abroad within the past 2 years.
- Returned from your trip abroad more than 3 months ago.

If you match these eligibility requirements and are interested in participating in this study, please consider filling out this survey (link to survey) where I will ask you a few questions and for your email address to contact you. Unfortunately, I am unable to provide any incentives for participation in this study at this time, however, I believe that this could be a rewarding experience for those who participate through providing a new space to reflect on past experiences.

Please contact me at the email address provided below if you have any questions, concerns, or would require accommodations to participate in this study. Thank you for your time and consideration!

Sincerely,

Travis H. Olson
------------

MA Candidate
Higher Education and Student Affairs
Dept. of Educational Studies, The Ohio State University
olson.337@osu.edu
Appendix D: Interview Protocol*

Date:
Location:
Participant (using pseudonym or some other masked identifier):

When setting up an interview time, the participant will be asked to bring 2-3 photos that they feel represent their time abroad. Briefly describe the purpose of the study and read the informed consent form with or to the participant.

1. Tell me a little bit about the photographs you have brought today.
   • Where were they taken and what is happening in them?
   • What memories do they elicit for you?

2. How did you come to your decision to participate in this specific program?
   • What motivated you to study abroad?
   • What did you hear about this program before departing?
   • What reservations, if any, did you have about participating?

4. How did you interact with other people while abroad?
   • Could you describe some of your experiences with peers and instructors while abroad?
   • What stands out from your interactions with local people?
   • How did you feel about your interactions with others while abroad?

5. Tell me some more about your trip abroad.
   • What were the most important things you did while abroad?
   • In what situations did you learn the most?
   • How were you prepared for the program?
   • How was your readjustment coming home?

6. What do you think you learned about yourself while traveling and studying abroad?
   • How does this experience fit into your larger educational and career plans?
   • How, if at all, did your experience change your future plans?
   • What do you feel you gained from participating in this program?

7. Is there anything you would like to add before we finish?

Thank the participant and review the next steps. Conclude by again asking if the participant has any questions or concerns about the process moving forward.

*Adapted from Jones, S. R. (2014) ESHESA 8895.32: Interview Protocol Example
Appendix E: Statement of Informed Consent*

This is a consent form for research participation: It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate.

Your participation is voluntary: Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to better understand how study abroad is carried out as an institutional and educational practice at U.S. colleges and universities. Your interview will be part of a larger set of data that will also include documents important to the design and administration of study abroad at this university.

Procedures: By agreeing to participate in this study, you will take part in an individual interview, lasting no longer than 90 minutes. Part of this interview will include sharing and speaking about 2 to 3 photographs you took while traveling and studying abroad. You may be asked to expand upon answers given at a later date through short follow-up interviews, either in person, over the phone, or by email. Follow-up interviews will last no longer than 30 minutes. Again, every aspect of your involvement is voluntary and you may chose not to participate in any way after the initial interview.

Duration: At any point you may leave this study. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are entitled.

Confidentiality: All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your participation may be disclosed if required by state law.

The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, and publications, but the researcher will not identify you. If you allow me to keep the photographs you share with me and I wish to use the photographs in future presentations and publications, I will get your permission to use and reproduce each photograph. No photographs that contain identifying information of you or other people will be used. Only Travis, my faculty advisor, and individuals within the Office of Research Compliance at The Ohio State University will have access to your individual data. All data will be stored in a secure location and then disposed of in a secure way when necessary.
**Risks:** Any discomfort you might experience should be no more than typically experienced during a discussion with a peer or colleague. There is the possibility of me asking you to think and speak about unpleasant experiences you may have had while abroad. If you are not comfortable with the discussion and wish to discontinue participation in the study, you are free to do so without penalty at any point.

**Benefits:** The potential benefits of your participation include the opportunity to reflect upon your time abroad. Through this process you may come to a deeper understanding of your experiences traveling internationally and how they relate to your personal, academic, and professional goals.

**Incentives:** No incentives are being offered for this study.

**Questions and Contacts:** For questions or concerns about the study, you may contact Travis Olson at olson.337@osu.edu or 651.343.5484 or Tatiana Suspitsyna, Ph.D. at suspitsyna.1@osu.edu. You may also contact Janalisa Menefee of The Ohio State University Office of Research Compliance at menefee.6@osu.edu.

**Signing the Consent Form:** I have read (or someone has read to me) this form and I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

---

Participant Name (please print)

____________________________________________

Participant Signature  ______________________________________

Date________________

Investigator Signature _____________________________________

Date________________

---

## Appendix F: Complete List of Document Corpus Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes identified in document corpus</th>
<th>Frequency of themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What motivating factors and justifications for actions regarding study abroad are presented in the documents?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university must embrace globalization through encouraging international or cross-cultural student interactions</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university must increase access and funding for study abroad</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university must embrace the market and increase prosperity</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university’s mission compels it to globalize</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university must improve its status and strive towards excellence</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Office of International Affairs must change its policies to be better strategically positioned within the university</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How is the world outside the United States presented in the documents?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The world outside the United States is dangerous and students must be aware of physical threats</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The world outside the United States is lacking in resources, accommodations, etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How are the roles of students described and prescribed in the documents?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are responsible actors who are required to take the necessary procedural and financial steps in order to prepare to study abroad</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have many choices when they study abroad and are encouraged to explore all of them in preparing to and participating in study abroad</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students must be information seekers and inform themselves of where they plan to study abroad</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have many concerns when studying abroad and these concerns are normal</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will gain many valuable skills through studying abroad</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be fully immersed in the culture they visit and have many chances for cross-cultural learning</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will become global citizens and be prepared for their future careers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students may be treated differently based on their appearance, abilities, or other social identities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G: Complete List of Interview Corpus Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes identified in interview corpus</th>
<th>Frequency of themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What motivates students to participate in study abroad and what motivations remained with students as they participated in their study abroad program(s)?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ peers, family, or connections they made abroad</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students hoped to get skills, relationships, or experiences out of their time abroad</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students wanted to experience something novel or exciting</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students desired to change who they were or how they saw themselves</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial considerations</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students had prior experiences traveling abroad they enjoyed</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students desired to experience another culture authentically</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How did students understand the communities and cultures they were visiting?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As material: Students understood the community and culture largely through physical and material practices, artifacts, and images</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As process: Students understood the community and culture through complex processes, conflict, and fluid relationships</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As complex: Students understood the community and culture as complex and changing, but only in relation to their home context</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What roles did students describe themselves as occupying while abroad?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normalized student: Students described themselves as occupying the role outlined in the student handbook and were present to learn through both class and experiences in the community</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist: Students described their choice to participate in certain activities or their interactions with local residents that were transactional in nature, with the resident providing a service or good to the student</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Learner: Students describe reciprocal relationships with the locals or prolonged interactions that caused them to reflect on their own subject positions</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intruder: Students describe conflicts with locals or instances in which they were made to feel unwelcome either because of their actions or appearing physically out of place</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>