

© 2010 Nicole Alane Lamers

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE CURRICULUM:
AN ANALYSIS OF THREE TRADITIONS USING ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE OF
GLOBAL WATER ISSUES

BY

NICOLE ALANE LAMERS

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Policy Studies
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2010

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Antonia Darder, Chair
Professor Marilyn Johnston-Parsons
Professor Michael Peters
Professor Fazal Rizvi

Abstract

As a result of a push for increasing internationalization efforts, institutions of Higher Education in the U.S. have begun promoting a wide range of efforts toward campus internationalization. This study has looked at three traditions of these internationalization efforts to examine the potentials and pitfalls of the various approaches. These include an information-based, an experiential and a spatial approach. These modes of engagement are examined through the lens of a set of epistemic virtues, meant to complexify and deepen the meaningfulness of the experience, which include historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination.

The first part of the study looks at an information-based approach, through an analysis of two lesson plans. The other two traditions are examined through case studies in practice. The first case study involves a study tour which focused both on issues of water, but also on issues of study abroad as well. The second case involved an on-campus elective undergraduate course that I taught called ‘Understanding Global Water Issues’.

What this study shows is that effective internationalization must occur at multiple levels and that these levels can reinforce one another. However, an ‘add-on’ approach to internationalization without a comprehensive plan or structure and without elements of criticality will not be as effective, and has greater potential to be ‘mis-educative’, which in turn closes down future possibilities to engage and learn. Finally, the *mode* of internationalization efforts is, in the end, not the primary issue, so much as the purposes and the processes involved.

This is dedicated to my children, and all that which continues to nurture and sustain us

Acknowledgments

It is impossible to acknowledge all of the myriads of people who have had a direct or indirect influence on the development of this project, but I will try. First, I would like to thank all of the participants who took part in this study, for allowing me ‘in’ to their processes, thoughts and lives. I would also like to thank Dr. Chika Schoole and Dr. Bekisizwe Ndimande, who worked so hard to create an experience for us that paralleled no other; as well as all of the teachers, lecturers, and new friends encountered along the way. My deepest gratitude goes to those teachers with whom I had the pleasure of working in Cameroon. I would like to thank all of my fellow graduate students, all of the students in the Global Studies in Education Online Master’s Program and all of my advisees in International and Global Studies, who continually challenged my own assumptions, identity and orientations. I would also like to thank Dr. Ken Salo and Dr. Faranak Miraftab, who helped to set me down this path so long ago, as well as Andy Johnston, who first sent me questioning my role, our role and the purposes of education. I would like to express my extreme gratitude to Dr. Barbara Hancin-Bhatt, who afforded me the opportunity to teach the on-campus course and who has inspired me with her quiet strength and tireless dedication to deep and meaningful internationalization. For endless editorial assistance and friendship, I would like to thank Dr. Jason Sparks, who began this journey with me so many years ago. And, finally to my committee – Dr. Fazal Rizvi, Dr. Michael Peters, Dr. Marilyn Johnston-Parsons, and especially to Dr. Antonia Darder – for endless patience, support, guidance and friendship throughout this process.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 A Brief History of International Studies and Global Education	14
Chapter 3 A Critical Pedagogical Conceptualization for Global/International Studies	35
Chapter 4 Methodology	56
Chapter 5 Information-Based Approach: How I Learned to Do These Things	70
Chapter 6 Experiential Education: Observing From Up-Close	83
Chapter 7 Spatial Approach: Putting It Into Practice	99
Chapter 8 Discussion: What I Think That I Learned	120
Chapter 9 Future Directions	135
References	144
Appendix A Global Water Supply High School Curriculum	149
Appendix B Got Water?	150

Chapter 1

Introduction

We need to look for familiar songs or familiar places when we travel beyond our abstract borders, for within the differences we can find the perfect blend of harmony and discordance. This discord just might reveal an entirely new sense of harmony in the place we journey, as well as altering the way we hear the music when we return to our homes. (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

Internationalization in higher education has become a ubiquitous slogan among educationists at all levels – international (OECD, WB, UN, etc.), national, and local. Though it is part of a slogan system, there has been little consensus on what the actual process should entail, or how specific practices should change to accommodate internationalization. There are a number of reasons for this ambiguity. To begin with, there are a number of motivations from which internationalization is promoted – from across the political and cultural spectrum – which leads to debate over the ends and the means of internationalization itself. This includes multiple understandings of the ways in which globalization works. Also, there is often confusion over the purposes, processes and goals in what efforts of internationalization are meant to achieve, and what each of those terms means. Finally, there are a variety of social imaginaries, discussed in more detail in the following chapters, which are working at odds with one another, competing to define what the outcomes of internationalization efforts might and should be.

Internationalization has had to define itself against and with the processes of globalization, also a contested term. In other words, internationalization efforts are generally responding to processes of globalization. There are several working definitions of ‘globalization’ (some pro-, some contra-, some skeptical, some hyper-) in practice (Held & McGrew, 2000) Steger (2003) in his ‘Globalization: a very short introduction’ likens it to the parable of the

elephant and the blind ‘globalization experts’, each describing various aspects of the elephant depending on which part of the elephant they find themselves in front of. Global skeptics finding the space between the elephant’s legs empty, declare that the elephant does not even exist, whereas others will find a trunk, a tusk, a belly etc. He defines six dimensions, over which academics and activists argue that contain the essence of globalization. These dimensions are: politics, culture, environment, economics, religion, and ideology. The main point of the parable is that, in opposition to the widely held view of globalization as an economic phenomenon, there are many other aspects to the elephantine nature of globalization that comprise the conglomeration of flows and influences which the concept encompasses. Similarly, John Urry (2003) defines the five major debates around globalization, which he defines as structure, flow, ideology, performance and complexity. In short, it is not useful to focus this analysis on the study of globalization as a ‘thing’, but to look under the surface to what Arjun Appadurai (1996) refers to as the ‘global processes and flows’ that have an impact on lives around the world. I am using the term ‘global studies’ to refer to the process of analyzing those global processes and flows. This term will be explained more in depth in the next chapter, alongside its relationship to internationalization.

There are a certain set of activities that are often used to indicate the level of internationalization of an institution. The American Council on Education conducts a survey every few years entitled “Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses”, which provides an outline of many of these activities. In the 2008 survey, they used the following as some of the ‘indicators’ of levels of internationalization:

1. Institutional Support (including stated institutional commitment, organizational structure and staffing, and external funding).

2. Academic requirements, programs and extracurricular activities (including foreign-language requirements and offerings, international/global course requirements, education abroad, use of technology for internationalization, joint degrees, and campus activities).
3. Faculty policies and opportunities (including funding for faculty opportunities and criteria for promotion, tenure, and hiring).
4. International students (including enrollments, recruiting targets and strategies, financial support for international students, and programs and support services). (p 4)

I list these for three reasons. The first is to signal the complexity when discussing internationalization efforts broadly. There is more that could be included, with multiple variations of each of the components listed in practice. My goal here is not to exhaustively examine the multitude of possibilities for internationalization in higher education, but rather to examine some of the main principles that should be present for *any* form of internationalization to be effective and meaningful in its outcomes. The second reason is that this document is fairly influential in Higher Education Institutions in terms of how levels of internationalization are evaluated. As a result of the push for internationalization, higher education institutions in the U.S. have in turn pushed to increase the quantity of the above listed activities. For example, it is often assumed that more international students on U.S. campuses results in more cross-cultural interaction, deepening the experience for both groups. However, a study conducted by Nicola Peacock and Neil Harrison (2009) found that “The sheer fact of proximity and shared environment does not appear to offer significant gains for the internationalisation agenda” (p. 506), as a result of what they call ‘passive xenophobia.’ The majority of the students felt that international students were self-isolating and generally bore the responsibility for initiating contact. There was specific concern about classroom interactions, where it was feared that collaboration with international students would negatively impact both grades as well as learning outcomes. In other words, increasing quantities of international students on campus, does not

automatically equate to an expanded global understanding. Therefore, what I am concerned with here is not quantity, but rather the quality of the experiences. The third reason is that institutions using this set of activities to evaluate their levels of internationalization rarely take account of the theoretical orientations which inform them¹. To that end, I focus on a small subset of ACE's 'academic requirements', related to education abroad and international/globally focused courses. In this project, I examine the discourse around three of these traditions of internationalization in operation – information-based, place-based, experiential-based – to explore issues of complexity in the processes, to look at issues of quality versus quantity, and most significantly, to explore the underlying theoretical orientations that motivate the ways in which the processes take place.

Setting the Context

This research was long in development, and is intensely personal. Thus, it is helpful to provide a brief background about the context within which my choice of topic, questions and methodologies came to be. I have been involved in a variety of internationalization traditions, both as the internationalizer and the internationalizee. To clarify, when I refer to 'traditions of internationalization', I am referring to the set of practices employed by higher education institutions to increase the international engagement, perspectives, and practices of its students. As an undergraduate, I lived and worked for four years in an international living-learning residence hall that places U.S. and international students as roommates and organizes a series of events to encourage interaction and exploration between the residents. I also participated in two

¹ Though there are a number of theories of internationalization, a few that are closely associated and support the development of these kinds of activities include liberal theories of international trade and international relations, both of which see internationalization as a good in itself. There are a number of theoretical orientations underlying the development of internationalization efforts, but it is outside the scope of this study to explore these here.

very different experiences of ‘education abroad’. One a large “island program” (with a large number of other students from the U.S. all taking courses together), the other an individualized exchange program, where I was the only student from the U.S. Between my undergraduate and graduate years, I held a series of positions related to internationalization efforts, including curriculum development for the US Fund for UNICEF, an international programs office in Bangkok, and a secondary school teacher in Cameroon, through the Peace Corps. During my time at the University, I served as the local Peace Corps Representative, was involved with the development of the Global Studies in Education Online Masters, spent time working as an academic advisor for International/Global Studies undergraduate majors, and currently I work for the Office of International Programs in the College of Education. The reason I list all of these various experiences is not only to illustrate my personal motivations for this project, but to illustrate the multitude of forms that internationalization efforts can take, all of which have simultaneously influenced and baffled me. This project developed in response to this expansive and expanding field of practice, which I have come to both respect for its incredible transformative potential, but also of which I have become quite skeptical as a result of its severe limitations. Moreover, both its potentials and the limitations have very practical real-life implications, in that global perspectives can be either stifled or fostered through the practices we choose on a regular basis. Of these experiences, one of the most vividly illustrative is that of my Peace Corps experience in Cameroon, West Africa, where I taught English at a secondary school in a rural community.

Originally, I was skeptical of the way that the Peace Corps experience was ‘sold’ to me: ‘How far are you willing to go to make a difference?’ In essence, the message was, regardless of who you are, your position as an American makes you inherently situated to provide some sort of

service to those around the world who are *not* in *that* position. I was one of two people in a group of about 65 teachers in my cohort to Cameroon, who held a teaching degree. I was the only one with any prior teaching experience. I was considerably older than the majority of Peace Corps volunteers, at 27 years of age, and had worked and lived abroad previously, which was not true of most of the cohort. In short, we were a group of young and inexperienced youth, labeled as ‘experts’ and placed in a position of advantage within our communities with a *mission* to ‘make a difference.’

I am of the opinion that my age and teaching background made my experience different from others in my cohort. To clarify, we all had unique experiences based on our own personal histories and orientations, and physical realities on the ground among many other factors. What I am trying to explain is that my specific history led to a specific experience as a Peace Corps volunteer, one with which I am still grappling with to this day, including within this study. Fellow volunteers, though critical of the Peace Corps experience as well, would often end their critique with a statement like, ‘At least we are doing *something*.’ However, what this study illustrates, is that ‘doing’, without thinking through the wider implications, can be even more damaging than ‘not doing’, which signals the importance of praxis. In addition, one of the general goals of this research is to examine the multiple ways in which the same experience in internationalization can yield such differing results based on an individual’s personal history, situatedness, and social imaginary, as well as to propose some approaches that might help to mediate some of these differences.

When I arrived at my graduate studies, I had some notion that I wanted to study issues of ‘Development’ and ‘Education’, but the specificities were fuzzy. I thought that I wanted to study the ways in which francophone West African education systems impacted the identities of West

African school youth, specifically in regard to their colonial, and continuing imperial roots. From the beginning, I felt uncomfortable with this focus on studying the ‘Other’. I was also intensely aware of the history of research in post-colonial and indigenous contexts through exposure to, among many others, such people as Edward Said, Frantz Fanon and Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), who states,

When mentioned in many indigenous contexts, it stirs up silence, it conjures up bad memories, it raises a smile that is knowing and distrustful.... The ways in which scientific research is implicated in the worst excesses of colonialism remains a powerful remembered history for many of the world’s colonized peoples. (p. 1)

My goal was not to contribute to that tradition. More importantly, I asked myself for what purpose I wanted to do this kind of research: To contribute to education-related development practices? Or to critique education-related development practices? Neither of these seemed satisfactory to me.

Paulo Freire (1992) wrote:

What kept me from ever looking down on or simply belittling “common sense” may have been the always-respectful contact I had with it, ever since the faraway days of my experience in the Brazilian Northeast, coupled with the never-failing certitude within me that, in order to get beyond “common sense,” you had to use it. Just as it is unacceptable to advocate an educational practice that is satisfied with rotating on the axis of “common sense,” so neither is an educational practice acceptable that sets at naught the “knowledge of living experience” and simply starts out with the educator’s systematic cognition. (p. 42)

When I first read this, it spoke to me, and remains a constant script in the back of my head. It resonated with my own experiences. Finding myself, a suburban white girl, in a rural West African village, I discovered how little my own formal education had provided me in terms of an understanding of myself, my ‘people’, my place in the world, and other places in the world. I began to feel that what was ‘common sense’ to me was, in fact, a set of misconceptions and

falsities that I had acquired over time. I felt cheated, and somewhat embarrassed in my role as ‘educator’.

I also had the great fortune of being placed at what many Cameroonian teachers referred to as an ‘exile school’. Because teacher placements in Cameroon are nationally-controlled, teachers who are involved in unionizing activities or unpopular political activities in general, are often sent to distant rural locations. About half of the teachers at the school where I worked were ‘local’, the other half were ‘exiles’. These two groups (a total of about 16 people) worked together to provide an education for over 700 students at the secondary school. An education that I envied when compared to the one I received in a reputable, wealthy suburban high school, in that it provided the students not only the ‘facts’, but a critical orientation toward the knowledge presented to them and an understanding of their own histories in the context of these “global disciplines”. For the most part, their textbooks were cast-offs from France, donated through NGO’s. The teachers at this particular school fostered a critical perspective in their approach and presentation of these materials.

What I learned from this group of individuals and their students is deeper than anything that I had experienced prior, or since. They challenged my ‘common sense’, in a nurturing and respectful way. In this way, it wasn’t expected that I change who I am or what I believe entirely. Rather, they took me from where I was to a whole new place, one that has allowed for continual growth and change, in a way similar to what Freire (1970) describes as conscientization. I owe a great deal of who I am and who I have become to this group of amazing, insightful, spiritually-grounded, politically-aware and active, compassionate, and seemingly tireless individuals. I understand that it was as a result of my position of privilege, and a somewhat random placement in a very unique situation, that I was able to be so thoroughly transformed in this particular way.

What my journey thus far has brought me to realize is that I owe it to them – not to study ‘them’, but rather to study ‘me’ and ‘us’, and how ‘we’ have come to understand those outside of our experience, or what Edward Said (1994) refers to as those who hold an ‘invisible influence’ on how we live. How the education that I received in the U.S. framed those who were subjected to colonial conquest, and imperial domination, both within our own borders as well as beyond those borders. What kinds of knowledge we are taught to value or de-value. How we come to accept inequality in wealth and power. How we come to believe, in the Peace Corps example above, that our birthplace somehow endows us with a ‘knowledge’ suitable to ‘make a difference’ to an entire community that is completely foreign to us. In short, my question became one of how the U.S. educational system understands what a ‘global citizen’ should be and what pedagogic actions this implies, especially in light of increasing calls for internationalization. And beyond that, to look at what is required to transform that current set of practices into something deeper, wiser and more impactful in terms of assisting us in understanding ourselves and the meaning of our place in the world, so that we might learn to act on and within the world in more thoughtful, respectful and wise ways.

Research Project

In this study, I analyze differing traditions in internationalization practices, within the U.S. higher education context, and how they have been used in the service of various imperatives. I also discuss the pedagogic potentials and limitations of each tradition. In order to make this analysis more coherent and useful, I have chosen to look at each of these traditions through the lens of a specific global theme – that of global water issues. Water issues are

complex, and there are few who would say that water is not a global issue of importance. It also represents an intersection of the physical and social sciences. According to Urry (2003),

Moreover, most significant phenomena that the so-called social sciences now deal with are in fact hybrids of physical and social relations, with no purified sets of the physical or the social....These hybrids, most of which are central in any analysis of global relations, are best examined through developing complexity analyses of the interdependent material-social, or 'inhuman' worlds. Through examining their dynamic interdependencies via complexity, their emergent properties can be effectively understood. The very division between the 'physical' and the 'social' is itself a socio-historical product and one that appears to be dissolving. The complexity sciences seem to provide the best means of transcending such outdated divisions, between nature and society, between the physical and the social sciences. (p. 17)

To illustrate, one of the main obstacles to understanding an issue of such global importance is the complexity of the subject, as well as defining exactly what the subject is –The People? Access? Quality? Governance? It is more than just H₂O. It is politics, economics and culture, as well as social imagination, all of which are historically constituted. When students learning about global water issues ask 'Why don't they (meaning not 'us') just make their governments provide this necessary resource?', there is no one-stop answer. It is a complicated combination of all of these variables. Perhaps it is corruption. But where does that come from? Perhaps it is fiscal austerity measures imposed as conditions from international institutions. But why are these countries in a place to have conditionalities imposed on them? Perhaps it is limited supply. But why are populations living in water scarce areas? And finally, even when a 'subject' is identified, there is the issue that the same 'intervention' – for example privatization of water services – in various locations produces a myriad of results. Each of these aspects compound and interact with the others. For that reason, I feel that it is important to approach water issues as a whole, as opposed to focusing on single issues within the complex web of different kinds of water issues.

To begin to understand the process of how people navigate these complexities, this study explores three pedagogical traditions of internationalization. The reason that these three were chosen is that they rank among the most common within efforts to internationalize. The first is an information-based approach. One of the U.S. Department of Education funding priorities involves providing funds to K-12 teachers and post-secondary faculty members to ‘internationalize’ their curriculum. What this often translates into is adding pieces of information about certain parts of the world to established curricula. I analyze two sample lesson plans developed for this purpose – as add-on components to established courses. The second component of this study is the hallmark of internationalization discourse – the practice of study abroad, or an experiential approach to internationalization. The third tradition that I explore, is one that requires a complete revision of the traditional thematic-based or subject-matter-based curriculum to one that has a place-based, or spatial, orientation. In brief, this means that the point of departure is a location. What is then required is an analysis of the ways that various global forces impact that locality, through an examination of the physical, economic, political and social realities at play. The point is that each of these forms of internationalization has been practically employed in the service of a variety of imperatives. My focus however is on how these methods can be employed in a deeper, more meaningful way, one that avoids what John Dewey (1968) refers to as ‘mis-educative’.

The belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative. Experience and education cannot be directly equated to each other. For some experiences are mis-educative. Any experience is mis-educative that has the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience. An experience may be such as to engender callousness; it may produce lack of sensitivity and of responsiveness. Then the possibilities of having richer experience in the future are restricted. Again, a given experience may increase a person’s automatic skill in a particular direction and yet tend to land him in a groove or rut; the effect again

is to narrow the field of further experience. An experience may be immediately enjoyable and yet promote the formation of a slack and careless attitude; this attitude then operates to modify the quality of subsequent experiences so as to prevent a person from getting out of them what they have to give. Again, experiences may be so disconnected from one another that, while each is agreeable or even exciting in itself, they are not linked cumulatively to one another. (p. 25-26)

The point is not that students are learning ‘incorrect’ information in a positivist sense, but rather that the educative experiences do not foster continued growth, exploration and criticality. For that to happen we need to focus on the moral/epistemological aspects of the process in order to foster in students, the ability to remain ever reflexive and critical of the world around them; to understand their historically-bound situatedness in the world; and to foster their capacities to interrogate their social imaginaries in order to begin to imagine how things might be otherwise.

The model I have chosen to present this information is largely from a reflexive semi-biographical narrative perspective. This project took place over a number of years – in which my thinking and understanding of internationalization efforts has grown substantially. Just as I explore the narratives of how the ‘research subjects’ experience transformation and growth, I will explore my own personal transformation and growth in this area. I have, in my experiences, encountered these practices in a certain order, which strongly reflects their prevalence. Each of my prior experiences influenced later experiences. This study is as much about my own ‘coming to know’, as it is analyzing the ways in which the students are ‘coming to know’.

Significance of the Study

My teaching and research experiences suggest that this study has the potential to be beneficial to a variety of practitioners and researchers. This is particularly true for those involved in the areas of internationalization efforts on U.S. campuses, whether in the form of education

abroad, curriculum development, or international engagement. It is also of potential interest to those in the fields of International Studies and Global Studies, the latter in particular. Though International Studies has a fairly well developed (or at least a commonly practiced) set of curricular and pedagogic approaches, Global Studies is still grappling to develop a means to facilitate understandings and exploration in students. I hope however, that the research can also potentially contribute to the discussion of internationalization, as a concept, on a wider scale (K-16 and beyond). The main point that this study seeks to communicate is that any approach to internationalization or global studies that does not incorporate elements of dialogic criticality and reflexivity are incomplete and have the potential to 'mis-educate' in Dewey's sense, rather than educate. Toward this end, the study provides a basis for further dialogue and discussions regarding the development and evolution of the fields of internationalization and global studies.

Chapter 2

A Brief History of International Studies and Global Education

David Scanlon and James Shields (1968) identified the need to establish an historical lineage for the study of international education. As they state,

Since international education can be traced to antiquity, it would seem that the literature of the field would provide an excellent starting point for resolving the question [of establishing an historical lineage]. However, the state of the documentation is such that there is little accessible material for the period before World War II and too much material... after the war to handle easily. Both periods present the serious scholar with complex research problems. (Scanlon and Shields, 1968: p. xii)

Robert Sylvester (2002, 2003a, 2003b), in his effort to map the history of the field of international studies from 1893-1994 emphasized the fact that without a clear understanding of the origins of the field, it is difficult to move forward in the development of a cohesive framework for the field. He notes that there is a wide misconception that international education emerged in the post-WWII era as a response to the horrors of war, or that it comes even later as a by-product of globalization, though he also acknowledges an increased interest and activity especially from 1969 on. Many of the authors that Sylvester cites (i.e., Arum and Van de Water, 1992; Deutsch, 1970; Heater, 1996; Shane, 1969; Vestal, 1994), consider global studies to be a subfield within the larger conception of international studies or merely as a synonym for international education. Many others have argued that global studies is indeed a distinct field, arising out of, as well as in response to, the gaps and inadequacies of international education, as well as multicultural education, as they are widely understood and practiced in the U.S.

Sylvester (2002) shows evidence of efforts for a form of international education as early as the 1600's, when John Amos Comenius (1592-1670), a Moravian bishop, sometimes referred

to as the ‘teacher of nations’, established a ‘Pansophic College’², or in the early 1800’s when Marc-Antoine Jullien (1775-1848) established a special commission on education to collect information from around Europe on educational practice. However, he chooses the National Association of Education Conference on International Education in 1893 in Chicago as the first substantial effort to coordinate among nations to try to understand issues of educational policy, pedagogy and curriculum. The conference occurred during the Chicago World’s Fair, which is significant in that the fair itself was an attempt to create a strong nationalism, while soothing fears about the massive changes occurring in agriculture and industry. It seems especially relevant, that a main goal of the fair is an attempt to assert the U.S. as a world leader, in technology, in commerce, and in education as well. As Freire (1970) asserts, there is ‘power in naming’. For the US to create for itself a position to have the power to define what international education means and how it should be practiced, gives it a great deal of leverage to develop the field in a fashion that supports its interests.

It is important to note – that at this point and continuing into the present – the understanding of ‘international collaboration’ required no more than a collaboration between two or more nation-states – the more nation-states, the more ‘international’. Little consideration was given to the location of these nation-states in the world economy. This continues to be the case throughout the Post-WWII era, even when education for development assistance enters the definition of international education. However, those countries considered to be in need of development assistance were not invited into the discussion – instead they became a topic of discussion. It is in this way that international education debates have been, and continue to be,

² The ‘Pansophic College’ was based on an idea of universal wisdom, or that everything should be taught to everyone irrespective of social or economic position, race or nationality, all for the development of their democratic qualifications.

held between the USA, Canada and European nation-states, with a sprinkling of other nations thrown in for a little 'spice'. For example, the 1893 Chicago meeting included participants from England, Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, France, Japan, Australia, Canada, Chile, Uruguay, and the U.S. (Sylvester, 2002, p. 98). This similar group of nations comprised the 1974 UNESCO meeting as well, which I will discuss later.

In 1923, as a direct result of efforts undertaken at the 1893 meeting, as well as the end of WWI, the World Federation of Education Associations (WFEA) was established. Though, again according to Sylvester (2002) it was largely ineffective. One of the reasons offered for this lack of influence was the continued debate and resistance of the nation-states involved to give up on any notion of national sovereignty in educational decisions, leading to a general sense of discord between participants. The final outcome of the WFEA World Conference was reported as:

The conference hoped to secure more accurate and satisfying information in text-books as to foreign countries, and to emphasize the essential unity of mankind in regard to the evils of war and the necessity of universal peace. These objects should be attained by the teaching of international civics, universal education, the exchange of teachers, and so forth. (Buell, 1925, p. 25)

This impulse to focus educational initiatives around efforts for the promotion of peace continue until the 1950's, when the discourse shifts more towards economics and national defense in response to the emerging Cold War. It was around this time that Area Studies Centers, funded by the federal government began to emerge in the U.S. The focus of these centers was to train U.S. citizens in the languages and cultures of both our enemies and potential allies. This seems to be the era where international education turned from a weak collaboration in efforts toward peace and mutual understanding, to an imperative and a tool for both economic and national defense purposes, each of which reinforces the other. It is in this era that a great deal

more funding was allocated to international education, and it was elevated to a higher priority on the overall educational agenda in the U.S. The potential power in naming seen at the 1893 meeting by a few became a widespread understanding and underlying assumption. It is also in this era that many of the international organizations, which now direct a great deal of education and development initiatives globally, were established. A few examples of these would be the World Bank, The International Monetary Fund, UNESCO and other United Nations agencies.

The next major event, which Sylvester claims to have global significance in the development of international education, was the UNESCO General Conference of November 1974. This meeting was preceded by more than two decades of research and debate over the meaning and implications of international education. Again, the term ‘international education’ became a point of major focus in that it could imply an education that is formed and executed above the nation-state framework. The committee resolved this issue by employing the term ‘education for international-mindedness’ as a compromise, a term which is still widely used in the literature to date. The conference came to a consensus on a definition of ‘international education’ as:

Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace. (UNESCO, 1974, p. 2)

The document produced from this meeting rests heavily on the UN Charter for Human Rights, one that is both largely contested and largely claimed by much of the so-called ‘developing world’. As I mentioned earlier, this was the era when foreign assistance to developing countries had already become an assumption – an underlying truth – and no longer a debate as it had been in the 1940’s and 1950’s. However, this didn’t mean that the perspectives of these nations or

communities were taken into account. The assumption held that those with the economic power were to export their systems of education to those who they felt needed it. Gita Steiner-Khamsi (2004) spoke extensively on this ‘externalization thesis’ that persists today.

Lee Anderson and James Becker (1976) presented an important critique of the UNESCO definition, highlighting three areas of weakness. The first is that the UNESCO documents promote the study of ‘foreign’ cultures, which emphasizes a ‘we-they’ dichotomy. Secondly, that this dichotomy “obscures the degree to which the study of one’s own community and nation have important international dimensions” (p. 3). And finally, this definition of international education with its focus on the study of ‘others’ “obscures the global character of human experience in the contemporary world” (p. 4). Anderson and Becker were some of the first scholars in the U.S., to emphasize a ‘world-systems’ view of international education and to hint at the complicated issue of multiple identities.

Though the concept of world-citizenship was not new, it took on a growing importance and relevance. The Cold War was coming to a close, and the world had changed. The race and class configurations in the US had been significantly altered through legal school desegregation, the Post WWII GI Bill, affirmative action, and several decades of social movements demanding civil rights. Environmental calamities, such as trans-boundary water pollution, acid rain and the issues of nuclear fallout also began to breakdown some of the rock-solid borders of the social imaginary of the nation-state.

In an essay originally presented in 1976 but largely disseminated after 1982, Robert Hanvey presented his framework for education for an ‘attainable global perspective’, which remains widely cited today. He states:

As conceived here a global perspective is not a quantum, something you either have or don't have. It is a blend of many things and any given individual may be rich in certain elements and relatively lacking in others. The educational goal broadly seen may be to socialize significant *collectivities* of people so that the important elements of a global perspective are represented in the group. (Hanvey, 1976, p. 2)

He highlights the limited nature of formal schooling and the much larger impact of informal socialization, and that learning is dynamic and ongoing. For this reason, formal schooling must be responsive to the informal educative experiences which shape its students. As an example, he uses the media:

If this is the way the media are: event-centered, and potent servants of both traditional and emergent elements of the national culture, what then for the schools? The schools, after all, are also carriers of the national culture. But the schools must stake out a niche that balances and corrects the media. The schools may be bearers of culture but they are also agents of an academic tradition that encourages scrutiny of that which seems conventional and obvious. If the media direct attention to events, the schools must look beneath the apparent event at the phenomena really involved. (Hanvey, 1976, p. 3)

Hanvey then delineates five dimensions essential to an attainable global perspective:

1. Perspective Consciousness
2. "State of the Planet" Awareness
3. Cross-cultural Awareness
4. Knowledge of Global Dynamics
5. Awareness of Human Choices

Hanvey's approach reflects the deep concern with the 'new' issues of the day (in the early 1970's), those of environmental concern, fear of nuclear war, and confusion over how to handle issues of diversity.

The last major movement that I will discuss in this section is one that I find most relevant to understanding global studies as it is today. The 1980's was the beginning of a movement for a convergence between multicultural education and international education (some examples are:

Lynch, 1989; Merryfield, 1986; Richardson, 1976). It is interesting to note that there was an increase in discussions of a convergence between the two movements in response to the 1982 'A Nation at Risk' report, which promotes a move for a 'back to the basics' approach, and uses as its justification, the inadequacy of the U.S. education system as compared to other national systems. This meant a reduction of already insignificant resources for anything falling outside of the understanding of the 'classics' or the 'basics' – which includes both multicultural education and international/global education.

At the same time, there was also a significant shift in the global economy. The Cold War was coming to an end, and the promotion of free markets took on new and expanding dimensions. Though NAFTA wasn't ratified until 1993, many of the educators who self-identified as either multicultural educators or global educators, interviewed by Merryfield (1986), cite the NAFTA debate as their impetus to begin exploring the issues of expanding markets in relation to identity issues. In the U.S., there was some critique that multicultural education had become a parochial nation-centric movement, which served only to further the 'otherizing' effects of curriculum initiatives meant to incorporate a further understanding of minority groups within the U.S., with little effort to drawing connections between global/local issues of race, class and privilege. This is not just a matter of financial resources, but also concerns the development of new forms of knowledge or recognition of different ways of knowing.

James Lynch (1989) summarizes nine reasons for a move towards a more global commitment in multicultural education, three especially pertinent to this discussion include:

1. The non-viability of a commitment to multicultural education, which neglects those issues of human rights and freedoms that lie outside the boundaries of the nation-state.

2. The need, at a time of considerable conservatism in western educational ideologies, to combine with and learn from other curriculum reform movements that have similar aims and objectives.
3. The spreading international recognition of the phenomenon of cultural diversity and a growing appreciation of the need to come to creative terms with that diversity. (p. ix)

He also makes reference to the environment, human conflict, a need to counter individualistic materialism in western society and the need to re-emphasize commonalities among human kind rather than difference. The concept of ‘unity within diversity’ is often mentioned in this era.

In the United States, the notions of internationalization and multiculturalism have often been seen as two separate but coexisting movements, Though there have been efforts to ‘bridge the gap’ between the two movements, this ‘gap’ has historical and practical roots which are not easily transcended. I mention this about multiculturalism because there has been extensive attention paid to the field, whereas international/global education has not received the same amount of attention. These two educational movements have many intersections, yet diverge in some ways. According to Ram Mahalingham and Cameron McCarthy (2000) “multiculturalism needs a paradigmatic shift in order to achieve its political and egalitarian methods.” (p. 5) The same is true of both international and global studies.

In effect, both of these approaches amount to a deficit approach to education reform that assumes that something is *missing* from current practices in the U.S. and that an alteration or an addition in the content will necessarily bring an alteration to the outcomes, rather than an effort to reconceptualize the overall approach or pedagogy, or the need to introduce components of critical inquiry *along with* curriculum revisions. I would also argue that this convergence did not come only from within. As the global economy changed forms and the role of the nation-state

began to change, well-defined boundaries of domestic and international concerns for diversity changed as well, and educators responded to this change.

While multicultural education was being critiqued for its national insularity (Chavez-Chavez, 1998), international education was being criticized for its narrow focus on comparativism and being beneficial to only an elite class through the international schools movement. In both instances, it looked only across borders at relations between nation states, with little reference to how global processes and flows affected those within national borders or what relationships existed between the local and the global. In short, international education failed to engage with the issues of identity and class within nation-state structures (and arguably even, between state structures). Moreover, multicultural education failed to engage with those issues outside of U.S. borders. In the mid-1980's, neither of these movements could continue seeing their methods as sufficient, without a variety of gaping inconsistencies emerging. This opened the opportunity for both fields to learn from one another, a process which continues into the present day. As Antonia Darder (2003) explained in her discussion of Freire's approach to a pedagogy of love, "He insisted that the struggle against oppression was a human struggle in which we had to build solidarity across our differences, if we were to change a world engulfed by capitalism." (p. 501)

These are just a few of the many influences on the various forms and modalities of both international and global studies, as it is practiced today in Higher Education institutions in the United States. There have been, and continue to be, other fields which influence how both are practiced today, some of these include development studies, post-development studies, international relations, international trade theory, environmental studies, area studies and the growing field of cultural studies. Some of these have been incorporated into mainstream practice,

whereas others have either been rejected or accepted only in part. There are as many forms of international and global studies as there are traditions which inspired them. The main point is that this field is dynamic (and growing). It is hybrid and ever-evolving in response to the dynamic, hybrid evolving circumstances within which it functions and which it attempts to make as the object of its study. Up to this point, I have been using international and global studies fairly interchangeably, as there is much that they share. However, it is also important to differentiate between the two as well. In general, international studies recognizes the need to analyze inter-state relations from a variety of perspectives (including economic, cultural, social, spatial, and historical), but with the intention of developing a more complete understanding of issues of governance. International studies programs, as practiced in U.S. Higher Education systems, generally include some sort of regional perspective that is understood in very specific terms (Asia, Africa, Latin America, Europe, etc.). It is important to note that very few international studies programs in the U.S. consider the U.S. or North America as a legitimate region of study. In opposition to this regional inter-disciplinary perspective, I would argue that global studies is seeking a more transnational and transdisciplinary approach. Themes or issues are foregrounded and multiple perspectives encouraged, including multi-disciplinary approaches; however there is less of a strict separation of the disciplines. Rather than trying to 'know' a region, the goal is to examine a variety of local manifestations of a global phenomenon, which can also include the US as one of those 'locals'. Global studies de-emphasizes the role of the nation-state, though does not eliminate it. Rather than the lens through which the world is studied, as in international studies, it becomes one of the many lenses and variables considered, in order to better understand issues of interconnectivity and interdependence.

As such, I find it useful to look at the evolution of some of the key concepts of international education throughout the years, in order to both understand their historical context as well as to understand from which they have emerged. As any attempt at placing ideas in any sort of chronological order, this is merely to serve as an outline of developing ideas, not a substantial historical account. I have presented this in Figure 1 for the purpose of ease of reading. This chart is by no means a definitive statement of the evolution of the field of international education, but rather largely based on the historic narratives of Scanlon (1960), Scanlon and Shields (1968); Tye and Tye (1992); Sylvester (2002, 2003a, 2003b), Hicks (2003) and Merryfield (2006), among others.

Since Hanvey's 1976 treatise, little has changed in regard to the pedagogic approaches to international/global studies. The content has grown, there is more interdisciplinarity, there is a richer understanding of the complexity of global forces, but the actual pedagogic approaches have varied little. There is still a great deal of division over the meaning and purposes of international and global education. In the next section, I would like to illustrate one reason for these continued divisions through an example of U.S. federal government Title VI funding as it has evolved over the years.

Concept	Decade
Understanding	1890's
Collaboration	1920's
Interdependence	1930's
Institutions	1940's
Foreign Assistance, tied to modernization	1950's
Dynamic nature of reality	1960's
Reassertion of changing nature of interdependence	1960's
Unity in Diversity	1960's
Acknowledgement of 'unevenness'	1970's
Political nature of international education	1970's
Environmental Issues	1970's
Cultural Diversity = Human Capital	1970's
Individual link to various levels of relations (local, national, global)	1970's
Intergenerational Responsibility (mostly related to environment)	1980's
Nation is not the only basis of organizing	1980's
Multiple Identities	1980's
Media	1980's
Reflexivity	1980's
Ambiguity of continued change	1990's
Critique of 'universal' as a globalized local	1990's
Multi-disciplinarity	1990's
<i>Issues</i> transcend national boundaries	1990's
Technology	1990's
Global Finance	1990's
Interdisciplinarity	2000's
Hybridity	2000's
Convergence	2000's
Reassertion of changing nature of interdependence	2000's

Figure 1. Evolution of Concepts in International Education.

The 'Imperatives', Social Imaginary, and Title VI

Charles Taylor (2002) explains that much of this confusion over the meaning of globalization, is a problem of understanding modernity itself.

By *modernity* I mean that historically unprecedented amalgam of new practices and institutional forms (science, technology, industrial production, urbanization), of new ways of living (individualism, secularization, instrumental rationality), and

of new forms of malaise (alienation, meaninglessness, a sense of impending social dislocation). In our day, the problem needs to be posed again from a new angle: Is there a single phenomenon here, or do we need to speak of *multiple* modernities, the plural reflecting the fact that non-Western cultures have modernized in their own ways and cannot be properly understood if we try to grasp them in a general theory that was originally designed with the Western case in mind? (p. 91)

Taylor is differentiating between ‘Western’ and ‘Non-Western’ cultures in this statement.

However within the United States, there are a multiplicity of modernities to be found as well.

There are multiple ways of understanding and responding to the ‘new ways of living’, ‘new practices and institutional forms’ and ‘new forms of malaise’. What allows multiple modernities to form, according to Taylor, are the social imaginaries from which they emerge and the ways in which they shape responses to the new conditions. As he explains, “the social imaginary is not a set of ideas; rather it is what enables, through making sense of, the practices of society.” (p. 91)

Taylor refers to this as a specific conception of the ‘moral order of society’, which, “tells us something about how we ought to live together in society.” (p. 92)

These multiple social imaginaries provide for a variety of ‘imperatives’ for internationalization, ranging from the political, to the economic, to the social, as well as any combination of the three. I use the word ‘imperative’ because each of these orientations, described below, comes in response to some form of ‘pressure’, a sense of an urgent need to internationalize in response to specific conditions. These conditions could be described as the changing realities of a global era – changes in the way that the marketplace works, changes in the way that people identify themselves, changes in the way that political structures work, or to what Taylor referred to above as the new practices and institutional forms, new ways of living and new forms of malaise. According to how one conceives how we are ‘supposed’ to live together (a sense of moral order), different solutions are proposed. In other words, each of these

‘imperatives’ is speaking to a certain kind of social imaginary³. To illustrate, I will give four examples of imperatives prevalent in current discussions of internationalization in the U.S. context.

One of these perspectives can be described as the ‘Global Workforce Imperative’, illustrated best in the following quote:

Globalization is driving demand for an internationally competent workforce. Already, one in six U.S. jobs is tied to international trade. The majority of future growth for industries of all sizes is in overseas markets. Future careers in business, government, health care, law enforcement, architecture, and a wide variety of other jobs will all require greater international knowledge and skills. (Sanders & Stewarts, 2003)

This perspective emphasizes the need to internationalize education for the purpose of maintaining competitiveness in our workforce, a largely economic perspective. The main impetus for this thinking is a reaction to the changing marketplace, including continued outsourcing of what is often referred to as ‘white-collar jobs’; the increasing porosity of borders, and an effort to maintain and protect the current economic position of the U.S. These kinds of arguments also often stem from anxiety over international student rankings, such as the PISA or TIMSS, where the U.S. has tended to rank behind other industrialized nations. It then follows, in this line of thinking, that we are lacking in the ‘skills’ to maintain a healthy workforce. The underlying assumption is that we not only need to improve our rankings, but also our understanding of the global marketplace to remain competitive.

Another perspective, which is similar to this, but carries a bit of a different tone, is that of an ‘American Global Leadership Imperative’. In this case, it is assumed that the U.S. has an obligation to maintain its role as a global *leader*. Rather than the sheer economic perspective,

³ Again, these social imaginaries are based on historically-informed theoretical orientations. The goal here is not to evaluate the merit or deficiencies of those theories, rather to highlight the multitude of perspectives which influence the purposes and practices of internationalization.

this focuses largely on the political as well. The underlying assumption here is that the U.S. has earned its role as global leader through innovation and cultural superiority, and as such should serve as a model for other aspiring nations to emulate. Here, the ‘pressure’ is felt by the push for changing all that was ‘known’, whether that be introducing multicultural requirements or acknowledging various types of knowledge systems as legitimate that perhaps have not enjoyed that classification previously. There is a push to ‘go back to the basics’, yet with an increased focus on and understanding of ‘others’ outside of the U.S. This is also largely based on a certain assumption of the ways areas should be divided (i.e. nation-states, regions, etc.) To illustrate:

Of course, the United States must be prudent in how it exercises its power. But we cannot safely avoid the responsibilities of global leadership or the costs that are associated with its exercise. America has a vital role in maintaining peace and security in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. If we shirk our responsibilities, we invite challenges to our fundamental interests. The history of the 20th century should have taught us that it is important to shape circumstances before crises emerge, and to meet threats before they become dire. The history of this century should have taught us to embrace the cause of American leadership. (The Project for a New American Century, 2009, para. 1)

The main idea is that we must know the world in order to better rule it. This practice is not unfamiliar to the colonial era, when European universities established departments of ‘Oriental Studies’, etc. The imperative is a reaction to the fear that our lack of knowledge of other parts of the world will jeopardize our ability to function in the role carved out by the U.S. in the post-World War II era.

Another perspective would be the ‘Nationalist Imperative’, one which re-emerged in popularity after the September 11, 2001 attack on the World Trade Center in New York, though not new to U.S. education. The impetus for this perspective is largely one of national security. NAFSA: The Association for International Educators published a report on Study Abroad in 2005, which captures the impetus for this imperative well:

On the international stage, what nations don't know can hurt them. In recent generations, evidence of that reality has been readily available. What we did not know about Vietnam hurt the United States. What we did not understand about the history and culture of the former Ottoman Empire has complicated our efforts in the Middle East for decades. Mistakes involving the Third World and its debt have cost American financiers billions of dollars. And our lack of knowledge about economic, commercial, and industrial developments in Japan, China, and India, successively, has undermined American competitiveness. Global competence costs, but ignorance costs far more. (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005)

This perspective is in direct response to a perceived threat to both national security, but also of national sovereignty. It is related to the 'Global Leadership Imperative' in that both fear that a change to the position of the U.S. in terms of global power relations would bring severe economic and political (and therefore social) consequences to U.S. citizens – however the term 'citizen' may be defined. What I find particularly revealing, in terms of the nationalist orientation, is how this statement is not considering the 'global' costs of, for instance "mistakes involving the Third World and its debt", but rather bases its arguments on the cost to American financiers alone. The nationalist imperative can also be characterized by its disdain for international institutions such as the UN, or anything related to a form of 'global governance', which would impair in any way notions of national sovereignty.

The final perspective that I will discuss here, is the 'Cosmopolitan Imperative', one that ranks the social above the economic and political, though acknowledges the importance and interrelatedness of all three. Just as there is a range of perspectives within each of these imperatives, the same is true here. In this case, it would range from a more 'global village' perspective (we must learn about one another to get along better) to one more rooted in a social justice orientation (we must understand one another and ourselves, from within the power structures which connect and control us, in order to promote a more just and equitable society). A middle ground between these two orientations comes from Merry Merryfield (2002):

I have found that global educators share certain characteristic instructional strategies: they confront stereotypes and exotica and resist simplification of other cultures and global issues; foster the habit of examining multiple perspectives; teach about power, discrimination, and injustice; and provide cross-cultural experiential learning. (p. 22)

It could be argued that the pressure for this imperative, rather than coming from above as in the previous perspectives, instead comes from below. That is, from social movements, from multicultural educators grappling with issues of diversity in their classrooms, and from citizens who are grappling with increasing inequities and new realities in the new global era.

Social imaginaries determine what kind of ‘pressures’ one considers to be ‘pressing’, and what kinds of solutions are available in response in order for future change. In Taylor’s (2002) conception of social imaginary, not only is our understanding of the ‘problem’ limited by our social imagination, but also, to some extent, our ability to imagine new ways of addressing those ‘problems’. Appadurai (1996), on the other hand, has a much more active notion of social imaginary; one that though it frames our understandings, is the basis of our ideologies, is largely based on where we are situated in the world, and frames our conception of options and opportunities; and is also active and expanding. In other words, our social imaginary is not something that is passive and unchanging, but rather it is forever in a state of being challenged and formed. For this reason, we have some control over the ‘direction’ our social imaginary (or those of our students) may take.

These imperatives above are just a small sampling of the kinds of imperatives, which are often multiple and intersecting, out of which internationalization efforts are fostered and also the forces to which they are responding. The idea is only to show the multitude of reasons and rationales behind internationalization efforts, as it follows that the ‘types’ of activities chosen to

‘internationalize’, and the ways that they are put into practice, will reflect those reasons and rationales. In other words, according to Dilip Parameshwar Goankar (2002),

the social imaginary therefore occupies a fluid middle ground between embodied practices and explicit doctrines. The relation between the three is dynamic. The line of influence is not causative but circular. A social imaginary carries within it an image of moral order, which imbues embodied practices and the accompanying cultural forms with meaning and legitimacy. (p. 11)

Goankar (2002) provides a vivid example of this in the form of international institutions in the late eighties and early nineties. He claims that specific notions of civil society and the role and shape of the public sphere were extended out globally “to extend the terms analogically and to imagine an international version of civil society that would grow out of transnational institutions, such as the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and newly emergent NGO’s, with their global reach and affiliations.” (p. 3) He continues on to explain that these institutions, in conjunction with the global media, were meant to provide a forum for a sort of transnational ‘dialogue of cultures’. According to Goankar,

In retrospect, that scenario looks optimistic and naïve. The events of the last decade have shown that these early hopes are being undercut by the realities of contemporary globalization. The arrival of the new millennium is accompanied by the rise of new and destructive nationalisms and fundamentalisms and the growing social inequalities created by a predatory economic globalization. ...the very transnational processes (especially those connected with the transfer of capital, information and populations) invoked as the facilitators of an international civil society and a transnational public sphere were already undermining the ideology, power, and sovereignty of nation-states so that they could not be the building blocks of such an order. ...the concepts of civil society and the public sphere and their possible transnational variants had to be understood in the larger historical and cultural context of the development of modernity. (p. 3)

An Example – Title VI

To illustrate more specifically how these ‘imperatives’ work in action, I would like to take a brief look at the story that the Department of Education tells about the history of Title VI

and Fulbright-Hays, which provides a glimpse of how these imperatives discussed above have changed and yet remained constant over time. The following passage is excerpted from the four page report “The History of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays: An Impressive International Timeline”. Though it is lengthy, I feel that it is important to look at the story that the agency tells about itself, in its own words, as it illustrates in detail the multiple ‘pressures’ that encourage the various modalities of internationalization of the curriculum from a national perspective and how the agency, then, incorporates and responds to those imperatives and pressures.

The 1940’s and 1950’s were characterized by shifting global political, economic and military alliances, resulting in both bipolarity and a spirit of internationalism.... Although this global geopolitical climate clearly mandated a need for international experts, particularly those trained in less commonly taught languages, they were in short supply. This spurred Federal funding to build foreign language and area studies programs at U.S. universities through the Title VI of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. The NDEA aimed to insure trained expertise of sufficient quality and quantity to meet U.S. national security needs... As a new international system evolved, Title VI programs evolved and expanded accordingly. [In the 1960’s] One important arena for U.S. security as well as foreign language and area expertise during the Cold War was Latin America. Countries throughout the region experimented with various forms of government spanning the political spectrum.... With the relaxation of Cold War tensions introduced by the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty in the 1970’s, questions were raised within the Administration regarding the necessity of the Title VI funding.... The overt threat to Title VI funding led to an expansion of the programs’ scope, signaling a shift in thinking about the national importance of international education. This dynamic – the “specialist training” emphasis of the original Title VI legislation versus the view of Title VI as a vehicle for general educational enhancement – continues to inform the debate about the appropriate role of Title VI. ... In 1972, the Title VI NRCs [National Resource Centers] ... moved beyond their specialist training focus to include outreach to elementary and secondary (K-12) education, four-year and community colleges, media, business and the general public.... In 1980, détente continued while the global economy became increasingly interdependent, contributing to greater acknowledgement in the business community of the need for international expertise. At this time, the Title VI legislation was incorporated into the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, emphasizing a greater focus on international studies’ value as a part of higher education, rather than solely as support for U.S. government, military and security needs. [In 1988] The Centers for International Business Education (CIBEs) were created... to strengthen the international dimensions of business education and serve as regional and national resources to business and education communities, providing programs that help U.S. business succeed in global markets.... In 1989 the world witnessed the fall of the Berlin Wall, the disintegration of

Soviet power, and the end of the Cold War. The international political system that emerged was unipolar, with the United States the only remaining superpower. Global information and economic as well as traditional security networks continued to grow and expand. Borders became extremely porous and challenges to national security came in new and less recognized forms, thus requiring expanded area and language expertise in a variety of disciplines and professional fields....The events of September 11, 2001, reinforced these findings and helped to emphasize, once again, the importance of international expertise for national as well as personal security and mutual international understanding. ...Times of international crises reinforce the importance of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays, their location in a domestic education agency and the partnership between the Federal government and higher education that they represent. Fulbright-Hays programs, in particular, have provided critical links to areas of great political sensitivity over time. Because educational programs were perceived in non-political terms, program participants were able to maintain Egyptian links after the Six-Day War, and continue operating in China following Tiananmen Square. Being present in those countries allowed participants to experience and integrate vital historical and cultural insights as these events occurred. ...Today's NRC includes a strong outreach component and collaboration with professional schools, greater emphases on integrated global forces and their regional impacts, as well as the less commonly taught languages of the world.... In today's global system, many nations formerly important because of strategic geopolitical configurations are now important in terms of trade. Challenges to national security are diverse and not always predictable. The current era is one of partnerships, networks, and relations among diverse people in multiple fields and among many nations (Department of Education, 2009)

What I find particularly striking about this narrative is that it never leaves the orientation of the 'Nationalist Imperative', while appealing to those of the 'American Global Leadership' perspective and evolving into the 'Global Workforce' perspective. Though I left out the particular types of engagement (the 'embodied practice') chosen to exemplify each 'turn' in legitimizing principles (the 'explicit doctrines'), the programs established mirror the particular objective stated. Only at the very end is there any sort of allusion to a 'Cosmopolitan' perspective, in the forms of 'partnerships, [and] networks of relations among diverse people'. I suspect that one reason for this may be that the programs need to appeal to a certain group of people – national-level politicians who would vote to either continue, expand or discontinue the funding resources. In other words, the text, and the practices and policies it represents, must

appeal to a specific kind of social imaginary, one that feels a sense of urgency for such things as national security and immediate economic competitiveness on a national level.

In addition, in this piece, there is no reflection given to the ways in which areas of the world are divided up. According to Appadurai (1996), in his discussion of area studies centers (what the Title VI document refers to as NRCs), “Thus geographical divisions, cultural differences, and national boundaries tended to become isomorphic, and there grew a strong tendency to refract world processes through this sort of national-cultural map of the world.” (p. 16) Appadurai further explains “area studies is somehow deeply tied up with a strategizing world picture driven by U.S. foreign-policy needs between 1945 and 1989, leading figures of universities, foundations, think tanks, and even the government have made it clear that the old way of doing area studies does not make sense in the world after 1989.” (p. 16) As a result, area studies has been widely criticized from a range of perspectives, from left-wing critics to those interested in the promotion of free-market systems. However, despite its specific ontology, Appadurai argues that “this tradition has been a tiny refuge for the serious study of foreign languages, alternative worldviews, and large-scale perspectives on sociocultural change outside Europe and the United States.” (p. 17) He adds that, “area studies has nonetheless been one of the few serious counterweights to the tireless tendency to marginalize huge parts of the world in the American academy and in American society more generally.” (p. 17) What this well-illustrates is the ways in which a ‘technique’ or a ‘program’ or a ‘pedagogical approach’, in this case – area studies programs – can be used in the service of a variety of imperatives.

Chapter 3

A Critical Pedagogical Conceptualization for Global/International Studies

As previously discussed, there is a set of key elements that comprise internationalization efforts (either explicitly or implicitly), which take different forms depending on their orientation. These include: an understanding of oneself, an understanding of one's relationship to others, some sense of moral order (how we should live together), some orientation toward 'truth', and some understanding of 'power' and the forms that it should take. Each of these has an impact on how one responds to specific efforts toward internationalization. So, for example, whereas one person on a study tour may come to recognize and just begin to grapple with a set of unexamined dispositions another person on that same study tour may have the same set of preconceived notions reconfirmed and deepened. Urry (2003) explains,

To express this point rather simply, there is no consistent relationship between the cause and the effect of some event. Rather, relationships between variables can be non-linear with abrupt switches occurring, so the same 'cause' can in specific circumstances produce quite different kinds of effects. (p. 23)

In the sections that follow, I will discuss some of the key concepts that might provide a basis for a revised pedagogical approach to internationalization efforts. Rather than suggestions of prescriptive *practices*, Fazal Rivzi (2007) discusses a set of epistemic '*virtues*' – guidelines, or tools that can be used with any set of practices to foster deeper more meaningful understandings of the global, specifically as it relates to the local. These include historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination. Though I will be focusing specifically on the epistemic virtues set out by Rizvi (2007), the discussion of these principles is largely informed by elements of critical pedagogy, post-colonial theory and cultural studies, and specifically the ways in which these three theoretical approaches intersect in the pursuit of a pedagogy for global studies.

Though each of these have numerous useful principles in regards to furthering the depth and meaningfulness of internationalization efforts, these five epistemic virtues encapsulate much of that. Moreover, these five virtues were the main principles with which the study tour, as well as my on-campus course, were based. A discussion of the overall usefulness of these virtues will take place in Chapter 8.

Historicity

Historicity of knowledge is a key concept that is essential to a global perspective, but which has been left largely unaddressed in much of the international/global studies literature.

According to Darder et al. (2003),

Critical pedagogy supports the notion that all knowledge is created within a historical context that gives life and meaning to human experience... By so doing, students come to understand themselves as subjects of history and to recognize that conditions of injustice, although historically produced by human beings, can also be transformed by human beings. (p. 12)

The acknowledgement of issues of legitimate knowledge and knowledge production are an integral component to the practice of historicity. It is not sufficient to historicize knowledge production without an eye to the legitimizing structures which “function to unite knowledge and power in ways that sustain asymmetrical relations of power under the guise of neutral and apolitical views of education – views that are intimately linked to ideologies shaped by power, politics, history, culture, and economics.” (ibid, p. 11) Historicity, in contrast to simply knowing the historical foundations of a certain set of information, takes account of the social context in which knowledge is produced. According to Peter McLaren (2003), “Knowledge acquired in school – or anywhere, for that matter – is never neutral or objective but is ordered and structured in particular ways; its emphases and exclusions partake of a silent logic. Knowledge is a *social*

construction deeply rooted in a nexus of power relations.” (p. 72) This understanding of the social construction of knowledge must also account for reification, which, “occurs when transitory historical states of affairs are presented as permanent, natural, and commonsensical – as if they exist outside of time.” (ibid, p. 80) It is this state of natural, common sense which itself must be historicized.

A vivid example of this is the way in which Said, throughout his work, accounts for the construction of the ‘Oriental Other’. In examining this socially constructed, and extensive, body of knowledge from a post-colonial perspective, he painstakingly highlights the complex processes used to legitimate that set of assumed ‘truths’. Said (1993) explains that,

Without significant exception the universalizing discourses of modern Europe and the United States assume the silence, willing or otherwise, of the non-European world. There is incorporation; there is inclusion; there is direct rule; there is coercion. But there is only infrequently an acknowledgement that the colonized people should be heard from, their ideas known. (p. 50)

To counteract this – or to historicize this, Said proposes that we begin to reread the cultural archive “*contrapuntally*, with a simultaneous awareness both of the metropolitan history that is narrated and of those other histories against which (and together with which) the dominating discourse acts.” (ibid, p. 51) The purpose of this re-reading is to develop “alternative or new narratives” which can become a part of the cultural archive themselves.

Vandana Shiva (1993), explains the consequences of silencing specific forms of knowledge in *Monocultures of the Mind* where she describes the ‘disappeared’ knowledge systems, comparing them to dissenters in Argentina, both having been “conquered through the politics of disappearance, not the politics of debate and dialogue.” (p. 19) She explains the ways in which local knowledge is ‘disappeared’, one of which is by “simply not seeing it.” She emphasizes that the local nature of the dominant system masquerades as universal. “It is merely a

globalised version of a very local and parochial tradition. Emerging from a dominating and colonizing culture, modern knowledge systems are themselves colonizing.” (p. 9) Shiva points out the paradox of the currently dominant globalized local knowledge, “the universal would spread in openness. The globalizing local spreads by violence and misrepresentation” (p. 11). This implies, according to Shiva, that the Western system of science has less to do with knowledge than it does with power. The second way in which knowledge systems are ‘disappeared’ is by erasing and destroying the reality, which they represent. Comparing this to the introduction of monocultures in forestry and agriculture, Shiva shows how local alternatives, as well as knowledges, begin to disappear because the conditions in which those alternatives thrive are altered at the most basic levels.

Without understanding how knowledge comes to be valued or devalued, or the ways in which it is muted or distorted, can lead to conditions of inequity, and with the possibility of appearing justified in the creation of these inequities. By denying the historicity of knowledge, not only are important aspects of our identities and realities misinterpreted, but opportunities for change are also lost. Beyond that, there is the practical issue, as Shiva shows in monocultural forestry, where the physical realities that are essential to maintaining a biodiversity of knowledge for a sustained future are also lost... and in many cases cannot be reconstituted.

As Dewey (1968) explains,

The nature of the issues cannot be understood save as we know how they came about. The institutions and customs that exist in the present and that give rise to present social ills and dislocations did not arise overnight. They have a long history behind them. Attempt to deal with them simply on the basis of what is obvious in the present is bound to result in adoption of superficial measures which in the end will only render existing problems more acute and more difficult to solve. Policies framed simply upon the ground of knowledge of the present cut off from the past is the counterpart of heedless carelessness in individual conduct. The way out of scholastic systems that made the past

an end in itself is to make acquaintance with the past a *means* of understanding the present. (p. 77-78)

In other words, our attempts to ‘heal’ the physical and social ills that arose out of the practice of monocultural forestry in India, cannot be solved by further technological advances based on present conditions (more potent fertilizers to fix the damaged land, underground piping to supply the lost water...) as these are only Band-Aids to a deeper underlying issue. These solutions do not address the historical context in which the problems were developed. They do not regain the knowledge lost, nor do they remedy the social upheaval caused by the degraded landscape. This is not to argue that we need to ‘go back’ to the ways of a previous era – that misses the point as well. The same social conditions do not exist, and it would be a different sort of Band-Aid. Instead, what both Shiva and Dewey are alluding to is using that historicized understanding of the present situation to inform new, more comprehensive, more constructive measures to address the ‘social ills’ and physical trauma that has arisen.

One perspective in regards to the historicity of knowledge as it is practiced in U.S. educational systems is articulated by John Willinsky (1998), who claims that we are now entering our postcolonial moment in the ‘West’.

In more than one sense, the educational project of postcolonialism in the West is only beginning. Although the process of decolonization began in earnest after the Second World War with the repeated successes of the independence movements, the West has barely begun to see beyond the divisions generated by the same sensibilities that drove imperial expansion over the face of the globe... We need to learn again how five centuries of studying, classifying, and ordering humanity within an imperial context gave rise to peculiar and powerful ideas of race, culture and nation that were, in effect, conceptual instruments that the West used both to divide up and to educate the world. (p. 2)

Bruno Latour (1991) in *We Have Never Been Modern*, takes this assertion a bit further in terms of both depth of argument and time. He identifies the two major events of 1989: the fall of

the Berlin Wall and the first conferences in Europe on the global state of the environment, as symbolic of the state of modernity. While the first signified the end of socialism, the other signified, for him, “the end of capitalism and its vain hopes of unlimited conquest of total domination over nature” (p. 8). He claims,

The perfect symmetry between the dismantling of the wall of shame and the end of limitless Nature is invisible only to the rich Western democracies. The various manifestations of socialism destroyed both their peoples and their ecosystems, whereas the powers of the North and the West have been able to save their peoples and some of their countrysides by destroying the rest of the world and reducing its people to abject poverty. Hence the double tragedy: the former socialist societies think they can solve both their problems and believes it has lessons for others even as it leaves the earth and its people to die. The West thinks it is the sole possessor of the clever trick that will allow it to keep on winning indefinitely, whereas it has perhaps already lost everything. (p.9)

In other words we need to deconstruct, demystify and analyze our stories- both of domination over others as well as domination over nature – as well as understand the historical context from which the stories have come. Whereas Willinsky is speaking of the divisions drawn between people based on geography and biological characteristics, Latour is highlighting the origins of the historical division between politics and science, which made invisible the machinations that served as the underlying justifications for those divisions between people.

Through the negation of the spiritual and the agency of the ‘nonhuman’ (i.e. nature), the ‘Moderns’ were able to create a myth of difference between themselves and the ‘Ancients’, which served as the hidden underlying justification for domination over those who acknowledged the interconnectivity between politics and nature, and therefore ‘condemned’ themselves to a state of ‘premodernity’. In the act of aligning those seen as premodern with nature and thereby dehumanizing them, the ‘Moderns’ had laid the groundwork for centuries of

imperial expansion under the pretense that one cannot be faulted for dehumanizing that which is not human.

But if our empire has left us with the rewards of (former) membership, it has also left us with liabilities of an educational nature. Imperialism afforded lessons in how to divide the world. It taught people to read the exotic, primitive, and timeless identity of the other, whether in skin color, hair texture, or the inflections of taste and tongue. Its themes of conquering, civilizing, converting, collecting, and classifying inspired educational metaphors equally concerned with taking possession of the world – metaphors that we now have to give an account of, beginning with our own education. (Willinsky, p. 13)

In essence, Willinsky is asserting that there is a colonial mentality, to which *all* are subject – colonizers as well as colonized. It is that colonial mentality that continues to shape the educational system in the U.S. To oversimplify in order to make the point, whereas those who were colonized have worked toward a decolonization of their minds for several decades, the colonizers, in the face of environmental and economic crises are only beginning to realize a need for that process.

Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) speaks to this process of decolonization as it relates to indigenous people.

Systems of classification and representation enable different traditions or fragments of traditions to be retrieved and reformulated in different contexts as discourses, and then to be played out in systems of power and domination, with real material consequences for colonized peoples. Nandy, for example discusses the different phases of colonization, from ‘rapacious bandit-kings’ intent on exploitation, to ‘well-meaning middle class liberals’ intent on salvation as a legitimization of different forms of colonization. These phases of colonization, driven by different economic needs and differing ideologies of legitimization, still had real consequences for the nations, communities and groups of indigenous people being colonized. These consequences have led Nandy to describe colonization as a ‘shared culture’ for those who have been colonized and for those who have colonized. This means, for example, that colonized peoples share a language of colonization, share knowledge about their colonizers, and, in terms of a political project, share the same struggle for decolonization. It also means that colonizers, too, share a language and knowledge of colonization. (p. 45)

Freire's discussion of the complex oppressor-oppressed relationship is also helpful here. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire talks about the process of dehumanization, and he says that in the process of dehumanizing others, one also is dehumanized. In order for those who were dehumanized by others to regain their humanity, they need to be able to 'name' that which oppressed them – a decolonization of the mind. Whereas, for those who dehumanized, the only way to regain their humanity is through the active dialogue with those who were dehumanized. "It is only the oppressed who, by freeing themselves can free their oppressors." (Freire, 1970, p. 56) In other words, those who were the objects of colonial violence (be it physical, spiritual, economic or emotional) are in the position of reclaiming their humanity through the process of decolonizing their minds. However, on the same note, those who suffered the delusion of moral superiority cannot simply decolonize their minds without severe consequences to that sense of moral superiority, without the need to analyze their *place* of privilege and without a conscious reconciliation with those who have been oppressed as a result of that same colonial thinking. In short, there is always a need for active deconstruction of power and privilege, no matter who you are.

What I argue is that when Willinsky refers to the need for the decolonization of Western educational epistemologies, it necessarily requires a critical analysis of the original division which served as the underlying justification for dominance – the division between politics and science, or in other words between humans and nature. For Western education to begin to historicize and decolonize, in order to therefore re-humanize, it must begin by reframing the location, or the place, of the human within the non-human. In Keith Basso's (1996) "Wisdom Sits in Places", where he works through the ways in which the Cibecue understand history through locations, he states,

It is clear, however, that remembering often provides a basis for imagining. What is remembered about a particular place – including, prominently, verbal and visual accounts of what has transpired there – guides and constrains how it will be imagined by delimiting a field of workable possibilities. These possibilities are then exploited by acts of conjecture and speculation which build upon them and go beyond them to create possibilities of a new and original sort, thus producing a fresh and expanded picture of how things might have been. (sp. 5)

I would expand Basso's account to include a 'fresh and expanded picture' of how things are, could be, and might come to be, as well. Dewey (1968) spoke of this at length in "Experience and Education".

We have the problem of ascertaining how acquaintance with the past may be translated into a potent instrumentality for dealing effectively with the future. We may reject knowledge of the past as the *end* of education and thereby only emphasize its importance as a *means*. When we do that we have a problem that is new in the story of education: How shall the young become acquainted with the past in such a way that the acquaintance is a potent agent in appreciation of the living present? (p 23)

In short, without an understanding of the historical contexts in which knowledge has been created and disseminated, it is not possible for 'history' to become 'a potent agent in appreciation of the living present', nor a catalyst for future change and possibility. It is through the active engagement with the whole historical context that possible new imaginaries of the past, present and future become possible.

Relationality

Arlif Dirlik (2001), in his discussion of the Place-Based Imagination, emphasizes that "*the global* and *the local* are terms that derive their meanings from one another, rather than from reference to any specifically describable spatiality" (p. 16). He explains that often the term 'global' represents specific processes such as economics, politics, culture etc., whereas the term 'local' then becomes the physical manifestation of, or more often the contradiction to, those

processes. He also mentions that in much of the literature related to global processes, there is an unspoken hierarchy where the local becomes a subordinate and a response to the global, rather than the local actually participating in the production of the global. This hierarchy is a direct result of the ways we have come to know our world:

I realize that the notion of culture has been used for long to imprison places, to render place-bound cultural identities into markers of backwardness, which then has provided the excuse for opening them up to “civilization” – global and national. But having gone through the latter process already, is it time once again to reaffirm culture as a place-based (not place-bound) phenomenon? Culture being a prime weapon in the struggles over hegemony, the question has a particular urgency in this, the age of global capitalism. (Dirlik, 2001, p. 32)

Jonathan Xavier Inda and Renato Rosaldo (2008) take this notion a bit further, in their discussion of de/territorialization. As people – or what they refer to as ‘cultural subjects’ – relocate and resettle as a result of increasing mobility, whether they are tourists or vagabonds in Zygmunt Bauman’s (2000) terms, they do so in new combinations of “cultural juxtaposition and mixture” (p. 13).

Nowadays, though, it is impossible, or at least rather unreasonable, to think of culture strictly in such localized terms, to view it as the natural property of spatially circumscribed populations. Globalization has radically pulled culture apart from place. It has visibly dislodged it from particular locales. ...Cultural interconnections increasingly stretch across the globe, eroding the “natural” connection or isomorphism between culture and place. (p. 13)

But they are not arguing that culture, or the relevance of ‘place’ disappear, they are specifically discussing what happens when culture is reinscribed in a place where it wasn’t before.

For anthropologists realize that the uprooting of culture is only half of the story of globalization. The other half is that the deterritorialization of culture is invariably the occasion for the reinsertion of culture in new time-space contexts. ...The point of all this is that, for anthropologists, globalized culture is never simply deterritorialized. It is also always reterritorialized. We are not dealing, in other words, with two separate processes. Rather, they occur simultaneously. It is a double movement, if you will. We would like to capture this double movement with the neologism de/territorialization. (p. 14)

Whereas Inda and Rosaldo are associating this process of de/territorialization with the current global era, many postcolonial theorists, such as Homi Bhabha and Edward Said, argue that this process is nothing new. That in fact, this is the way that all cultures have been constituted, not just by coming in contact with one another in a synergistic process, but rather, by defining themselves against one another in a process of hybridization, which is located within power structures. In other words, all cultures are hybrids. None are developed in isolation but rather all are developed in response to contact with others within structures of power. Bhabha (1994) argues that,

...colonial hybridity is not a *problem* of geneology or identity between two *different* cultures which can then be resolved as an issue of cultural relativism. Hybridity is a problematic of colonial representation and individuation that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other 'denied' knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of authority – its rules of recognition. Again, it must be stressed, it is not simply the *content* of disavowed knowledges – be they forms of cultural otherness or traditions of colonialist treachery – that return to be acknowledged as counter-authorities.... the difference of cultures can no longer be identified or evaluated as objects of epistemological or moral contemplation: cultural differences are not simply *there* to be seen or appropriated. (p. 114)

Similarly Rizvi (2007) posits that, "The notion of a pure culture, located within its own territory, has always been a myth because all cultures result from their encounters with others." (p. 23) In addition, spatiality and place are not synonymous. Two people occupying the same space may make very different 'sense' of that place (Hutchison, 2004). In other words, place-making is related both to the cultures that have developed in response to one another, as well as to the power relations shaping that growth. In this sense, one cannot understand 'other' cultures as entirely separate and distinct from one's own. There is always some form of relationship, whether direct or indirect, and the analysis of that relationship is a key aspect to understanding the 'issue' at hand. Just as the global and the local define one another, we must understand that

we are all hybrids in that we are a part of this complex, dynamic network, both historically and actually. How we come to understand this phenomenon is through an examination of the indexical nature of our identities.

Appadurai's (1996) description of 'scapes' is very useful in imagining and understanding the complexity of cultural politics and its relationship to identity in a local-global nexus. He defines five dimensions of global cultural flows – ethnoscapescapes, mediascapescapes, technoscapescapes, finanscapescapes, ideoscapescapes, which are both fluid and irregular, and are:

deeply perspectival constructs, inflected by the historical, linguistic, and political situatedness of different sorts of actors: nation-states, multinationals, diasporic communities, as well as subnational groupings and movements (whether religious, political, or economic), and even intimate face-to-face groups, such as villages, neighborhoods, and families. Indeed, the individual actor is the last locus of this perspectival set of landscapes, for these landscapes are eventually navigated by agents who both experience and constitute larger formations, in part from their own sense of what these landscapes offer. (p. 33)

According to McLaren (2003), "We do not stand *before* the world; we live *in the midst* of it." (p. 72) Relationality means understanding one's situatedness within these deeply perspectival cultural flows – understanding that we are actors within those flows and analyzing what our role as an 'individual actor' within this set of landscapes means. Paula Moya (2006) describes this relationship as "indexical", "Insofar as identities reference our understanding of ourselves in relation to others, they provide their bearers with particular perspectives on a shared social world." (p. 97) And according to Rosaldo (2006), "Contrary to the critics, the notion of identity is complex and changes through time. It is neither monolithic nor static." (p. 124) These two points taken together are the core of relationality.

Relationality then, similar to Hanvey's notion of 'perspective-awareness' is understanding where we find ourselves in the midst of these scapes and how this is dynamic and

relational. It could be argued that it is a form of ‘inter-spatiality’. Another aspect, expanding on Hanvey’s notion of ‘cross-cultural awareness’ would be to move beyond the fixed notion of culture and examine the hybridity of both ourselves and others and how that hybridity both came to be and also effects our actions, opportunities and imperatives. Our social imaginary is largely influenced by our situatedness in the world. Without an understanding of where we have come from, and where we are, we cannot hope to begin to imagine anew. Rosaldo (2006) speaks to this issue in relationship to social change.

In my view, the hope is that there will be a general recognition that we all are positioned subjects and we all speak from distinct points of view shaped by identities that have to be socially recognized. The array of different subject positions must be taken into account in order for people to have a conception of the social whole. On taking account of the different points of view one has to think with care about the groups that are subordinated, marginalized, or excluded by the dominant discourse because they are the people least taken into account for reasons of power. One must think of the possibility of social change as a means of thinking of the society in its totality and coming of a vision of the common good. (p. 123)

Reflexivity

In essence, relationality is about understanding one’s ‘place’ in the world. However, understanding situatedness is one thing, reflecting on the meaning of that situatedness is another. Reflexivity allows for identity to become a pedagogic resource. According to Moya (2006), “while identity and knowledge are not coextensive, nevertheless, what we “know” is intimately tied up with how we conceptualize that world and who we understand ourselves to be in it.”(p. 102). Moya argues that decades worth of research have shown that both teachers and students bring their identity into the classroom with them. She discusses the movement toward ‘color blind’ and ‘identity neutral’ approaches out of fears of ‘irresolvable conflict’ or ‘stereotype

threat', among others. However, rather than working under a false notion of neutrality, Moya argues that educators should, instead, create a space to mobilize those identities.

Identities are highly salient for students' experiences in school; they make the classroom a different place for different students. ... I argue that a truly multi-perspectival, multicultural education will work to *mobilize identities* in the classroom rather than seeking to minimize all effects of identities as part of a process of minimizing stereotypes. Only by treating identities as epistemic resources and mobilizing them, I contend, can we draw out their knowledge-generating potential and allow them to contribute positively to the production and transmission of knowledge. (p. 96)

The first part of reflexivity is acknowledging the non-neutrality of all knowledge, in relation to its historical contexts. Part of that process requires understanding that although some forms of knowledge may appear as universal as a result of historical and current power relations, all knowledge is local. Rosaldo (1999) explains,

The notion of self-understanding as an ethical project calls for the universal human perception that each person or group is an other among others. That is, nobody has a monopoly on truth. All knowledge is local, no matter what its pretensions. *Esprit humaine* thus becomes a local product that requires ethnographic explication in its Parisian contexts, rather than an accurate portrayal of the universal human spirit. In this sense we are all condemned to parochialism, ethnocentrism, and presentism unless we find a means to broaden our visions by learning about other local knowledges. (p. 31)

As an example of this, Rosaldo refers to the work of Clifford Geertz, who encourages,

To see others as sharing a nature with ourselves is the merest decency. But it is from the far more difficult achievement of seeing ourselves amongst others, as a local example of the forms human life has locally taken, a case among cases, a world among worlds, that the largeness of mind, without which objectivity is self-congratulation and tolerance a sham, comes. (p. 31)

It is only upon this condition of understanding oneself as an other among others, practicing a local knowledge privileged or not privileged through a variety of complex historical relations, that people "can come to know the depth of differences separating them, grasp the precise nature of these differences, and construct a public vocabulary through which they can seriously talk to one another." (Rosaldo, p 33, 1999)

One word that appears often in the post-1980's literature is 'reflexivity', but it is often left open and vague as to what that can mean. Critical pedagogy offers a useful approach to this through the concepts of dialogue and conscientization. A dialogical relationship means that each participant has "something to contribute and receive. Students learn from the teachers, teachers learn from the students." (Darder et al., 2003, p. 15) It is only through this prerequisite approach – being open to learn – that anyone can ever potentially have something to offer. Related to this is the idea of conscientization, "defined as the process by which students, as empowered subjects, achieve a deepening awareness of the social realities that shape their lives and discover their own capacities to re-create them." (ibid., p. 15) This seems to me to be the ultimate aim of a global perspective, and the necessary outcome of a dialogically based praxis.

Though both Hanvey (1976, 1982) and Tye and Tye (1992) allude to something approaching a dialectical method, where they fall short is in that they maintain an assumption of an underlying universal truth that can be known, if only we try hard enough. However, as Darder (2003) argues, "in opposition to traditional theories of education that serve to reinforce certainty, conformity, and technical control of knowledge and power, critical pedagogy embraces a dialectical view of knowledge that functions to unmask the connections between objective knowledge and the cultural norms, values, and standards of the society at large." (, p. 12) This means that there is a need to focus on and explore the contradictions and disjunctions that allow us to understand our world as well as our similarities and differences and, in so doing, will find our ability to create new knowledge and possibilities. The goal is not for a complete understanding in the universalist sense, but for an understanding for practical action. This is an essential component of 'unity within diversity', as opposed to a diversity which is about a coexistence that doesn't require any interrelationship or struggle over meaning.

Reflexivity also assumes that all teaching involves a cycle of continuous learning and re-evaluation of norms and assumptions. It assumes a dialectical relationship between students and teachers and also assumes a certain tolerance for both ambiguity and conflict. By destabilizing the assumption of a capital 'T' truth, and allowing for the possibility of multiple and incomplete understandings of reality, we are able to analyze the ways in which we come to know one another. As Rizvi (2007) explains,

It suggests that learning about others requires learning about *ourselves*. It implies a dialectical mode of thinking, which conceives cultural differences as neither absolute nor necessarily antagonistic, but deeply interconnected and relationally defined. It underscores the importance of understanding others both in *their* terms as well as *ours*, as a way of comprehending how both our representations are socially constituted. (p. 32)

In brief, reflexivity requires that individuals actively engage with and question their own perspectives and how they developed over time, as the result of a variety of circumstances and encounters. It requires that individuals question what they take for granted and also examine the historical and political factors, that have allowed certain types of understandings to become considered 'popular knowledge' or taken for granted assumptions. And finally, reflexivity requires a self-analysis of the ways in which we come to understand others, the ways in which we come to understand ourselves, and the ways in which others come to understand us.

Criticality

Many efforts toward internationalization incorporate aspects of historicity, relationality, and reflexivity. For example, there is a course which comes out of the University of Minnesota, called 'Maximizing Study Abroad', which is fairly renowned in the field of education abroad. It requires students to research their destination location in terms of its history, culture and political systems. It requires them to reflect on their own identities as 'Americans'. And it requires them

to examine relationships between the students' 'local' and the destinations' 'local'. All which is done from a fairly 'neutral' standpoint. What it does not venture to do – I presume for many of the reasons Moya (2006) discusses in regards to 'color-blind' education and its effort to maintain a semblance of neutrality – is to interrogate the global and local political conditions; the history of colonialism and imperialism; or the distribution of resources and power. In short it does not foster in students the ability to practice criticality.

Rizvi (2007) defines criticality as, "understanding the contested politics of place-making and identity formation and the social construction of power differentials" (p. 31). Criticality entails going beyond an acknowledgement that 'knowledge' is not neutral, to an understanding of the specific context in which it was generated. In other words, it is not enough to simply understand and appreciate cultural similarities and differences, but rather it is equally necessary to understand them *within* the asymmetrical configurations of power and knowledge in which they were both formed and are maintained and perpetuated. As McLaren (2003) explains, "The critical educator, however, is most interested in what Habermas calls *emancipatory knowledge* (similar to Giroux's *directive knowledge*), which attempts to reconcile and transcend the opposition between technical and practical knowledge. Emancipatory knowledge helps us understand how social relationships are distorted and manipulated by relations of power and privilege." (p 73)

Darder (2002) illustrates this well in her work:

Similarly, we need to recognize that events that are taking place today in Bosnia or Chiapas or Nigeria or the Middle East are not solely the result of regional struggles. Conflicts in these regions are closely tied to the manner in which industrial development and U.S. "postindustrial" interests have exercised global control of mass populations, influencing the economic and political climates in these parts of the world. These interests are the ones that are sustained by the values and practices that shape educational institutions. In other words, the traditional values and expectations of many health,

education, and welfare agencies are inextricably tied to the same interests and values that on one hand support the “globalization” of U.S. corporate “common culture” and on the other sustain deepening economic inequalities here and abroad. (p. 7)

In other words, we can understand the historical precursors for any of the events that Darder mentions, within their own context; and we can even understand the role that the U.S. plays in creating and maintaining these situations. However, without an understanding of the underlying values, ideologies and social imaginaries that legitimate these situations, we are left with an incomplete and often lopsided picture. It is the function of a critical approach to these sets of relationships which might allow us to decipher the structures of understanding which serve as justification and fodder for, what upon closer examination, are clear cases of injustice and inequality.

To begin with, this requires a critical evaluation of what Taylor (2002), among others refers to as the ‘social imaginary of Western modernity’, one that emphasizes universality, rationality, progress, efficiency; all which take specific form (embodied practice) in institutions of education, commerce and governance. However, understanding these in and of themselves are not enough. Rather, because these are not static, it is important to critically analyze them in the context of what Appadurai (2000) refers to as ‘disjunctures’.

The various flows we see – of objects, persons, images, and discourses – are not coeval, convergent, isomorphic, or spatially consistent. They are in what I have elsewhere called relations of disjuncture. By this I mean that the paths or vectors taken by these kinds of things have different speeds, axes, points of origin and termination, and varied relationships to institutional structures in different regions, nations, or societies. Further, these disjunctures themselves precipitate various kinds of problems and frictions in different local situations. Indeed, it is the disjunctures between the various vectors characterizing this world-in-motion that produce fundamental problems of livelihood, equity, suffering, justice, and governance. (p. 5)

Imagination

Closely related to the idea of criticality – or analysis of the social imaginaries, and ideologies which legitimate injustice – is the role of imagination itself. In brief, the social imaginary works in two ways. First, it is what is inherited or as Taylor (2002) describes, “the ways in which people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations.” (p. 106) In other words, I imagine that society is what it is, or should be a certain way, because of my historical situatedness. This, in a sense, is what we are ‘given’, through education, family, media and so forth, to help us make sense of the world around us. However, there is another more agential side to the notion of social imaginary – it is active and always at work. For example, it is not a book that has been written; it is a book being written. The ending has not yet been decided, as there is no end, and, therefore, there are infinite possibilities to shape the narrative in ways that may work against the common sense, understood, traditional ways of understanding and doing. There is the possibility to imagine that things could be different. In imagining, we are also in turn, shaping our social imaginary, or our understanding of how it ‘should’ be. Appadurai (1996) explains,

These landscapes thus are the building blocks of what (extending Benedict Anderson) I would like to call *imagined worlds*, that is, the multiple worlds that are constituted by the historically situated imaginations of persons and groups spread around the globe. An important fact of the world we live in today is that many persons on the globe live in such imagined worlds (and not just in imagined communities) and thus are able to contest and sometimes even subvert the imagined worlds of the official mind and of the entrepreneurial mentality that surround them. (p. 33)

Rizvi (2007) defines a global imagination as, “a deparochialization of the processes of learning and teaching, highlighting the importance of ‘grassroots’ global networks capable of

interrogating dominant social imaginaries that are no longer adequate for negotiating the complex global realities we now confront.” (p. 31) This process would allow us to ‘hear’ other’s stories in a new way, as Nel Noddings (2005) suggests, perhaps even in a way that helps us understand our own stories, one that will help us tell our own stories better and more fully. One that understand Rosaldo’s ‘other among others’, but also understands that those stories, within a critically reflexive process, are conscious of the power relations that forge the ‘knowledge’ of how ‘we’ and ‘they’ know the world. This in turn would allow us to transform our identities – our notions of who we (in both an individual and a collective sense) are. According to Moya (2006) “To the extent that we are interested in transforming *this* world into a better one – insofar as we cannot get *there* except from *here* – the transformation of the identities that are central to the arrangement and functioning of society will be a necessary part of our epistemic and political project.” (p. 97)

The goal is not so much to impart knowledge about other cultures, but rather to understand the ways in which cultural formation, and our understanding of it, is transformed and altered through global processes of economic and cultural exchange. Through this, we can come to understand our position within these configurations and can better determine our roles and responsibilities. Rizvi emphasizes that this kind of reflexive and critical understanding will naturally move us away from a social imaginary dominated by the universalizing logic of the market, as well as away from any romanticized notion of global citizenship, both of which obscure the complexity of the global processes and relationships.

As our understanding of who we are and how we are in the world continue to evolve, we maintain what Friere (2000) referred to as the ‘capacity to always begin anew’. “For Freire, there was no question that he, others and the world were always in a state of becoming, of

transforming, and reinventing ourselves as part of our human historical process.” (Darder, 2003, p. 506) This is another essential feature of a global perspective, in that it highlights the dynamic nature of knowing, and the forever unfolding possibilities of practice. In unmasking our ideology, in acknowledging the historicity of our knowledge, in maintaining a dialogical approach to our praxis, we provide ourselves with the potential to always begin anew. Without this capacity, we would remain trapped within the boundaries of our limit-situations and blinded and, therefore, restricted by our unexamined understanding of what we perceive as knowledge and in turn how we understand the global landscapes and our responses to them.

Conclusion

Internationalization has been ‘performed’ in a variety of modes and forms for a variety of purposes throughout the history of higher education in the U.S. However, what I will explore in the next few chapters, is the role of ‘working’ the social imaginary through fostering the virtues of historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination in these various practices. In other words, rather than ranking internationalization efforts as more or less effective, examining these approaches and what it might take to realize their potential to create actively transformative internationalization efforts. The next chapter will take you through the specific methods used in this study.

Chapter 4

Methodology

In their discussion of the various methodologies used by researchers in education, Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) discuss the quantitative, what they refer to as positivist; and qualitative, which they refer to as interpretive paradigms as “essentially concerned with understanding phenomena through two different lenses” (p. 26). Whereas quantitative research “strives for objectivity measurability, predictability, controllability, patterning, the construction of laws and rules of behavior, and the ascription of causality; the interpretive paradigms strive to understand and interpret the world in terms of its actors.” (p. 26) Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) expands this further,

...From an indigenous perspective Western research is more than just research that is located in a positivist tradition. It is research which brings to bear, on any study of indigenous peoples, a cultural orientation, a set of values, a different conceptualization of such things as time, space and subjectivity, different and competing theories of knowledge, highly specialized forms of language, and structures of power. (p. 42)

According to Louis Cohen et al. (2007) a third approach to educational research was introduced to address the issues brought up by Tuhiwai Smith, that of critical educational research, which “regards the two previous paradigms as presenting incomplete accounts of social behavior by their neglect of the political and ideological contexts of much educational research.” (p. 26) Whereas the first two paradigms have the goal of locating some form of truth statement, critical educational research is concerned with “the emancipation of individuals and groups in an egalitarian society.” (p. 26) This is achieved through the interrogation of relationships, how knowledge is socially constructed, and ideological perspectives. In short, it is in itself a critique

of other forms of research, in that they “accept rather than question given agendas for research.” (p. 27). The goal is not transformation, but discovery.

According to Cohen et al., an important part of critical educational research is the element of ideology critique, meant “to uncover the vested interests at work which may be occurring consciously or subliminally, revealing to participants how they may be acting to perpetuate a system which keeps them either empowered or disempowered.” (p. 27) John Smyth (1989) simplifies the stages of ideology critique into the following:

- Description (what am I doing?)
- Information (what does it mean?)
- Confrontation (how did I come to be like this?)
- Reconstruction (how might I do things differently?)

Cohen et al. emphasize that ideology critique has “both a reflective, theoretical and a practical side to it; without reflection it is hollow and without practice it is empty.” (p. 28), emphasizing the role of praxis within critical educational research.

While this proposed research project relies heavily on some of the rationales behind critical educational research, I am also largely inspired by what Cohen et al. refer to as complexity theory. They rank this as the fourth and newest emerging paradigm in educational research. They claim that “complexity theory has entered the world of social sciences and is providing not only a significant challenge to existing research methods, but is suggesting alternative ways of conceiving the world and, thereby, of researching it.” (p. 33) They argue that complexity theory changes the orientation from simplistic cause-and-effect models, where linear predictability is the norm, and replaces it with an “organic, non-linear and holistic approach, in which relations within interconnected networks are the order of the day.” (p. 33) By looking at phenomena holistically, one is able to see the dynamic interactions of the various parts, allowing

an understanding of how, for example local responses to similar global phenomena can be so different.

To accomplish this, however, complexity theory suggests a movement of the unit of analysis “away from, for example, individuals, institutions, communities and systems (cf. Lemke 2001). These should merge, so that the unit of analysis becomes a web or ecosystem (Capra 1996: 301), focused on, and arising from, a specific topic or centre of interest (a ‘strange attractor’).” (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 34) This addresses one of Tuhiwai Smith’s (1999) concerns about Western forms of humanistic research, which “place humanity on a higher plane (than animals and plants) because of such characteristics as language and reason.” (p. 48) This creates a specific set of self-referencing codes, classifications and representations, which “create a cultural ‘force field’ which can screen out competing and oppositional discourses. Taken as a whole system, these ideas determine the wider rules of practice which ensure that Western interests remain dominant.” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 47) In complexity theory, those self-referencing codes are no longer the central point of analysis, rather it is all that goes on between them that becomes interesting and useful, allowing for a multiplicity of perspectives to emerge. According to Urry (2003),

Rather global ordering is so immensely complicated that it cannot be ‘known’ through a single concept or set of processes. Indeed it is epistemologically and ontologically unknowable, with efforts at comprehension changing the very world that is being investigated. But, because of the power of metaphor in thinking, some notions from complexity will be interrogated in order to assess their fruitfulness in representing those processes implicated in such global ordering. (p. 15)

Some of the key features of complexity theory are ‘connectedness’, ‘emergence’ and ‘self-organization’. Accordingly, Cohen et al. suggest that complexity theory suggests “case study methodology, action research, and participatory forms of research” (p. 34); all of which

suggest, “participatory, collaborative and multi-perspectival approaches to educational research.” (p. 34) Complexity theory has a variety of forms and practitioners. According to Lesley Kuhn (2008), “I do not think however, that complexity has yet been systematically articulated in such a way that it could be termed a single ‘theory’.” (p. 169). However, she does emphasize that complexity’s commitment to ‘radical relationality’, allows it to “offer a way of envisaging and working with complex phenomena.” (p. 169) When I refer to it here, I am largely referencing those versions of complexity proposed by Capra (2002) and John Urry (2003), though also informed by Mark Mason (2008) and Lesley Kuhn (2008). I find that these perspectives serve as a useful theoretical resource in that they provide a model around which a pedagogy for global studies and internationalization efforts might be built or imagined. Urry (2003) describes complexity as emphasizing, “that there are diverse networked time-space paths, that there are often massive disproportionalities between causes and effects, and that unpredictable and yet irreversible patterns seem to characterize all social and physical systems.” (pp. 7-8) Each of these characteristics underlie the analysis set forth in the upcoming chapters. In opposition to a traditional positivist approach – searching for the ‘best’ way that most closely resembles ‘the’ truth – I am trying to highlight both how and why it is important to allow for flexibility and openness to the ‘disproportionalities between causes and effects’.

In this study, I attempt to understand the “archive of knowledge and systems, rules and values which stretch beyond the boundaries of Western science to the system now referred to as the West.” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 43) which influence the way a variety of efforts, or traditions, toward internationalization take shape. There have been numerous pre- and post- surveys of students studying abroad which measure such ‘variables’ as ‘cultural intelligence’, ‘adaptability’ and so on. What these surveys don’t

capture, however, is the depth and complexity of the myriad ways in which understandings of self influence understandings of others, specifically as they relate to global forces and flows. It is easy to show that students have learned *something* while abroad, or engaged in some form of ‘internationalization’. What I am hoping to investigate here is what forms that ‘something’ might take, and specifically how it is, that when faced with the same set of information or experiences, students derive such different ‘results’ in terms of their understandings/outcomes and the ways in which they are transformed (or not). In other words, the students are not the ‘subject’ of the research, nor are the actual forms that the internationalization efforts take. Instead, what I am trying to highlight is the movement between all of these (including my role as a participant/researcher/teacher/learner) – the texturized stories of a group experience influenced by a variety of external flows, embodied both in the people involved and the unique experiences that they bring, as well as the structure (micro and macro) within which the experiences took place.

The Research Project

In order to better understand the complex networks that influence each experience meant to internationalize or to create a more globally-minded individual, I will examine three traditions of internationalization in the U.S. However, to get a better look at what each of these do, or can do, I have chosen to organize each tradition around the theme of global water issues. As Cohen et al. (2007) suggest in their discussion of complexity theory, there is use in focusing on “a specific topic or centre of interest (a ‘strange attractor’)” (p. 34), in order to study the interconnectedness or networks that constitute it. This will provide an opportunity to not only

look at the practices involved, but to see the kinds of obstacles students face in beginning to navigate the complexity of global issues. It will also provide an opportunity to examine the kinds of ‘tools’ or resources that the students use to overcome these obstacles. All of which will help us come to better understand our own practices as educators and to better understand the complexity of the process of coming to ‘know’. Again, to use the example of study abroad, often practitioners promote education abroad as a result of some vague notion that it is ‘good’ for students. In the lesson plans that I propose to evaluate, it is assumed that if students ‘know the facts’ on global water issues, their actions will change accordingly. Yet, as we know, the same experiences take on different meanings for a variety of people.

The story takes place in three parts. The first part looks at lesson plans that were developed as ‘add-on’ components to curricula. I began looking at these in 2004 for a unit that I was creating for practicing educators on how to teach about global water issues, and it has become a bit of a hobby now. This provides insight into the ways in which traditional curriculum developers imagine, or construct, the important features of the global issue of water. To understand the process of how people begin to navigate the complexities of this issue within traditional internationalization efforts, parts 2 and 3 explore two different cases. The first case involves a group of students, mostly from the US, whom I accompanied on a study tour to Pretoria, South Africa in Summer of 2007 – a water scarce region – to look at water issues there. The second case involves a group of students in the U.S. (not all of whom were from the US) who took an on-campus course that I had the great fortune to teach in Spring of 2009 called ‘Understanding Global Water Issues’, which involved a survey of water issues around the world, including in the US. The two cases are not meant specifically to be compared and contrasted, but rather to highlight different aspects of the process of coming to terms with the issue of water

scarcity. Each evolved out of my own prior experiences and built upon one another. My experiences in the study tour had a direct influence, and were much of the motivation for me to offer the on-campus course. Too often internationalization is associated with study abroad alone, whereas this is far from the case. It is much easier to imagine how a study abroad experience can be made to be more meaningful and effective, but I thought it useful to explore the same concepts in the more traditional, and wider-reaching, classroom environment. According to Bob Stake (1995), “The real business of case study is particularization, not generalization.”(p. 8) It is not meant to be generalizable nor quantitatively empirical, rather it has an “emphasis on uniqueness, and that implies knowledge of others that the case is different from, but the first emphasis is on understanding the case itself.”(p 8) Accordingly, this study examines the multiple ways that students come to understand – or at least begin to grapple with – a subject that in essence is entirely foreign to them. All of the students in the study have access to ample sources of freshwater.

According to Norm Denzin (2003), it is important to think about “fieldwork as a collaborative process, or a co-performance. The observer and the observed are co-performers in a performance event. In that sense, this project is largely a reflective semi-biographical narrative, as it is as much about my evolving understanding of what it means to understand the world from a critical global perspective, as it is an examination of the students’ evolution. Again, according to Denzin, “This performative approach puts culture into motion. It examines, narrates and performs the complex ways in which persons experience themselves within the shifting ethnoscapings of today’s global world economy.” All of which emphasize “partial, plural, incomplete, and contingent understandings, not analytic distance or detachment.” (p. 11) This idea is particularly important to this project, as I have not sought to reproduce or re-invent the

multiple lists that exist out there of the ‘qualities of a global citizen’. I have not sought to create a roadmap, that when applied, yields a cosmopolitan mindset. Rather, I have sought to explore the ways in which these internationalization experiences might be made more meaningful, purposeful, and less ‘mis-educative’ in the sense that Dewey describes. To this end, in both the study tour and on-campus course cases, I actively employed aspects of historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality, and imagination as a framework for both action and analysis. Again, my experiences with the study tour in 2007 largely informed my approach to the on-campus course. Both of these were also largely informed by other personal experiences in internationalization, which I highlighted earlier. I do not feel that this is an issue, as much as a point of which I have needed to remain cognizant. The purpose of this research is to understand the ‘contextual conditions’ – my own as well as those of the participants. In summary, the methods that I have used for this study include reflective semi-biographical narrative, participant observation, and critical discourse analysis, both in regards to the three lesson plans, as well as the student assignments.

The Cases

Part 1 -- Information-Based Lesson Plans The most common form of internationalization could be referred to as information-based or those that are meant as ‘add-on’ information to a set curriculum. In this study, I analyze two information-based lesson plans. The lesson plans I have chosen include one from the PBS teacher’s website (see Appendix II), and one from a non-profit organization called water.org (see Appendix I). These were chosen because of their high visibility, which means that they were chosen for specific reasons to represent the organization’s orientation toward the topic at hand. In short, they are highly

representative of the ways in which issues of water are approached in classrooms across the US. The idea here is that if you present enough information, students will naturally grasp the complexity, and the implications, and the information is therefore useful.

Each of these lesson plans deals with aspects of global water issues; each are targeting a secondary school audience in the U.S.; and each has a prescriptive set of procedures that teachers are meant to follow to communicate their message. This set of procedures tells a very specific story about the authors' understandings of global water issues, global relations, the role of the nation-state and the role of the US in the world. Using a critical textual discourse analysis, I highlight the stories that are being told. This is important for a variety of reasons. First, these are the dominant tales that are being told in our classrooms. Second, these tales tell students not only something about how they should understand global water issues, but also how they should understand their place in the world. In short, these kinds of lessons contribute to student's identity formation as it pertains to all things 'global'. It also provides a specific orientation toward local-global dynamics.

Each of these lessons has its own pedagogical, political and conceptual orientations, which is interrogated using a textual analysis. The approach used is informed by Norman Fairclough's (2003) Critical Discourse Analysis, which takes a descriptive orientation toward ideology critique. As Fairclough explains, "if ideologies are primarily representations, they can nevertheless also be 'enacted' in ways of acting socially, and 'inculcated' in the identities of social agents." (p. 9) Theo van Leeuwen (2008) describes this approach to textual analysis as an attempt to understand the underlying "social cognitions, socially specific ways of knowing social practices, they can be, and are, used as resources for representing social practices in text. This means that it is possible to reconstruct discourses from the texts that draw on them." (p. 6)

Lesson plans are a particularly interesting form of text, as they are directive. That is to say, they are directing their users to act in a certain way, for a certain purpose, and based on a specific (implicit and explicit) set of goals. The goal of this portion of the research is to illustrate some of the general underlying ‘imperatives’ for approaches to teaching about global water issues currently practiced, and to evaluate to what extent, and in which ways, they address or incorporate aspects of historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination.

Part 2 – South Africa – Experiential Education

You know, study abroad is like spring training for this century. It helps you develop the fundamentals, the teamwork, and the determination to succeed. And we want more American students to have that opportunity. (Hillary Clinton in speech to NYU)

There is a growing movement toward ‘experiential’ learning of all types in U.S. higher education, including such things as ‘service learning’, ‘capstone projects’, and even ‘entrepreneurial service’ ventures. However, within the field of international education, study abroad has long been seen as the most effective means for language and cultural learning. Some small liberal arts universities have begun requiring some form of education abroad for graduation, while large research institutions are increasing the number of short-term faculty led courses. It is the latter that I explore in this project.

In the Summer of 2007, I accompanied a group of Masters students to Pretoria South Africa for a 10 day study tour on issues of water. There were 15 students on the trip (12 female, 3 male), one course instructor, and me (acting in the role of a coordinator of sorts). There were two ‘host country nationals’ who assisted with the planning and preparation in South Africa. All 15 participants were practicing educators, either in elementary schools, secondary schools or in community colleges. Students stayed together in rooms at a bed and breakfast (2-5 people per room). Before the students left for South Africa, they were required to attend four weeks of

online coursework in preparation for the trip. As the goal of the course was both to better understand water issues, as well as to self-reflexively examine the potentials and pitfalls of study abroad experiences, students were asked to read about and discuss various approaches to the practice of study abroad, in addition to materials relating to water issues, history and politics in South Africa. The pre-departure portion of the course also addressed logistical issues. Another important feature of this study tour is that students were presented with three key questions, on which they were asked to reflect throughout the study tour. These were:

1. To what extent and in what ways are issues surrounding water becoming globally important in terms of the political, social and economic aspects of the issue?
2. How do these issues reflect shifting patterns of global interconnectivity and interdependence?
3. How might we teach about water from a global perspective using North Transvaal as a specific local site from which to view global issues?

While abroad, students attended a variety of lectures and events, visited cultural sites and schools and spent time together actively debriefing. Each of the lectures was organized so that it was presented by a South African educator. These educators, like the group, came from all levels of the educational system. They were asked to speak on specific topics, such as South Africa's Education System, Economics of South Africa, Politics of South Africa, Cultures of South Africa, Water Issues in South Africa, Teaching about Water Issues in South Africa. The lectures were held in the mornings, so that the group could visit schools, go to museums, or meet with officials in the afternoons. These afternoon excursions included the University of Pretoria, township elementary, middle and high schools, an orphanage, a township church, the University of Pretoria Water Institute and the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry. In addition, the group spent a day in Johannesburg where they visited with a social movement – the 'Anti-Privatisation Forum', and visited the Apartheid Museum and Nelson Mandela's old house, which

is now a museum as well. Evenings were generally spent at the lodging in discussion of the day's activities. One evening was spent viewing the film 'Amandla!', followed by a discussion led by one of the organizers. Another evening was spent with a group of educators from around Africa, who had come to Pretoria for a short-course. Finally, one full day was spent on a group tour of traditional tourist sites, including the Cradle of Humankind and a Rhino and Lion Game Park.

In the pre-departure portion of this study tour, students were asked to write a 5-6 page essay on a topic dealing with issues of study abroad. At the end of the tour, they were asked to write an 8-10 page essay reflecting on the key questions of the study tour. I also requested that they complete a short survey prior to their departure, regarding past experiences and 'global' education. I have used these three sets of written assignments as a source of 'data' for this study.

Part 3 – 'Understanding Global Water Issues' – Place-Based Education Though it is common practice to internationalize curriculum through additional materials, such as those discussed above, there is another approach born out of the environmental studies movement which involves an overhaul of traditional disciplinary approaches, to one that puts 'location', or 'place', first, ideally the physical location of the students. In this way, students are able to explore issues from an interdisciplinary perspective, based on actual practice. The idea is that, as an example, rather than studying the notion of water privatization in the abstract, students place it within a physical, historical context that then allows for an examination of other specific mitigating factors and externalities, which may not be visible in the abstract. In addition, this promotes an interdisciplinary perspective, one that would allow students to explore, for example, the intersections between the physical existence of water and the political, social and economic aspects of that existence in relation to one another.

According to Noddings (2005), this approach helps students understand their own stories, in order to better hear, or hear in new ways, the stories of others. This is the approach I took in teaching a course called 'Understanding Global Water Issues' in the Spring semester of 2009. There were 19 students in the course (13 female, 6 male), all undergraduates. Three were not citizens of the United States, but all of the students came from places where they had access to ample water resources. In this course, we looked at examples of water issues in the Southwest region of the United States, with particular focus on Colorado and Arizona and the relationship with Mexico; in Cochabamba, Bolivia; Narmada Valley, India; and Lesotho and Johannesburg, South Africa. Through these cases, we explored concepts such as the 'Tragedy of the Commons', Integrated Water Resources Management, and equality of access and quality. Students also worked in groups to analyze a United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) water report, as well as a report from the NGO World Resources Institute. Students were asked to keep a weekly journal with specific prompt questions, completed a pre-course survey and wrote a short final paper. These written assignments also served as 'data' for this study.

Research Questions

The larger purpose of this project is to contribute to the development of critical approaches to internationalization efforts as well as to reassert a critical pedagogical approach for the emerging field of global studies. For this study, the primary question that informed its inquiry is 'How are students engaging with and challenging their own identity and social imaginary in the process of coming to understand a global issue?' This larger, and more complex, question is further broken down into the following:

1. In what ways are students coming to understand the subject at hand?

2. How are issues of identity used and challenged in this process? How has my own identity been challenged in this process?
3. In what ways do students critically reflect on their own social imaginaries? In which ways do they engage with it in the process of imagining something new?
4. In what ways does the introduction of such epistemic virtues as historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination influence the ways in which students come to understand the subject and themselves? In which ways did my emphasis on introducing these virtues influence the flow and outcomes of the courses?

Chapter 5

Information-Based Approach: How I Learned to Do These Things

The first mode of internationalization that I examine is the information-based approach. I have chosen two lesson plans that are widely available to teachers in the United States. There are a number of lesson plans on global water issues available, both in print and via the internet, that are designed specifically for teachers to incorporate into their curriculum. I started reviewing these lesson plans in 2004, and chose these two examples for specific reasons. First, the Water Partners International (water.org) lesson plan (see Appendix I), is highly representative of what is generally available. What is unique about this set of exercises is that, whereas most of the available lesson plans are disciplinary-heavy (they focus on geography, biology or politics to the exclusion of the others), this one attempts a multi-disciplinary approach. The second lesson plan is from PBS.org Global Connections educators' pages (see Appendix II). In this case, the lesson plan is part of the 'Middle East' section and is called 'Got Water?'. The reason that I chose this lesson plan is that it is one of the few that I have found that tries to provide more in-depth knowledge in regards to the historical and political origins of water conflict. However, it also maintains a somewhat narrow focus on the affected region, without looking at outside 'global' influences (though it is found in the 'global connections' section).

According to John Dewey (1968),

Learning here means acquisition of what already is incorporated in books and in the heads of the elders. Moreover, that which is taught is thought of as essentially static. It is taught as a finished product, with little regard either to the ways in which it was originally built up or to changes that will surely occur in the future. It is to a large extent the cultural product of societies that assumed the future would be much like the past, and yet it is used as educational food in a society where change is the rule, not the exception. (p. 19)

The important point here is the understanding of the relationship between knowledge and reality. Reality is ‘out there’, to be ‘known’, the job of a teacher is to guide the student to the set of knowledge that most closely represents ‘reality’.

I remember clearly the required course in literacy in my undergraduate teacher education program. We were taught these stages of ‘literacy’: comprehension, reasoning, interpreting, analyzing and synthesizing. We were then given secondary school level texts and asked to write a set of questions relating to those levels of understanding. A couple of fact-check questions to see if students are reading and taking in the information; a couple of ‘higher order’ questions to see if they are understanding key concepts; and finally the ‘critical thinking’ questions, which asked students to link the information and concepts from the text to the real world. What I also remember, very clearly, is being told that at least 60% of our students would be unable to answer the ‘critical thinking’ questions ‘correctly’, and that this is what distinguishes our A and B students from the rest. I also remember asking, quite naively, ‘if 60% of the students aren’t able to answer those questions, isn’t that our fault as a teacher?’. I don’t remember the specific response, but I do remember that it felt very unkind – something to the effect that if I think that all students can perform to equal levels, that I will not last as a teacher and that it is a *disservice* to students to let them think that they are capable of things which they are not. Interestingly, years later when learning about education in South Africa under Apartheid, I came across this well-known quote from Hendrik Verwoerd, who was at the time the minister for native affairs,

There is no place for [the Bantu] in the European community above the level of certain forms of labour ... What is the use of teaching the Bantu child mathematics when it cannot use it in practice? That is quite absurd. Education must train people in accordance with their opportunities in life, according to the sphere in which they live.

When I read this, I was brought back to this experience in my undergraduate training, where I was, in essence, taught to train students “in accordance with their opportunities in life.” I do not know if this is a common perspective among teacher educators, however, what is important to note is that an information-based approach *allows* for the possibility of this kind of conception. If the idea is that we all go through these stages (some later than others), there is also the possibility that some of us will not make it through the entire set of stages. What this, in turn, allows for is a justification for systems of meritocracy, tracking, labeling, etc. And finally, if a teacher is ‘teaching to the middle’ – and that middle is assumed not to be able to think critically – why would the teacher invest the time and energy in encouraging such things as reflexivity, relationality, criticality or imagination. Dewey (1968) explained this perspective,

If the underlying ideas of the former are formulated broadly without the qualifications required for accurate statement, they are found to be about as follows: The subject-matter of education consists of bodies of information and of skills that have been worked out in the past; therefore, the chief business of the school is to transmit them to the new generation. (p. 17)

Paulo Freire (1970) described a banking system of education, where students receive ‘deposits’ of knowledge. In removing the political and contextual connections, knowledge is rendered ahistorical and irrelevant. However, as can be seen in the two lesson plans that follow, students are not *required* to examine the historical, political, and most specifically, the power relations that shape the topics at hand. In short, it becomes about acquiring ‘knowledge’ about a situation, but loses its transformational properties.

Global Water Supply High School Curriculum

The first lesson plan is the ‘Global Water Supply High School Curriculum’ provided by a non-profit called ‘Water Partners International’. According to its website, “Water.org is a U.S.-

based nonprofit organization committed to providing safe drinking water and sanitation to people in developing countries.” The organization works on water issues in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Honduras, India and Kenya. They are working to develop relations in Haiti as well. Though they are involved in a number of types of water projects, the one that they appear to highlight the most is the ‘WaterCredit’ program, which is basically a micro-lending program specifically targeted at the building of water infrastructure and sanitation in homes. The Curriculum Guide was funded by the Open Square Foundation, for which there is little information, except that it was formally called the Agora Foundation, that focused on the reading of the ‘great books’. According to the water.org website, “We envision the day when everyone in the world can take a safe drink of water. It is easy to take for granted ready access to a safe supply of drinking water. Yet more than one billion people lack this most basic commodity. Creating accessible, safe water supplies in developing countries liberates people to live healthier, fuller, more productive lives.”

In this forty-nine page curriculum guide, a total of eleven pages are spent on delineating the National Curriculum Alignment, including sections on English/Language Arts, Science, Social Sciences (Geography only), Civics (which includes politics and history), Technology and Economics. There are four sections, or what they refer to as ‘Mini-Units’. The first is a ‘Water-Aware Portfolio’; the second is called ‘Mock Muck’ and is meant to simulate water treatment and purification processes; the third is a ‘Hydro-Technology’ mini-unit, where students ‘research, analyze, interpret and apply information to invent and design new water supply, collection and/or sanitation technology’; and finally there is a “Rising Tensions over the Nile River Basin” activity, which allows students to ‘analyze the concept of a global commons dilemma through an evaluation of a primary source document’.

I will examine these more in depth, but wanted to provide an overview of the main ‘flow’ of the document to illustrate what I understand to be some of the overarching goals. These are not explicitly stated, but are based on my perceptions of the curricular thought behind the structure of the lesson plan and the choice of materials included. Through the portfolio assignment, students are meant to gather information through readings and internet research. The activity is meant to take place throughout the entire lesson plan. According to the instructor’s guide, “Portfolios that have depth, duration and complexity will challenge students and motivate them towards construction of knowledge.” The ‘Mock Muck’ mini-unit which comes first is meant to provide students with an experience of trying to clean a dirty sample of water, to deepen their understanding of what others face when living without access to clean water. This, I assume, is meant to create a sense of ‘empathy’, and an experience upon which further lessons are to be based. In the ‘Hydro-Technology’ lesson, students read further on the depth and seriousness of global water issues, including an article on water-borne diseases. They are asked to design a new technology related to water supply to address these issues. I feel that this is both an effort to allow for the ‘higher order’ thinking in the cognitive-developmental approach, as much as it is a response to students sense of a desire to ‘do something’ about the situation. It is also an effect of the authors attempt to incorporate as many disciplinary perspectives (or check off as many national learning standards) as possible. Finally, as it is assumed that students have mastered the main ‘issues’ of the global water crisis, and they have experienced the frustrations and encountered the difficulties of ‘inventing’ a solution, they are ready to tackle the global problem itself. In the ‘Rising Tensions over the Nile River Basin’ lesson, students read a summary of the conflicts between Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania relating to access to the waters of the Nile River. The article ends with a list of ‘alternatives’ for Egypt, and how it might

respond to the challenges. After a list of comprehension questions, students are asked to respond to the competition for access to the water of the Nile from the perspective of the Ethiopian Minister of Water. This, I assume, is to allow for the ‘critical thinking’ stages – or the analysis and synthesis to take place. This final lesson is followed by a short ‘supplemental’ lesson on the ‘Tragedy of the Water Commons’, which asks students to simulate fishing from a limited pool, to illustrate the ways in which individual self-interest is destroying the fish stock. This unit is offered as supplemental, and though it tells a very interesting story in itself of how the authors are asking the students to imagine the world and their role in it, it does not fit in directly with the larger lesson plan that I just described.

According to Cohen et al. (2007),

Not all knowledge can be included in the curriculum; the curriculum is a selection of what is deemed to be worthwhile knowledge. The justification for that selection reveals the ideologies and power in decision-making in society and through the curriculum. Curriculum is an ideological selection from a range of possible knowledge. This resonates with Habermas’s (1972) view that knowledge and its selection is neither neutral nor innocent. (p 31)

So, what story is this set of mini-units telling? This set of proposed procedures tells a very specific story about the authors’ understandings of global water issues, global relations, the role of the nation-state, and the role of the US in the world. A look at one of the activities might help illustrate this point. In the article ‘Rising Tensions over the Nile River Basin’, there is discussion of an agreement over allocation of Nile River water signed in 1929 “between Egypt and Great Britain (which represented Uganda, Kenya, Tanganyika [now Tanzania] and the Sudan)”. I find the word ‘represented’ an interesting choice. Later in the article, it says,

The other Nile Basin African countries consider the agreement as a relic of a colonial era which no longer reflects their needs and aspirations and hence it should be annulled. Countering this argument, Sherif Al-Mousa, head of the Middle East Program at the American University of Cairo, argues that the Nile water agreement should be treated the

same way as the boundaries of most Nile Basin countries which were established by colonial powers, and are recognized under international law.

In the discussion questions, there is no space to discuss this kind of an issue. It seems like a very valuable opportunity to discuss the issues of knowledge/policy and power. Though it ‘consults’ history, in regards to the development of water technologies and the discussion of historical legal documents in regards to the use of Nile River water, this is different from valuing historicity, which in contrast to simply knowing the historical foundations of a certain set of information, takes account of the social context in which that knowledge was created. Though this is not represented in the prescriptive lesson plan provided, it does not mean that an individual instructor could not make use of such an opportunity to bring in issues of the lasting legacies of colonialism, as well as modern forms of imperialism.

Without this historical perspective, it is also difficult to enter into discussions about relationality. The story this set of lessons tells about students’ place in the world is one of an ‘us’/‘them’ orientation, where the students in the U.S. represent a sense of the ‘White Man’s burden’ that both Basil Davidson (1992) and William Easterly (2006) discuss and critique at length. This could be related to the fact that this lesson plan comes from a non-profit organization seeking donors; it is, therefore, to their benefit to create a certain sense of responsibility and thus a certain kind of response (donations) to the information presented. Indications of an ‘interaction’ between the U.S. and the ‘developing world’ appear twice in the entire lesson plan. First, as part of the portfolio project, where “Students will create a proposal to convince the U.S. Congress to take a more active role in assisting developing nations with water and sanitation infrastructures” and later, when asked to “List examples of what a person living in a water-rich area can do to help alleviate the problems experienced by those living in water-deprived areas.” There is no mention of the issues of water in the U.S., despite growing concerns

throughout the country. The concept that it is a ‘developing’ country problem is further perpetuated with another portfolio project that asks students to “visit (<http://www.water.org>) and create a Venn Diagram comparing water and sanitation conditions in two of the five following countries: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Honduras, India, Kenya”. Having established the students’ position of dominance in relation to those in ‘developing’ countries, in need of these students’ assistance, students are then asked to “create an invention to assist with the collection, distribution, sanitation or any other aspect of the global water crisis”. Though there is a brief discussion of the unequal distribution of water across the globe, as well as a mention of the concept of ‘virtual water’, students are not asked to reflectively engage with their role in the global water crisis or how their habits, self-understandings, and location in the world are integrated (or implicated) with the issues of water ‘over there’. In addition, even in discussing the 1929 Nile River Agreement, there is an obvious lack of historicity throughout (merely stating history, without contextualizing that history).

Got Water?

I would like to turn to the second lesson plan – PBS.org’s ‘Got Water?’. This lesson is also meant for grade levels 9-12 and links to a list of standards similar to, though much less ambitious than, the previous lesson described. In this case they limit themselves to the Social Studies standards. The learning objectives are described as: “Students will learn that delivering clean, fresh water to citizens around the world involves and affects politics, economics, international relations, and technology.” There are three parts to this lesson plan, broken down into: “1) Introduction to topic, homework assignment; 2) Developing a proposal for water-sharing, presentations; 3) Presentations and discussion.”

Part 1 begins with a question meant to stimulate a brainstorming session. The pre-amble states: “Fresh water is a limited natural resource. Communities throughout the world are faced with the same question: Is there enough water to support local industry, agriculture, and human consumption?” Students are then requested to think about their own town and factors that might affect the ability to provide water to citizens. They are then asked to think about whether the issues are the same on a state and national level. Finally, as part of this brainstorming session, students are asked to contemplate where water comes from and why, specifically in regards to the following factors: water sources, technologies, governmental policies, and the economics of water. In the structure of the lesson plan, these issues of local water are never revisited.

Following the brainstorming session, students are introduced to water issues in Turkey, Syria and Iraq, using a print article, “Middle East Water: Time Running Out” and an audio segment from NPR, “Tukish Dam”. The main focus of both the article and audio segment are the various responses to Turkey’s decision to build a dam on a waterway that impacts upon all three countries. After reading the article and listening to the audio, students are divided into three ‘teams’, representing one of the three countries. They are given the task of creating a national position on the water issues regarding the dams in Turkey, where “the ultimate goal is to find a cooperative solution for all three countries.” Students are expected to conduct further research on their own and complete an individual written report. The specific parameters of these reports include: 1) information about water issues facing their assigned country (agriculture, economy, environment); 2) the impact Turkey’s dams will have; and 3) the political context and outstanding issues with the other two countries.

Part 2 of this lesson asks students to come back together in their groups, with finished reports in hand, to ‘formulate their country’s water position and elect a team spokesperson.’ The list of guiding questions for this section include the following:

1. Where does your country get its water?
2. How does your country provide water for its citizens? Make sure you address all water needs, not just domestic consumption.
3. How does your team advocate cooperation with the other two countries?
4. Has your country had any conflicts (military or political) with the other two countries attending the summit? In what ways have they involved water issues?
5. What are your proposals for resolving these problems?
6. Can you come up with ways that would provide the basis for a water-sharing plan?
7. Does your country have water resources that it can afford to share?
8. If so, what will you expect in return for sharing your water?
9. If your country does not have enough water and needs to secure water from the other countries, what can you offer in return (e.g., other natural resources) that would encourage the other countries to share water with you?

I share these questions in detail because they are an essential feature of the process through which this lesson is attempting to teach the students. They are meant to help students come to a certain set of conclusions over others (discussed below). The final stage (Part 3) is the group presentation and debate, in the form of a ‘summit’, when an attempt is made to negotiate a mutually beneficial solution.

Though I find much that is useful in this lesson, including the attempt to address the complexity of negotiating such issues as water access, it has many of the same weaknesses as the previous example. Both lessons maintain a highly nationalistic orientation, without taking into account the highly political and arbitrary nature of national boundaries. Both maintain an uncritical stance of market-based solutions to issues of water distribution. Both assume that the

‘issue’ at hand is ‘not enough water’, rather than exploring other potential causes of water scarcity (such as water-intense agricultural practices, poor infrastructure, unsustainable nature of urban centers, etc.). Neither attempts to discuss issues of power differentials. Neither places the issue within its complex historical context. In this case, Turkey, Syria and Iraq have very complex historical conditions that have led to the current configuration of power relations between them. In addition, there is not a fostering of exploration into the role of the U.S. with respect to those relationships. For example, the U.S. is heavily involved in all three of these countries, which also contributes to the constellation of power relations between them. As this lesson is targeted at U.S. secondary school students, this is an important aspect to consider, especially because it is also teaching them how to understand themselves in relation to the world. Although there is room in the lesson plan for students to explore some of these issues on their own initiative, it is not fostered from within the structure of the lesson. It is easy to see though, how a student, or a classroom full of students could complete this entire lesson plan and arrive at the conclusion that the Middle East, as a whole, is entirely unqualified and unable to resolve their own water issues. It is also easy to see how students approaching this lesson with negative views of those in the Middle East might have those negative views emboldened and deepened. With any kind of instruction like this, there is another outcome beyond the topic at hand. Not only are students learning here to conceptualize the complex nature of global water issues, they are learning to understand their own relationship to them as well. This lesson doesn’t take place in a vacuum. Students are surrounded by a variety of resources guiding their perceptions and approaches to this lesson plan. They are in a context where Samuel Huntington’s ‘Clash of Civilizations’ is widely accepted and perceived to be the norm, where Islam is often seen as the ‘enemy’, portrayed as such by the popular media. There is already a widely held perception in

the U.S. that the Middle East is full of nothing but extremists, terrorists, and suicide bombers. The first sentence in the article associated with this lesson plan does nothing to either engage or dispel any of these myths: “Already troubled by economic woes and sectarian conflict, the Middle East is facing an imminent new danger that could plunge the region into famine and war.” This statement is followed shortly by the statement: “The Middle East is living on a time bomb.... It could explode at any time.”

The point is that in a situation like this, where politics are evoked, but not engaged from a critical perspective, whatever views that students enter with, will be fortified, amplified and extended. The authors of the lesson are attempting to historicize the issue through such comments as: “Regional politics also contributes to the growing water problem, as the nations that share the region’s main river systems have been unable to rise above historic rivalries to cooperate in the development and allocation of precious water supplies.” However, this comment removed from the context of the current situation – where for example Iraq was been under sanctions for over 10 years and suffered two external invasions from the U.S., whereas Turkey has been receiving support from the U.S. and is positioning itself to join the European Union, among many other external and internal factors – creates a space for students to ignore contemporary and historical situations which are largely contingent on historical contexts and largely implicative of their own positionality.

The problem with information-based learning is that it asks, or more specifically – in a context framed as ‘problem-based’ requires, students to propose a ‘solution’ based on small amounts of decontextualized knowledge. It assumes a distance between ‘knowledge’ and ‘reality’ in that students are expected to ‘construct’ knowledge under the assumptions of an apolitical and neutral distance. They are given a ‘set of knowledge’, as if they were being given a

set of bricks, and asked to build something new out of that set of bricks. This not only limits what they can build and the usefulness of it, but it limits how the students think about the process of building. If students were asked to reflect on the source, the weight and the validity of the bricks themselves, they might decide that there are other ways of doing things. They might begin to imagine anew.

This is not to say that teachers are not able to work toward fostering a critical and reflexive global perspective in their students through an information-based approach. What it is saying is that the method, or approach, in itself is not the key. Rather than creating more efficient modes of ‘banking knowledge’, it is the active and continual engagement, discussion and examination of issues within a context of historicity, relationality, reflexivity, and criticality that can foster the imagination and allow students to imagine how things might be differently, in a way that does not maintain the legacy of colonialism, imperialism and oppression so integral to any ‘global issue’.

Chapter 6

Experiential Education: Observing From Up-Close

“Every experience is a moving force. Its value can be judged only on the ground of what it moves toward and into.” (Dewey, p 38, 1968)

Education Abroad, the most current term for Study Abroad, has a long history in the U.S. Higher Education system. Years ago, a small number of (normally) privileged students would spend their Junior Year abroad, normally in Europe, which would bestow upon them a certain amount of social and cultural capital. This social and cultural capital is based upon the perception that an experience abroad invokes an automatic sense of knowing that others cannot have. It assumes that what is learned abroad is naturally educative and positive. In those days, before the advent of modern communication technology, the experience was much different than it is today. The length of stay was generally longer and the support structures largely lacking (including the support of fellow U.S. citizens), all of which most likely led to a very different kind of experience than what can be had today. The current trend, in an effort to ramp up study abroad numbers, and therefore perceived levels of campus internationalization, is toward shorter-term, faculty-led, group programs. There has been much discussion in the Education Abroad field as to whether these kinds of experiences can be as, more, or at all educative when compared to longer, more independent sojourns. Another interesting movement is toward the nomination of ‘non-traditional’ destinations, often interpreted to mean the ‘developing’ world. The program that I will discuss in this chapter is both a short-term, faculty-led, group program, as well as one to a ‘non-traditional’ destination, Pretoria, South Africa. The group of fifteen participants were all practicing educators seeking a Master’s Degree in Global Studies in Education. This group was particularly interesting to me because they all had already been thinking about how to

internationalize their own practices, and were actively engaged in doing so. I thought this a unique opportunity to process *with* them how they were thinking through their own processes of transformation and what that would mean for their own practices. The study tour was built around the set of epistemic virtues discussed in Chapter 3 -- historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality, and imagination. In concert with these virtues, all of the activities and discussions were structured to explore and foster these as well.

As the field of Education Abroad developed, specifically in the post-World War II years, there have been a number of accompanying social, economic, political and educational forces that have both changed with it and influenced the shape and direction that it would take. Anthony Ogden (2006) discusses some of the logistical issues which have a fairly serious impact on the academic aspects of study abroad,

As the field of education abroad positions itself for dramatic enrollment growth, it is important to consider in what directions it should develop. Liability concerns, heightened consumer expectations, and mounting logistical and administrative burdens are already impacting the very nature of education abroad from how programs are structured to the fundamental education students receive. During this time of rapid growth and change, it is important to know more than ever what learning outcomes result from participation in education abroad, to understand what it is we truly want students to learn through this experience and how we can effectively support them in achieving it. (p. 109)

The same underlying assumptions exist that did in the 'Junior Year Abroad' era – if you get students 'out', they will learn from whatever experiences they have. The question, however, is *what* they will learn. John Dewey (1968) discusses this at length in his book "Experience and Education",

... the trouble is not the absence of experiences, but their defective and wrong character – wrong and defective from the standpoint of connection with further experience....It is not enough to insist upon the necessity of experience, nor even of activity in experience. Everything depends on the quality of the experience which is had. The quality of any experience has two aspects. There is an immediate aspect of agreeableness or disagreeableness, and there is its influence upon later experiences. (p 27)

Ogden (2007), in his article, 'The View from the Veranda: Understanding Today's Colonial Student', describes at length the ways in which quality experiences are discouraged and prevented structurally in the study abroad programs designed for today's 'consumers' of experience. As he states, "we build education abroad programs based primarily on U.S. student demand and then secondarily concern ourselves with issues of intercultural integration." (p. 40) This is reflected in much of the literature that motivates most Education Abroad funding. For example, according to the Lincoln Commission Report published in 2005 called 'Global Competence & National Needs', the reasons that they feel that the U.S. government should support Education Abroad is to support the goals of:

1. Globalization and Economic Competitiveness;
2. National Security
3. U.S. Leadership
4. Educational Value of Study Abroad
5. Active Engagement in the International Community.

However, when looking at what is meant by 'educational value' in this report, they use a list of survey results from study abroad returnees to illustrate this value. These results find that study abroad, "reinforced their commitment to foreign language study", "allowed them to acquire 'skill sets' important to their career path", "influenced them to study other cultures", and "that their study abroad experience continued to influence their perspective on world events." (p. 9) All of these relate to the first three reasons mentioned (global competitiveness, national security, U.S. leadership), more than they indicate any sort of intrinsic 'educational value'.

Another issue in Study Abroad which comes up frequently is location. According to the Lincoln Commission Report (2005), "Despite the growth of the Pacific Rim as an important

center of economic power, and the emergence of China, the former Soviet Union and Africa on the world's economic stage, two-thirds of Americans studying abroad do so in Europe. Fully one-fifth of these students are in the United Kingdom.” (p. 17) In the report, and in much of the Education Abroad literature, there is an emphasis on changing that ratio, “if vital American interests are to be served.” (p. 18) Ogden (2007), in his discussions of the tendency to build veranda's from which students view their host culture, emphasizes,

The unfortunate irony inherent in education abroad is that instead of dispelling myths or false perceptions of risk, we may actually be perpetuating them. As the field becomes more institutionalized and standardized, the stronger the barrier between the student and the host culture becomes. . . . Individuals learn to perceive the world through perceptual lenses that are filtered by their own social and cultural backgrounds, and as such education abroad's insistence on minimizing risk may be exacerbating their reluctance to engage with the unknown.” (p. 47)

S. Megan Che, Mindy Spearman and Agida Manizade (2009) highlight that this is especially disconcerting in ‘non-traditional’ destinations,

There is a high probability that such study abroad programs will occur in former colonies; by the 1930's, colonies and ex-colonies (of formal European governments) covered 84.6% of the land surface of the globe (Loomba, 2005). Given this colonial context, formal educational endeavors such as study abroad programs conducted in less familiar destinations carry a risk of perpetuating highly inequitable practices and relationships rooted in the earliest West/non-West interactions and continued to this day, despite the nominal independence of former colonies. This risk increases as one's level of understanding about global, international relationships decreases. That is, we are positing that the less one knows and understands about the influences and actions at work when two nations come into contact, and the historical implications behind such contacts, the more one is likely to think and behave in a manner destructive to the people, culture, or environment of the less familiar destination. Students who understand what it can mean to be socially conscious and who are actively becoming more socially conscious can engage in decolonization (San Juan, Jr., 1999). Understanding theories of postcolonialism and privilege can broaden one's understanding of historical and current global interactions and the power structures embedded therein, thereby increasing the possibilities for a more responsible, authentic international exchange. (p. 110)

Essential to this idea of stepping off of the veranda, is an understanding of what experience is and how it relates to education. In U.S. Higher Education, there is a growing movement toward all forms of experiential learning, including internships, study abroad, service learning and practicum. Michael Woolf (2006) explains that the growth of much of this has “been stimulated by a combination of the notion of the exotic as an attraction in itself with the missionary-like sense that, somehow or another, an American presence is an added value in developing countries. This is study abroad being constructed somewhere between the travel agency and the Mission.” (p. 137) The likelihood of myths and misconceptions being challenged in the search for the exotic or the quest to ‘serve’ is small, as they are not seeking to dispel these misconceptions, but in the design assume that they are already known. To provide an example, while an advisor for International Studies majors, I had a number of students who would opt for a Spring Break ‘Service’ trip, where they would go to some destination (generally Central America) and assist in, for example, building houses for a week. These students would spend considerably more money on these experiences than their friends who opted for the beaches of Cancun and they came back, more certain than ever, that they had experienced the ‘real’ location. They would also come back, more certain than ever, that the local populations were in desperate need of their assistance. However for many of them, it would be the end of their engagement in such activities, because they were frustrated at the ‘lack of will’ of the local population to accept that assistance. Their experience is what Dewey refers to as ‘mis-educative.

Part of the goal of this Study Tour to Pretoria, South Africa was to see if we as individuals, or as a group, could step off of our veranda on this kind of a short-term program. It was also meant to allow the participants, many of whom had traveled extensively, and many of whom were considering taking their own students abroad, to process what the obstacles to that

‘stepping off the veranda’ might be. We operated under the same constraints that Ogden mentioned: risk management, safety issues, need for comfort and access to technology, etc.

Pretoria Study Tour

Before I left, friends would tell me that they were scared for my health or that I needed mosquito netting and toilet paper. They would tell me that I would be living in mud huts and most likely be attacked by rebels. They told me that I was crazy to go to a place that was so dangerous. I think mostly they were afraid for me because it was different and because any time one leaves the United States, one was asking for trouble. Despite, and even perhaps because of these warnings, I wanted overwhelmingly to go. I wanted to see something other than myself and my story. I wanted to see how different the human experience could be. (study tour participant in post-tour reflections)

In general, it was the average short-term study tour. We had a main content focus (water issues), we covered issues of politics, history, culture, economics, and education. We covered the tourist trails. There were a few things however, which were not average. First, the group, as I mentioned before were educators actively engaged in understanding the processes involved in ‘coming to know’ global issues. Another of these was an intense focus on a series of ‘debriefings’ throughout the experience on the issues of study abroad in general. I think that for many of the students, this allowed them to reflect on their own experience, and perhaps challenge some of their own apprehensions throughout the tour. Finally, they had an intensive pre-departure preparation, which included an overview of study abroad issues, an introduction to the history and politics of South Africa and an introduction to global water issues. We also met twice online upon return to continue to debrief. Students were asked to submit reflection papers about their experience. The topics discussed represented a large range of issues, though there were a few experiences which had a large impact upon how the students processed the

experience as a whole. When we arranged these activities initially, we merely had some sense that we wanted to provide multiple perspectives, first-hand narratives, and accompanying visuals to support those concepts which were perhaps more ‘foreign’ to them. The three experiences which stood out the most are a visit to an orphanage, a visit to the headquarters of a social movement (and a subsequent impromptu ‘field trip’ with them) in Soweto, and a guest speaker who was a secondary school student of Afrikaans descent.

Children’s Center One of our ‘on the ground’ tour coordinators, a South African faculty member who had spent some time at our home University, arranged for a visit to an orphanage. It was not on our original schedule (or curriculum plan), but we were happy that he offered to arrange it. When I brought it up to the participants in our pre-departure meetings, they were thrilled and immediately started thinking of things that they could bring for the children. In the end each person brought an extra suitcase filled with books, clothes, pencils, etc. We had read articles and had discussions about ‘poverty tourism’ prior to departure as well. Though there was excitement initially about the planned visit, as the time drew nearer, some became hesitant about the legitimacy of the visit. One student wrote, “It may be safe to say that the majority of us felt anticipation accompanied by some level of discomfort when we drove into the children’s center that day.”

What we were greeted with however was far different than the participants had expected. A husband and wife who had over the years taken in forty-five children. The word ‘orphanage’ may be a bit of a misnomer. This was not a temporary location for children while searching for permanent families. These children were not looking to be adopted. They had, in essence, become one very, very large family. They grew their own food, raised chickens, helped each other with homework, shared chores, and so on, all on a compound no larger than the average

middle-class home in the suburbs of U.S. cities. Yet, it did not feel crowded to me. After initial greetings, and a tour of the house, they gathered us in a shelter that they use for church services. The study tour students gave their gifts, and the children performed dances and songs that they had prepared for us. Many of the students commented that this experience challenged their notions of what ‘poverty’ should look like,

At first I had imagined that the children would be very young and small, and I was a little surprised to learn that the majority were over the age of 8. More than likely, the imagined orphanage in my mind had been created from media images – movies and infomercials like “Feed the Children,” which evoke pity and compassion in our hearts through carefully selected images of big eyes and little bodies. I was thankful for the lesson learned through this experience, however. The image of need cannot be generalized. It comes in all colors, shapes and sizes. (study tour student in post-tour reflection)

These happy and hopeful faces were not what they were expecting. One participant commented on her surprise and pleasure to hear that one of the secondary school girls planned to become a doctor.

After the formal presentations, the study tour participants broke off and chatted with the children, took pictures, and exchanged addresses. Eleven of the fifteen participants chose this experience as one that was the most important to reflect upon in their post-departure papers. Most of them reflected on the awkward dichotomy of feeling so connected at the time of the encounter, but upon our departure grappling with feelings of having committed ‘poverty tourism’. One student commented,

When we visited [the] Children’s Center, [our host country contact] said that we were seeing the “Real South Africa”. I would argue that we saw one of the real South Africa’s, and that we saw carefully and artfully selected snapshots chosen by [our two host country contacts] and the other coordinators of our study tour. This is fine, and we had a limited amount of time in which to accomplish many things within our framework of study. However, we must bear in mind that our perspective on South Africa is not holistic. We did not experience many contrasting situations through different eyes. As I stated previously, what I saw differed greatly from anything I have experienced in my own life. But, our South Africa tour was of one stratified layer of an extremely complex social

system. We must remember this as we digest and process the experience, lest we end up “otherizing” the people we have visited.”(study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

Anti-Privatization Forum If the visit to the Children’s Center was a case of the ‘developing world’ not acting like the participants thought it would or should, our visit with the members of the Anti-Privatization Forum was even more disconcerting to many of them, specifically the organization’s dynamic spokesperson Trevor Ngwane. This is a group that is known internationally for its fight against the privatization of water and electricity in the former townships of South Africa. They are located in Soweto, outside of Johannesburg, but are actively involved throughout the country and across the world. Along with similar movements in India and Brazil, this group has made an intense impact on discussions of the privatization of services such as water and electricity, including in places such as Atlanta and Detroit, in the U.S. One participant wrote,

Trevor Ngwane has a voice and a presence not easily ignored. As we sat around a long table in a small, chilly room at the APF headquarters in Soweto, we were mesmerized by the stories and the passion of this man. Ngwane and his fellow APF members were the voices of the oppressed, and their message was clearly the rumble of resistance heard ‘round the world. They believe that water is a human right, and charging the poor for water is a violation of those human rights. According to Ngwane, the buying and selling of water for profit must be stopped. The oppressed will never benefit, and the “capitalists won’t get more responsible”. (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

What was particularly thrilling to some, and particularly disconcerting to others, was that this group engages in illegal shut-offs of pre-paid water meters. To provide some context, in the post-Apartheid era, specifically in the governmental policies of Thabo Mbeki, Nelson Mandela’s successor, the townships of South Africa became an ‘experiment’ in services privatization. With a staggering unemployment rate, many were unable to pay their water bills. However, as the South African constitution guarantees a right to (a certain amount) of water, the private companies devised the solution of pre-paid meters. They are installed in homes and residents

must purchase a card with a certain number of units on it in order to access the water. If a family is unable to afford water, they are given the minimal amount on a card, but no more. This amount is woefully insufficient for a variety of reasons, including poor infrastructure where 50% of the water is lost as the result of leaky pipes, yet the families are charged for this. Soweto, as is the case with all townships, was only meant to house temporary workers and therefore does not have the infrastructure to support the very dense communities which have become quite permanent there. What the APF does is to remove the pre-paid meters, so that families would have free access to water. This is an illegal act, though the APF does not see it as illegal. They feel that denying people the right to water is a far worse crime. After about two hours of discussion in a room with a number of APF members, led by Trevor Ngwane. They offered to take our group out with them on a disconnection. These are the moments that cannot be ‘structured’ in a curriculum. We decided to accompany them, but allowed those who were uncomfortable with the idea to stay in the vans that we had rented. In the end, a group of mostly white tourist-looking people pouring off of a bus with cameras in hand was enough to deter the resident of his original intentions. He decided not to have his meter shut off that day. Twelve of the fifteen participants wrote about this particular situation, and Trevor Ngwane in general.

The student comments ranged from deeply affected:

Comrade Trevor urges us to put a face to the struggle, to recognize the personal struggles of mothers, fathers, and children (Ngwane). These are our neighbors that are most affected by the neo-liberal programs imposed by governments and global financial bodies. These are our brothers and sisters that go unfed and under-nourished, without homes and work, without something as basic as water. This is our family, our loved ones, who have been stripped of dignity, who have witnessed the degradation of humanity, who have been denied the ability to participate politically. We must involve each other again in the social imaginative process and the active political struggle, for we are these people, whether at home or abroad. (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

To hesitantly understanding:

In order to understand the issue from Mr. Ngwane's point of view, I have to put aside by own perspective and think about what it has meant, historically, to be a black South African, deprived under Apartheid of any human dignity. ...If I put aside my own expectations about that to which I am entitled, I can begin to see a different perspective, especially when I think of South Africa's past, and what has driven them to the point of such desperate need.then anyone can begin to appreciate the perspective of the Anti-Privatization Forum with regards to water. Understanding the fall of Apartheid and the social activism apparent in South Africa, and their actions can be viewed within their own context, and not my own. (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

To critically skeptical:

When vast injustice is being done, passivity reeks of cowardice, and anyone can certainly sympathize or even admire the bravery and commitment that the APF exhibit in their honest pursuit of a flawed ideology. And in the case of South Africa, where violent revolt has played such an integral role in 'progress,' the means of effecting change peacefully can seem at the least outmoded, and at worst, fatally ineffectual. I do not propose here to solve the eternal question of when *it is* right to use force, but only to claim that the APF's justifications and methodology, in my estimation, have inadequately answered this question. (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

The experience obviously had an impact on the group. Yet each person experienced and processed it in their own way. While I find that interesting, what was more striking to me, as I went through the narratives of this event, was not what was there but what was *not* discussed. That is the *content* of the water issues that were meant to be at the core of each of these encounters. What struck me most was the difference in the way that Trevor Ngwane was 'processed', in juxtaposition to the Head of the Pretoria Water Institute, Prof. Cloete, who we had met with a few days prior. They both spoke of water issues at great length; they both presented a variety of materials, facts, statistics, opinions, and visions for the future. In many ways, their commentaries mirrored one another. Trevor Ngwane spoke of the ANC Freedom Charter, which spoke of the right to water, Prof. Cloete referenced the UN Charter for Human Rights. However, the Head of the Water Institute was a White male, who spoke technically,

calmly, and with authority. Trevor Ngwane was a Black male (tall, with a deep and resonating voice), who also spoke with authority, but also with a great deal of emotion and passion. What was striking in the student comments is that when they spoke of the visit to the Pretoria Water Institute, they spoke of the content of the presentation. Whether for or against the solutions being pursued by the Institute, they engaged with what was being said. In the case of the APF, though we had multiple presenters and they worked to ensure that they each had a time to speak, there was only mention of Trevor Ngwane, and for the most part, they talked about his passion, his expression and his presence, but very little about the content. In the pre-departure survey, I asked each of them, “What is the role of a participant in a study abroad to make the experience an effective one?” The answers were all similar in referencing things like open-mindedness, willingness to listen, etc. However, although they all were willing to listen, and listened actively, they each heard very different things and they heard different *people* in different ways.

I think that there are a variety of factors at play in this. First, the perspective of the APF was largely ‘crowded out’ by other perspectives more similar to the Head of the Pretoria Institute. Though we aimed for a range of perspectives in our pre-departure planning, and I think that we delivered that to some extent, the majority of the people that we came in contact with (both planned and unplanned) were of a class that was not directly impacted by pre-paid water meters. They did not live in the townships. Even those teachers that we met who lived and/or worked in the townships were not those who were subject to water cut-offs. Secondly, we had to make a special effort to journey ‘off of the veranda’ and into the APF compound to ‘hear’ what they had to say. But it was not only their words that were different, it was the entire experience. I would argue that the unfamiliarity of the surroundings, the modes of speech, the perspectives from which the ‘content’ came, and even the general ‘set-up’ of the meeting (less structured,

more conversational, etc.) made it more difficult for the participants to really ‘hear’ what the group was saying. Another impression that I had from the reflections, is that for some, the APF fit into a specific category – ‘activist’ or ‘revolutionary’, and by placing them in that category, felt that they had nothing to ‘learn’ from them because they already knew what they were going to say. For this group, Trevor Ngwane was more of a spectacle to behold, than a source of information. On the other hand, these same people felt that they had learned a great deal from the Head of the Water Institute. Finally, I would argue that in South Africa, as a result of its recent history, there is a much more politicized energy. In the U.S., teachers, especially, are encouraged to steer clear of all things political. I feel that the overtly political nature of the APF was disconcerting to a few. Some mentioned it in their reflections, one wondered whether such an experience was really appropriate on a study tour. What this illustrates is the multitude of ways that these experiences are both experienced and processed.

In regards to this particular event, I feel like we, as organizers, didn’t allow for enough ‘processing time’. We had traveled to Johannesburg for the day and this was one of many stops, all of which were intense sensory experiences. That day we had also visited the Apartheid Museum, Nelson Mandela’s house, and finished off with two lectures at a dinner party in a very nice area of Johannesburg. Many commented on the stark contrasts experienced that day. I think that we should have predicted that students would need a bit more time to process this than was the case for other events. This signals an important aspect of the logistics of study tours – the need for flexibility in the scheduling in order to fully benefit from the unique learning opportunities which spontaneously present themselves.

The ‘History Student’ Another ‘event’ which nine of the fifteen participants commented on in their post-tour reflections, was really not an event at all. It was a comment –

unprepared, and innocently offered up – by a secondary school student who had accompanied his instructor from a ‘Model C’ school (formerly reserved for Whites) to talk about their views on water issues. The student was a White male of Afrikaans descent. He was obviously at the top of his class, having won national recognition for a variety of projects. He presented those to us and spoke of the efforts to address water issues undertaken by his school, including such things as reducing the number of times per week that they watered the rugby field. However, it was in the question and answer session that followed where he made a comment which jolted a number of the study tour participants.

He spoke about disliking history and distrusting the recent affirmative action policies of the African National Congress. He stated that he did not enjoy the study of history, because he was tired of hearing about how “bad” his parents and grandparents had been during Apartheid, and he wanted to move forward. He also spoke very plainly against the affirmative action policies in his country, because they may make it more difficult for him to find employment. ... reminding me that there are many South African realities born from numerous and historically divided perspectives. (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

Many of the students were deeply disturbed by this young man’s attitude toward his own history. Others found that it resonated a bit with their own feelings at times, specifically those who were White and male. Another student commented,

As I spent time in South Africa, I was able to see the manifestation [of the abuse of power] in too many capacities, but I believe the Amandla! movie was the closest I came to emotionally understanding the use of power during this society. I say “emotionally understanding” because, honestly, I cannot even still mentally understand it. I do not even know if I want to mentally understand it because when I do I may learn history, but with that history I would have to know the “reasons” for such tragedy. I have absolutely no desire to ‘know the reasons’. Maybe, this is what that young, bright Afrikaner student was describing when he said that they do not have history courses. (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

I think that this quote encapsulates much of what is problematic in current Study Abroad practices. Students want to ‘understand’, in a neutral or cognitive sense, but they do not want to ‘know’, as this knowing would present a serious challenge to the ways in which they perceive the world as it could, should, and would be. Addressing this issue is not anything that can be addressed structurally in a study abroad program. It is something that comes largely from the pedagogical approaches of those leading the experience. As study abroad programs and study tours are scaled up, those who run them tend to be logistically-oriented coordinators, concerned with basic necessities, and safety issues. According to Che, Spearman and Manizade (2009),

...transformation and growth require an element of unease, and developing an understanding of privilege—attempting to locate oneself in the intricate series of power relations that define, to some extent, one’s reality—is imperative for socially just, globally conscious study abroad programs. Study abroad participants—especially those from dominant groups—that have not started to problematize their (ethnic, economic, social, or sociopolitical) status or critically examine privilege may not be prepared to constructively engage with experiences in stark contrast to their lived reality, such as encountering apparently impoverished peoples (Barbour, 2006). (p. 112)

I think that this sentiment of unease is eloquently described by one of the study tour participants,

Although, revelations about oneself are needed for change to occur, not all self-actualizations are easy to accept. In fact, I believe that the more one is self-realized, the more humble one becomes. ...Finding one’s identity is important to me, but the truth is, we may not like what we find. (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

These are just a few of the many experiences that study tour participants chose to discuss, however they were the three that were mentioned consistently. I assume that is because they were the three moments where participants felt a sense of ‘unease’ and were required to question themselves. I suspect that, as the student mentioned above, perhaps some of them did not like what they found. This is well illustrated in one student’s discussion of the unease of returning ‘home’,

I didn't understand the intense emptiness I felt upon my return. It truly felt like I had entered someone else's world, and that I had been forced to step back into familiar, but out-dated shoes. My thoughts were overwhelmed by all I had seen, the people I had met and the stories I had heard. The mental and emotional burden became too heavy, and it was all I could do to appear stable to those who *used* to know me. Following my return from South Africa, I experienced another unusual and confusing symptom. Suddenly, all I could notice was difference. Whomever I saw on the street, in a store, anywhere – if they were a person of color – my eyes were drawn to them. Black was beautiful and fascinating; the deeper the color, the more intrigued I became. In this new world, white became recessive, invisible, and empty. In a strange way, I became uncomfortable in my own skin, and it was unclear to me exactly who, if anyone, was the “other.” (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

I have not tried to highlight the differences between students' experiences, yet they each experienced this study tour in very different and unique ways. They all experienced ‘something’, but what that ‘something’ was, was very different for each. I will discuss this further in Chapter 8, as the same is true of the on-campus course, to which I will now turn.

Chapter 7

Spatial Approach: Putting It Into Practice

It may seem counterintuitive to begin studying ‘the world’ with a focus on your own local environment, but what this chapter hopes to show is that this is a productive approach to understanding the complex nature of global forces and flows because it has at its core a requirement to figure out where you fall within them and what that means. As Anthony Giddens (2000) explains, “Globalizations can thus be defined as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa.” (p. 92) According to Gruenewald and Smith (2007), a sense of ‘placelessness’ has become a common factor in many lives in this global era. With increased migration, the homogenizing forces of global processes, as well as an increasingly non-locally produced media, it is easy to become disjointed from that place where you find yourself. However, according to Rizvi (2007):

At a practical level, any attempt to internationalize the curriculum faces the highly entrenched traditions of educational policies and practices that remain largely locally defined, even if they are influenced by many external sources. Almost by definition, much of our pedagogic practice is local, where our priorities are informed by the immediate exigencies of our day-to-day lives. The immediate issues we have to deal with are invariably local. If this is so, then, I believe that our approach to teaching about global interconnectivity should begin with the local, but must move quickly to address issues of how our local communities are becoming socially transformed through their links with communities around the world. (p. 21)

In a place-based approach to global education, your *place* becomes the central starting point for analyzing issues that occur on a global scale.

The focus of this chapter is not to explain in detail what place-based education is, as this is done extensively elsewhere (Bowers, 2005; Noddings, 2005; Sobel, 2004) but rather to show, using the example of an on-campus course that I taught called ‘Understanding Global Water

Issues', how analyzing the notion of place within the local/global nexus can be a positive, and possibly a necessary, starting point for understanding the complexities of global processes. By understanding a single process, in this case water issues, in a location, and then relating it to another location, not only do students learn about this particular issue, but they learn how to explore other such issues on a global scale. This was the goal of this course. Water is considered one of the major global issues of our day, whether it is in terms of quality or access. It has been argued that within the next decade wars will be fought over water rather than oil. Understanding the complexities of an issue of this magnitude requires examination of the socio-cultural, economic and political factors which complicate any broad-based attempt to summarize the situation. This course looked at the emerging issues of water on a global scale through the use of narrative. We looked into water issues in the U.S., Mexico, Bolivia, Southern Africa and India, with an aim to contextualize the overlapping and competing concerns involved in global water issues and debates.

Place-Based Education

David Sobel (2004) describes Place-Based Education as the following:

...the process of using the local community and environment as a starting point to teach concepts in language arts, mathematics, social studies, science, and other subjects across the curriculum. Emphasizing hands-on, real-world learning experiences, this approach to education increases academic achievement, helps students develop stronger ties to their community, enhances students' appreciation for the natural world, and creates a heightened commitment to serving as active, contributing citizens. Community vitality and environmental quality are improved through the active engagement of local citizens, community organizations, and environmental resources in the life of the school. (p. 7)

Sobel (2004) then describes four new directions in school reform that can emerge out of

place-based education. They include the following:

1. From Extraction to Sustainability as the Underlying Metaphor

2. From Fragmentation to Systems Thinking as a Conceptual Model
3. From Here-and-Now to Long-Ago-and-Far-Away as a Development Guideline for Curriculum Design
4. From Mandated Monoculture to Emergent Diversity as a School District Goal

The first, from extraction to sustainability, seems an obvious goal of environmental education. However, where place-based education in practice generally stops is with the outer boundaries of the physical community in which it is actively engaging. Though this is often intentional and does not need to be seen as a limitation, it can become one. As Noddings (2005) suggests:

Young people are easily drawn to romantic and sentimental solutions. The so-called “tree-huggers” are right in wanting to preserve our forests, but they are wrong when they attack logging operations without considering how their proposed solutions may affect people and their livelihoods. If logging in a particular area must cease, how will the affected community survive economically? What are the best patterns of sustainable logging, and do they differ from one place to another?....Thus another question for global citizens to ponder in considering solutions to environmental problems is, *Whose* place will be affected? (pp. 59-60)

The second direction that Sobel highlights, from fragmentation to systems thinking, can be seen as a remedy to this problem, both in a locality and when making links to the wider world. This, again, seems an obvious advantage, but is harder than it might seem in that we can often feel bound by our disciplinary-based curriculum, reinforced by standardized testing. Sobel highlights the ability of students participating in this type of curriculum to transfer knowledge to both ‘near’ and ‘far’ related scenarios. This means that not only can they transfer what they have learned to issues which are either close in proximity or nature to the issue addressed, but also are able to apply that same kind of thinking to issues which bear less resemblance or which appear in contexts that are more unfamiliar to the students. This is partially implied by Sobel’s third direction, from here-and-now to long-ago-and-far-away.

However, it is not only this ability of ‘far’ transference that is implied in this third direction. He is also talking about the natural developmental stages of a child. Both Sobel and Noddings cite various studies illustrating that “there is a sensitive period during the elementary years when children are predisposed to bond with the nearby natural world” (Sobel, 2004. 20).⁴ Therefore the move from here-and-now to far-away should be seen as a natural learning progression, would be the move from tangible, hands-on to more abstract learning. This is important to a global studies approach in that understanding one’s own place (the here and now) in the complicated global flows and interconnections is generally more tangible and comprehensible than understanding those flows and interconnections on a wider scale. It grounds the students’ understanding. As an example, looking at the changing dynamic of industry (for instance a large factory closing and its effects on local residents) in one’s own town, may be a useful introduction to immigration issues in the US.

Finally, the fourth direction, from mandated monoculture to emergent diversity as a goal, is an essential feature of both environmental and global understandings as well. As described earlier, Vandana Shiva (1993), Comparing this to the introduction of monocultures in forestry and agriculture, Shiva shows how local alternatives begin to disappear because the conditions in which those alternatives thrive are altered at the most basic levels. What is being stressed here is the need and potential for new forms of knowledge to emerge when educational endeavors move away from the traditional disciplinary approaches to the more concrete, practical and complex. Without understanding how knowledge comes to be valued or devalued, or the ways in which it

⁴ This may be a point for further study, however, in that it could be argued that the ‘sensitive period’ is not necessarily an innate form of learning that changes into something else, but rather that this natural form of learning is disrupted by the rather un-natural structure of formalized education. It is difficult to imagine that children continue to bond with the nearby natural world while housed in square cinderblock classrooms and where ‘outside’ is considered to be a concrete playground, as an example. It would be interesting to explore whether this kind of ‘sensitive period’ fades in spaces like a Waldorf School or other environmentally-oriented learning environments.

is muted or distorted, it is not possible to begin to teach effectively about the issues presented here, or global issues in general. If we apply this same concept of ‘monoculture to emergent diversity’ to choices of curriculum-knowledge -- in other words, how we come to decide what we will and will not present or make available to students in this era of standardized testing in the United States -- we are in great danger of ‘disappearing’ the local knowledge, and connections to the local, of our students. In so doing, we are also disabling their ability to understand the wider systems and the global as well, as there is no solid base upon which to build.

Sobel’s (2004) framework offers a very useful starting point for those seeking to teach from a global perspective. What Sobel does not actively do however, is to connect the local knowledge gained to the global forces and flows that influence that knowledge. Noddings (2005) suggests that:

There are two basic ways in which educators can help students connect local and global interests. One is to learn to care for our own local places, thus learning that commitment to the environment requires work – not just talk. Another is to study local places appreciatively and communicate something about them to the larger world. Communication is, of course, a two-way process: we can tell the story of our own place, and we can listen to the stories told by others of their places. Both are powerful learning strategies. (p. 62)... It is hoped that as students study and write about their own homeplaces, they will become receptive to the stories of people in other places. (p. 64)

What Noddings emphasizes is the need for an appreciation and understanding of one’s own place, as well as an appreciation of the importance of place in order to be able to honestly appreciate and comprehend the stories that others tell of their own place. This, I am suggesting, is the fundamental starting point for understanding the complicated set of events, commonly referred to as globalization.

Finally, in Nel Noddings discussion of Place-Based Education, she claims the following:

Study of environmental problems in the United States – especially management of water – could also help students to understand what is going on in other parts of the world and why so many people are now protesting against the projects of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank (Bigelow and Peterson 2002; Stiglitz 2002).

It is this challenge that I have taken up in this portion of the study, to demonstrate how placing the ‘local’ as a central construct is well-suited to the task of understanding the global/local dimensions of water issues, and local/global issues in general. Essentially, what is key here is best summarized by Basso (1996), “If place-making is a way of constructing the past, a venerable means of *doing* human history, it is also a way of constructing social traditions and, in the process, personal and social identities. *We are*, in a sense, the place-worlds we imagine.” (p7) All places have a history. Without understanding that history and the power relations which forged it, contemporary situations of inequality cannot be understood nor addressed. For example, as the students explored Bolivia’s relationship with the World Bank, they came to understand that it is not one that occurs in isolation, but rather has deep roots in its colonial and post-colonial past – a relationship in which the US is deeply implicated. Without understanding that specific historical relationship, it would be nearly impossible to understand how one, living in Central Illinois, might bear any relation or responsibility to one living in Cochabamba.

On-Campus Course: Understanding Global Water Issues

I had the opportunity to teach this course in the Spring semester of 2009. The course itself was a part of a set of courses meant to introduce students to a variety of global issues, including such topics as migration, microfinance, human rights, etc. Because this was a one-hour elective course taught over 16 weekss, it was important to find a balance between depth and overburdening the students into flight. I tried to use a variety of media to help get the main points

of the course across, including documentaries, video clips of online lectures, one feature film, and a variety of news and academic articles. We began the course with a discussion of local water issues, of which most were unaware, particularly the fact that the water that they drink, shower with, cook with, etc. was privately owned by a German company. This put the issue of water privatization at the fore of all discussions that followed throughout the course of the semester.

To set the context, I wanted to explore the issues of multiple perspectives, as well as the use of narrative, as a means to set a framework for the course. We read William Cronon's (1992) "A Place for Stories: Nature, History, and Narrative". In this article, Cronon analyzes four different historical accounts of the Dustbowl. Each account took a different approach toward defining the causes (man-made vs. natural), the solutions (technological vs. demographic), and the way that it portrayed human responses to it (they survived it, they suffered from it, they conquered and tamed it). The next assignment was to watch the movie 'The Milagro Beanfield War', along with a clip from a documentary called 'Thirst'. The movie is fictional, but loosely based on the true story written for a Sociology dissertation about a small town in Colorado faced with water access issues. In essence, it is a comedy, which helped to display the caricatures of 'perspectives' in relation to the issues of water. This assignment was followed by some online lectures, including one by a water 'expert' and by two water 'activists' (the authors of the book and documentary 'Thirst'). After this framing of the issues and setting the context, we moved into our Case Studies. These included the U.S. Southwest; Cochabamba, Bolivia; Narmada Valley, India; and the relationship between Lesotho and Johannesburg in South Africa. In the process of examining these cases, we looked at the concepts of the Tragedy of the Commons,

and the concept of the ‘Hydro-Social’ Contract. We finished with a reading and video of Maude Barlow on the ‘Future of Water’.

Students responded to weekly journal assignments, to which I alone had access. They also spent some time in group discussion forums. The questions were designed in response to the assignments as well as classroom and online discussions. Also, we started a project mid-semester that lasted throughout the last eight weeks of the course. Students chose a country (actually, the assignment was to choose a location, which they all understood to mean country, though I explained that it could be a city, a region, a watershed, or any other kind of location). They researched the issues of water in that location and chose a specific focus to examine more in depth (for example, dams, pollution, access, etc.) I grouped them together based on similarity of interests and asked them to form an ‘NGO’, which they named, developed a mission statement, and created ‘action items’. This was not in my original plan. I will discuss later the reason for this adjustment.

There is much that is interesting that came out of this course. The students were quite diverse, in terms of major, national origins, first language, life experience, political orientation, major and overall approach to the world. I feel lucky that I ended up with the group that I did. The topic drew majors from the Environmental Sciences, Engineering, Political Science, English, Business and International/Global Studies. As the course was developed as a component of the Global Studies Major on campus, about half of the students were associated with that major. I think the diversity and receptivity of the crowd indicates several things. First is the natural tendency toward interdisciplinarity of a topic such as global water issues. Second is that students were quite excited to have a course that focused on ‘real world issues’. Third is the transnational nature of this kind of issue. The mono-lingual, mono-cultural student was the

minority in this class. The majority of the students were either first or second-generation immigrants, with some who would be classified as ‘international’. This also to some extent reinforces the notion that this is an issue of ‘others’, rather than one that concerns the ‘average’ U.S. citizen. And finally, that there is a willingness, an openness, and a perceived need to listen to one another across these disciplinary perspectives. I sensed from the students that they were acutely aware of the limitations of their disciplines, and though some of the Engineering students were less than enthusiastic about the length of some of the historical accounts, they dove in regardless. In other words, this cohort of students was different from the average group at this university. Similar to the group of students in the study tour to South Africa, this ‘globalized group’ of individuals provided me an opportunity to explore with them how they have been, are, and want to be coming to understand global issues.

I think the most useful way to examine the flow of this course is through the nine discussion/journal questions that developed. They speak very much to the ways in which the students were developing, as well as the ways that I tried to respond to them, while keeping in mind the overarching goals that I had upon entering the course – namely, maintaining attitudes and exploring issues of historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination.

The first question asked them to reflect on Cronon’s discussion of narrative and multiple perspectives:

Cronon, on p. 1374 (para 2) analyzes his own narrative on narratives. He also ends the article with a list of questions – all about values. Please reflect on your own personal values that you use in seeking out or creating the stories that help you understand the world. In 2-3 pages, tell your story of how you understand and organize the complexities of the world using any or all of the following to frame your discussion:

- What do you care most about in the world you inhabit?
- How do you use and assign meaning to that world?
- How does the earth respond to human actions and desires?
- What sort of communities do people, plants and animals create together?

- How do people struggle with each other for control of the earth, its creatures and its meanings?
- What is the mutual fate of humanity and the earth?

There is no correct answer, just thoughtful ones. You do not need to answer all of these questions, just any that might help you in your discussion. (2-3 pages)

The questions listed were taken directly from Cronon's article. My intention was twofold.

To help them synthesize a fairly complex (and lengthy) academic article, and to see to what extent they were willing and able to reflect on their own personal values. In a sense, this first assignment (and all of the following) represented a significant conflict of interest for me, which I think is characteristic of this kind of participatory research where the researcher is also a teacher (or the teacher is the researcher!). I was looking to see from where they were starting, so I could 'measure' some kind of 'transformation'. That was the role that I thought I was taking as the 'researcher'. As their 'teacher', I was also looking to see from where they were starting, but in the hopes of identifying a foundation from which all sorts of interesting dialogue and introspection might take place. At this point, the two did not feel mutually exclusive or contradictory. Reflecting back, however, I wish that I had taken more of a collaborative stance with this group, unlike those on the study tour, whom I considered co-conspirators in the quest for understanding this thing called 'global understanding', I approached these undergraduate students as 'subjects' of my research, rather than partners. This served to lessen the overall impact of the learning opportunity, as well as the research opportunity. Regardless, the students poured their hearts and souls into this first assignment. I learned a great deal about each of them, and they seemed excited to have an opportunity to share in this way. I have heard critiques of this approach, that students seem content with anecdotal evidence and that asking them about their experiences reinforces, or legitimizes, the tendency toward anecdotes over in-depth

research. However, I find Freire's (1998) assertion that we must begin with what students' know, or their "common knowledge":

Ingenuous curiosity, from which there results, without doubt, a certain kind of knowledge (even though not methodologically rigorous) is what characterizes "common sense" knowing. It is knowledge extracted from pure experience. To think correctly, from the teacher's point of view, implies respect for "common sense" knowing as it progresses from "common sense" to its higher stage. It also implies respect and stimulus for the creative capacity of the learner. It further implies a commitment on the part of educators and teachers that respects the critical consciousness of the learner, in the knowledge that the ingenuous consciousness of the learner will not be overcome automatically. (p. 36)

In their discussions of their understanding of the relationship between humans and nature, as well as a thoughtful examination of how they see themselves and how they approach the world and that relationship (between humans and nature), the students expressed a range of perspectives. Some considered humans a virus on the Earth, using the film 'The Matrix' as an example of how they visualized the relationship. Others expressed the sense of a "symbiotic" or "mutually interdependent relationship", with discussions of "balance", "harmony", "equilibrium", "cooperation", and even "a complex web of dependencies". This perspective assumes that humans and nature are separate, but interconnected, which allows questions such as "What will go first, humanity or the Earth?" Interestingly, only one student suggested that humans are 'a part of nature'. Perhaps it was the phrasing of the question. There seemed a general consensus though that "the world is a tough place filled with more cruelty [and greed] than there is good."

In regards to how they were understanding their own orientations toward this relationship and towards fellow humans – there was a constant theme – the need for "empathy", "sympathy", "understanding", "joy of learning", "honesty", "openness", "the value of mutual dialogue and consensus in decision-making and conflict resolution", "family and friendship", "citizens of the

world”, and “hope”. If there was a central theme that ran through these narratives, I would explain it as this: the world has become bad through a growing self-interest, greed and consumption (generally attributed as the fault of the ‘Western modernized approach to life’); the Earth is suffering as a result, to the point of near destruction; however, I am a generally good person and I want to do something about it. In short, I understood the general theme of these narratives as the desire to understand a growingly complexified version of the world, yet along with the feeling of being overwhelmed by the ambiguity, uncertainty, and vastness of the task. I feel that this quote captures this general sentiment:

Somewhere from the age of 14 to 22, my meaning for the world has made a dramatic change. I no longer feel connected to the person I was at age 14; I no longer see the world in black and white. I always thought that with more education one would become surer about the world and life. This has been quite the opposite for me, I feel more and more confused each day. What is right and wrong? Is it even that definite? As I stand at a crossroads in my life I use an explorative narrative to explain the world. I now see the future as less black and white, which makes creating a middle to the narrative tough. (on-campus student in journal response)

The student continues on later,

Leaving former beliefs and forming new beliefs is the defining aspect of my current narrative. I am going to end in a far different place than where I began and I arrived at this point through confusion and exploration. Wherever my personal narrative takes me I will remember where I have been. (on-campus student in journal response)

In other words, as these students are coming to understand the complex realities of global inequalities, of global environmental issues, and of their own personal histories, they are also grappling to make sense of how these fit together. In so doing, they create a narrative which, in Cronon’s terms, has a beginning (cause), middle (consequences) and an end (future directions). There was very little dispute on the beginning: the push toward a technologized, modernized, and alienated (self-interested) way of living, as propagated by all those who came before us. There also seems to be a general consensus on the middle: growing inequity, dwindling natural

resources, growing environmental and economic calamity. However, there is a vast array of difference in regards to the end of this story. Much of the difference could be traced back to the specific understandings of the relationship between the beginning and the middle (or humans to nature), but all, without exception, peppered by the hope that good people like themselves will do good things to make it change. What those “good things” are is the point that is contentious. It seems a simple enough story, but as we explored it further, many contradictions and questions began to emerge. To illustrate, we need go no further than assignment #2 (assigned after viewing ‘The Milagro Beanfield War’, and two online lectures providing an overview of global water issues):

We have now seen a few examples of the ways in which water impacts the way that people live, their livelihoods and their life opportunities. In 1-2 pages, describe the main issues that arise when there is limited access to (good quality) water. What are those most important issues that water policy needs to take into account? Also, give a brief outline of how each of these issues might be addressed – in your opinion. Remember that these are meant to be thought pieces, rather than research papers – feel free to pull from the videos and readings, but also your own experiences and understandings.

A student, who responded to the first question with the following,:

The environment, the Sun, land, air, and water, as well as the animals within it give us beauty, sustenance, humor and raw materials. In turn, we have taken much and given back very little, and what we have given, in the form of CO₂, oil spills, and nuclear waste, have been negative and destructive. I deal with this knowledge of clear exploitation by looking to the future, by seeking new ideas and techniques that might reverse humanity’s destructive influence and turn it into a positive one. (on-campus student in journal response)

responded to the second question, stating:

As Americans, most of us have been fortunate enough never to have been confronted with the moderate to extreme water shortages affecting some parts of the world. I believe that this is one of the main reasons why I believe we have a responsibility to educate ourselves about these problems and try to work towards solutions. The fact that our infrastructure and technology has afforded our lifestyle the comfort of fresh water 24/7, it is obvious that we have done something right. These improvements and technologies

work, and should be shared and implemented with those parts of the world where water scarcity is an everyday concern. (on-campus student in journal response)

The student also references one of the online lecture, from Dr. Peter Gleick:

Dr. Peter Gleick revealed that there is no place on Earth where there isn't at least enough fresh water to meet basic human needs. The problem lies in the lack of willingness of governments and people around the world to put in the money and effort needed to improve infrastructure to such a degree that this water can be transported to those people who need it. (on-campus student in journal response)

So, even though the student feels that there is one story being told, there are actually multiple stories intersecting along the way. The beginning and middle of the first story is the despoiling of the earth through modern endeavors, and the end solution is more technology to fix what has been broken. However, this story, though it appears global, is really about a certain sector of society. In other words, the 'we' in the first response... as in 'we have given back CO₂, oil spills,' etc. is not referring to all of humanity, it is referring to the modernized, westernized folks with the 'comfort of fresh water 24/7'. There is another story being told at the same time, about the non-westernized, non-modernized other – the 'uncomfortable' – who are uncomfortable as a result of a 'lack of willingness of governments and people' to improve their own conditions. This is the danger of this kind of narrative, one that appears universal, but in reality is not without a critical and reflexive process. This set of quotes is fairly representative of the contradictions that began to emerge and continued to develop throughout the course.

Another contradiction that became apparent was a general distrust of corporations, yet an almost fundamentalist dependence on a market-based system to regulate water distribution. Corporations are responsible for polluting and over-using "our" water resources, but as our conversations continued, privatization appears to many of them as the best solution for "their" water problems. This will be discussed more later.

The next task for me was to try to place various situations of water scarcity in juxtaposition with one another, so that they might examine the similarities and differences. I chose Tucson, Arizona and Cochabamba, Bolivia to begin with. There are a number of reasons for the choice of these two cities, most of all though, they are well known cases. There are a number of books, articles, films etc. about each situation, which allows for a number of different perspectives, or narratives, to come out. I began with Tucson, because for the majority of the students, it is much closer to ‘home’ than Cochabamba. We read a chapter from a book called “Water Follies” and looked at the varying types of water law in the United States. The question that followed our discussion was:

Based on these descriptions [of types of water laws in the United States], and Glennon’s reading, discuss how you would regulate water in a city like Tucson, Arizona that would balance the environmental, economic, cultural and social dimensions of water allocation. What would you expect of the federal, state and local government? Which legal system (or a variation thereof) would you employ to address the concerns over water shortages? Take into account the historical dimension of water allocation as well. In what ways would you negotiate the change from the present ‘prior appropriation’ doctrine to your system?

Part of the impetus for this question came from a desire to bend to their incessant focus on ‘doing something’. In the surveys that I conducted at the beginning of the course, I included the following question: “In a perfect world, what would you *hope* to gain from taking this course?” A majority of the students answered that they wanted to know what to *do* about global water issues. In our class discussions as well, we would discuss the depth and scope of the issues, and the question would invariably come back to, but what do we ‘do’? This question was meant as an opportunity to think this through: if you were given the ability to design the law that regulates water use and distribution in Tucson, what would you ‘do’? However, the question was not taken to favorably by some of the students. They felt that it was unfair. One person asked,

‘How can I begin to know the ‘correct’ answer, when I know nothing about Tucson?’ Another suggested that the assignment was a trick of some sort. Perhaps it was in a way, I wanted to ‘trick’ them into thinking about all of the many aspects of water that we had not yet addressed (or had only begun to). In a sense, I guess I wanted to ‘trick’ them into accepting the partial-nature of their knowledge in general and the impossibility of ‘knowing’ all that there was to know. I was hoping that this would make them think about what they had yet to discover about the history of Tucson; its particular location near, but not on, the Mexican border; its role as a downstream consumer; the local political configuration; and so on. It wasn’t really a trick. I was hoping to use what they perceived as obstacles to this assignment as a starting point for further discussion.

Others dove right in, creating “semi-autonomous, community-elected councils who were then answerable to a council higher up in the hierarchy”; requiring “drip irrigation” for agriculture; and developing “tax incentives for voluntary relocation”. Only one student suggested the need to “change practices that are now rooted in culture” (as opposed to Cochabamba, where this was commonly mentioned). In general though, there was a sense that government (local, state and/or national) was the appropriate regulating agency for water, yet again, based on market-driven principles (water is scarce, it should cost more). Interestingly, almost all discussions of inequality in access disappeared. The narrative went, if there are people in Tucson who cannot afford the elevated rates based on scarcity, they should not live there, and should be given some sort of incentive to move.

Needless to say, I was a bit disappointed by their responses. I felt that they had shown themselves well in the first assignment and I had looked forward to seeing that same ‘compassion’, ‘hope’ and ‘innovation’ that they had so whole-heartedly self-proclaimed. I tried

to use this assignment as a springboard for discussion in the next class meeting, but I hit an unexpected wall of resistance. The more that I tried to complexify the discussion – illustrating how the multiple proposed solutions reflected their various sets of values and beliefs, most specifically on the relationship between humans and nature – the more I sensed and heard an impatient demand to let them know which one of them had gotten it ‘right’. One student asked, “So, if we all proposed different solutions, which one do you think is the best?” They, in general, were looking to me to legitimate their ideas, not to complexify them. This push for the ‘right’ answer persisted throughout the course. In my journal, I wrote, “They don’t want to learn *about* water issues. They want to learn what to *do* about water issues. The two are not the same. How can I convince them that if they want to know what to *do*, they need to know *about* water issues first. How can I even begin to approach issues of criticality and reflexivity, if they aren’t even willing to learn those things about which they are supposed to be critical and reflexive?” This frustration on my part, I feel is an illustration of my role as ‘researcher’ getting in the way of my role as ‘teacher’. I was only listening ‘for’ certain things, not really listening fully to them. If I had really been listening to them, I would have taken the course in a much different direction than I did. I would have stepped back, slowed down, listened harder. Instead, I kept trying to drill in the ‘multiple perspectives’, because I felt that it was a precursor to understanding issues of historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination. I felt like I needed to ‘break’ them of their insistence on a ‘correct’ answer. I needed this course to ‘work’, I needed it to produce something useful so that I had something to write about.

So in that vein, the fourth assignment was similar to the previous two. I presented two arguments in relation to the notion of ‘The Tragedy of the Commons’, one that supported the notion and one that critiqued it. I asked them to again try to identify the ‘values and assumptions’

upon which water laws are based. I had hoped that after our discussion, they would have a heightened sensitivity to these ‘assumptions’. The opposite from what I had hoped occurred. Instead of describing the underlying values and assumptions, they described the laws themselves. I felt like I was failing at my task, but again, if I had been listening, they were telling me something quite profound. They were telling me that this was all new to them, and that they had never considered a possible critique to the notion of Tragedy of the Commons – people are greedy, they will always take more than they need, no matter what or who it will hurt. They were also telling me that they wanted to side with the critique of this notion, but couldn’t see their way there yet. Their lived experience didn’t provide that perspective. One student commented,

Believe it or not, after six weeks of learning about the global water crisis, I am more confused than ever. Yes, I have started to have a more global perspective on my daily life. However, I’ve started to notice that everything regarding water issues links to another essential issue to human survival. Because water is such a vital resource to mankind, competition over it is serious. Often times, the government has to interfere and enact laws that either restrict or limit water usage.

In essence, they repeated what they had already stated: humans are greedy, corporations are greedier, and they don’t know how just yet, but they have hope that it will change.

I felt like I needed to take a step back and evaluate where the course was headed. I could see interest waning and felt it in their less than enthusiastic responses. The following two weeks we focused on the water issues in Cochabamba, Bolivia. This allowed us to take a look at the issues of water privatization in a different light. Examining issues of water privatization critically from within a U.S. context proved difficult, as there very easily appears to be no other alternative. In Cochabamba, the citizens worked quite hard to show that another path was possible. I decided not to ask them to respond specifically to the videos, articles and discussions on Cochabamba. Instead, I asked that they use that time to pursue their own research on the

topic. To figure out what questions came up for them and seek out information that would help them to work through those questions. They did do this, as was evidenced in livelier classroom discussions and much more in-depth questioning. Upon reflection, I feel like I was trying overly hard to ‘guide’ them on some ‘path’ of enlightenment. I had a plan to force them to think deeply about their positionality, to reflect deeply on the meaning of that position, to analyze critically the political configurations that influenced the various global flows that acted on their location and those locations of others. After mid-term, I changed the plan a bit.

The 5th World Water Forum was approaching; in preparation, a synthesis of the previous World Water Forum was released. I asked the students to choose one of the main topics addressed in the synthesis: Water for Growth and Development; Implementing Integrated Water Resources Management; Water Supply and Sanitation for All; Water for Food and the Environment; Risk Management; Water Financing; Empowerment of Local Stakeholders; Science, Technology and Knowledge Sharing; Targeting and Monitoring; Right to Water; Parliamentarians and Local Governments. They were then asked to relate their chosen topic to the situations in the U.S. Southwest and Cochabamba, Bolivia, with an invitation to continue to search outside of these resources for further information. The idea was to provide some primary source material through which they could work out some of the questions that had been raised. I was surprised at how much they really took to this assignment. They weren’t trying to figure out the answer that I was looking for. Instead, they just really took the time to think through the meanings and the differences. One student, who focused on the topic of Empowerment of Local Stakeholders, found a small example in Tucson of a small community that formed a collaborative to better regulate and manage their water usage and focused on the difficulties for community empowerment in a U.S. context. Another student found an article on immigration

between Bolivia and Argentina and how the Argentine financial crisis put increased pressure on the Bolivian economy. This student related this to the situation between the U.S. Southwest and Mexico. The relationality and reflexivity that I had been trying to squeeze out of them, flowed out on its own accord. However, there was an overwhelming apolitical nature to their analyses. There were comments in regards to their faith in the U.S. government in terms of regulation, but a lack of faith in any other governments to do the same.

They continued on individually with their projects, while the in-class discussion turned to the issue of dams and water access in the Narmada Valley in India and in Lesotho, in relation to Johannesburg, South Africa. We viewed two films (one on each) and read a few articles. I made another change in the course arrangements. Originally, I had asked them to submit all of their thought pieces to me alone as journal entries. I did this specifically to please the regulations of the Institutional Review Board on research on human subjects. As I needed to protect their anonymity in my writing, I had not fostered online discussion between the group. This unique group, who had multiple perspectives, who had a variety of experiences in regards to water issues, and who were more than willing to share had been limited in their ability to grow and develop together for the sake of protecting my rights as a researcher. For the final assignments, I asked that they post them to an online forum where they could converse with one another. I am unable for this reason to quote directly from them, but I can provide some general comments. After discussing the dams built in the Narmada Valley and their social consequences, there was much debate back and forth about the overall value of large-scale dams. Some felt like the benefits outweighed the costs, others did not. Very few mentioned issues of politics and power in this process, except to explain why the dams were poorly constructed. The entire discussion was largely ahistorical as well. In contrast to this, the film that we viewed in regards to Lesotho and

South Africa focused specifically on the legacy of colonialism and apartheid. It wasn't until this time that they began to engage with the original narrative that they had proposed – that Western modernization had caused severe ecological damage. Once this issue was mentioned, it was taken up by others. For example, that large dams are attempting to fix a problem caused by modernization with more modernization and, therefore, were doomed to have the same kinds of negative impact. Issues of local knowledge were brought up. Also, there was discussion about the role of international financial institutions on the decisions of governments in 'underdeveloped' countries. These issues had all come up previously, but were not engaged with. I think that this is largely as a result of the way that I had structured the course to benefit my research agenda, rather than their collective growth. I feel like the students made significant gains in these last two assignments which were a discussion as opposed to an individual treatise.

Finally, the course ended with our own mini-Water Forum. The students presented their NGO's that they had created and their proposed agendas. Again, I was impressed with the ways in which students really engaged with one another and the projects. They took the task very seriously, even though they knew that it was not a part of their grade. They played their roles as members of the NGO community and they asked very thoughtful and interesting questions of one another. I left that final course feeling as if we had just begun to scratch the surface. For me, teaching is very much like one of the students on the study tour course described... "you come together, you get to know one another, you share of yourself, and as it is beginning, it all ends." However, I feel that we learned a great deal from one another. A few of the students have since reported back that they have chosen to focus on water issues in subsequent courses, because their curiosity was awakened in this brief encounter.

Chapter 8

Discussion: What I Think That I Learned

There is a complicated contradiction to be found in ‘educational’ endeavors which seeks to foster introspective reflection, criticality, and dialogue in order to provide depth and meaningfulness, in that the whole notion of formal education, as it is practiced on a larger scale in the U.S., is largely normative; whereas the process of fostering criticality necessitates a critique of that same normativity. This contradiction has been acknowledged by many progressive educators. In relation to this project, the goal was never to find ‘a’ way of internationalizing or doing global studies, but rather to explore some approaches that might help to make internationalization efforts more meaningful, and less ‘mis-educative’. Freire (1998) sums this up well, “If education cannot do everything, there is something fundamental that it can do. In other words, if education is not the key to social transformation, neither is it simply meant to reproduce the dominant ideology.” (p. 110) It is the process that ultimately shapes the outcome. As such, to privilege a focus on outcome can inadvertently lead to status quo solutions, despite well-meant intentions. Hence, there is no short-cut to global understanding, as it is not a ‘destination’, it is a process, and therefore there is no ‘end’ to it either. What this implies, for me, is that it is not the *mode* of delivery that matters, whether information-based, experiential or place-based, as much as it is the relationship between that particular mode and the pedagogical orientation taken. Each of these modes discussed here have the potential to be highly educative, as much as each have the potential to be highly ‘mis-educative’, depending on the pedagogical process that informs its execution in the classroom.

What this study has reaffirmed for me is that there is no ‘formula’ for introducing globally-minded thinking; there is no set of activities that inspire criticality, reflexivity,

relationality, historicity and imagination. These emerge as much from the pedagogical approach, as they do from the curriculum. These two aspects – curriculum and pedagogy – cannot be separated. The most comprehensive and thoughtful lesson plan means nothing if it is not taught from a comprehensive and thoughtful perspective. This is not a new idea. For example, Freire (1998) wrote, “to know how to teach is to create possibilities for the construction and production of knowledge rather than to be engaged simply in a game of transferring knowledge.” (p. 49)

However, it is especially crucial for efforts at internationalization and the developing field of global studies to keep these issues – both of the construction of knowledge, as well as the need for criticality – at the forefront of their planning and practice. There are two reasons that this is so crucial. First, global studies and internationalization are dealing with highly complex, spatially disbursed, transdisciplinary issues. If they remain embedded in traditional, or commonly-used practices, they will not only lose their legitimacy, but will also seriously limit their efforts to achieve their original purposes – whatever they may be (security, economics, sustainability, etc.) Second, these fields are tied up with issues of identity in ways that many traditional academic disciplines tend not to be. To ignore this, is to ignore what Moya (2006) referred to as the pedagogic potential of identity. But also, to ignore it will lead to a higher likelihood of ‘mis-educative’ experiences, which can limit both personal and academic growth. Finally, global studies and internationalization efforts must develop what Freire (1998) refers to as “epistemological curiosity”, which “through greater methodological exactitude appropriates the object of its knowing.” (p. 37) This means that there is a need to interrogate knowledge, including the ways in which it is constructed and disseminated, beyond the stages of merely ‘constructing’ it.

To provide an illustration of what I am trying to explain, I would like to return to the concepts of the ‘imperatives’ discussed in Chapter 2. What is important here is that the purpose defines the goals, which in turn defines the means of achieving those goals. These three together determine what kind of possibilities are within the purview of the imagination. For example, if the *purpose*, or imperative, for an educational endeavor is national security, the *goal* may be more fluent Arabic speakers (as is currently the case for the U.S. government), the *means* then would be language training (not focused necessarily on broader political context). If the *purpose* is global competitiveness, the *goal* may be to understand global markets, the *means* might be defined as learning more economic modeling (in this case language becomes de-emphasized). If the *purpose* is global environmental sustainability, the *goal* may be to end resource depletion and overexploitation, the *means* may be to better understand resource use and cultural and social factors which determine it. Each of these is based on a particular social imaginary – how we understand the ways in which the world works. To take these examples further – to their potential implications, the study of these above mentioned processes, without the fostering of ‘epistemological curiosity’, could potentially lead to a situation of, in the first case, poor intelligence and poor decisions which leads to an increased threat to national security rather than mitigating it. In the second case, this could lead to a decontextualized system of monetary governance with poor long-term planning, which could lead to a financial crisis. In the third case, this could lead to band-aid solutions which create worse long-term problems, both socially and ecologically. I provide these hypothetical examples, because they clearly illustrate some of what happened within both the study tour and on-campus course. In both cases, there were individuals who were, for many reasons, not as ready as others to challenge their own epistemological

locations. This is a result of both where they ‘were’, as well as a lack of ‘starting from where they were’. To explore this more in depth, I would like to turn to the original research questions.

In what ways are students coming to understand the subject at hand?

This question, when I started on this project, seemed like the easiest, the ‘comprehension’ level question, a matter of creating a list of the observable. It has become, for me, the most difficult to answer, as there is no ‘list’ that could have any sort of meaning. However, there are three aspects that I feel are important to discuss in regards to ‘how’ students are coming to know.

a) The students are largely focused on the content (the ‘strange attractor’), in this case water issues, yet what they express that they are learning is largely about the complicated dynamics between politics, economics, social and cultural forces and themselves. b) The ‘how’ of coming to know is largely related to ‘who’ is coming to know. In other words, each person created for her or himself a unique journey toward a deeper, fuller understanding. Much of this related to how open they were to challenging their own previous understandings. c) The importance of dialogue – both with the ‘teacher’, as well as with fellow students, and fellow ‘people’, as was the case in the study tour.

To begin with, I had chosen the topic of ‘global water issues’ to be the focal point through which these three different approaches to internationalization might be examined, because it is an exceedingly complex issue and one that is truly global. Water is an issue for everyone. Most students commented on this fact at some point in their reflections (on both the study tour and on-campus courses), but then quickly moved to the ‘so what’ or the complexity of that question. I had suspected that there would be those that would be more comfortable in the realm of facts and figures, yet not one person even attempted to remain in that realm. I have gone

through both courses, including content and assignments, and it would have been possible to do so. This I find interesting. Absalom & Verdura (2006) discuss this same issue in regards to a research project on internationalization undertaken in Australia,

From this preliminary study [about internationalization and study abroad in an Australian context] there is one startling conclusion to be drawn: students bring an integrating, complex view of internationalization to their study which clashes with the disintegrating, more simplistic view transmitted by the task-based orientation of the curriculum. That students need to point to comparative tasks, arguably fundamental, as a way of developing international perspectives underscores the degree to which pedagogical approaches to embedding international perspectives in the curriculum need to be reassessed. Simply adding *international content* is not enough. This is particularly the case with today's undergraduates who are attuned to a globally interdependent environment in ways that perhaps older faculty members are not. (p. 332)

What this signals to me is that these students came into these experiences – or perhaps chose these courses because – they have an already well-developed notion that the world is a complex place. In neither case did we need to dwell on issues of interconnectivity or interdependence. These were givens brought in with the students and based on prior experience and study. What they were looking for was a complexification and analysis of that interdependency and complexity. They wanted to know how to respond to it. They have already become skeptical of positivist modes of knowledge production, though perhaps were at different stages of imagining what other modes of knowledge production might look like. They were also largely skeptical of the ‘selectivity’ of the information presented to them, and preferred to augment their experiences with independent research. Again this may signal the uniqueness of these particular groups, but is notable nonetheless.

The second point is in regards to the ‘who’ of coming to know. According to Ogden (2006),

Education abroad helps students change learning structures, learn new paradigms and become more complex individuals. If a student's structures are not ready to be opened, the student then has only one mono-cultural frame in which to encounter experiences....When (or if) they discover that others do not share those views, the tendency is to denigrate those who are different and to reaffirm that the group one belongs to "has it right." When stressed, during periods of cultural adjustment, for example, students often return to this mono-cultural, dichotomous way of thinking. (p. 91)

I would extend this beyond only education abroad, to include any form of internationalization effort. As I mentioned, there were a number of situations in both of the case studies where students were not in a place to challenge their own mono-cultural framework. In both experiences, I felt that there were a handful of people who, in a sense, ended up back where they had started. They experienced and processed all of the same things, yet returned to their initial point of reference. It is important to note that it was not that they were less rigorous than the other students. Actually, these were some of the 'best' students in traditional terms: returned all assignments on time, read all of the assigned materials, participated in discussions, etc. Yet their conclusions at the end of the course were largely echoes of what they had said in the beginning of the course. In other words, their understandings had been reaffirmed through the process. I went back to the pre-departure surveys to see if there was anything that was similar between this group of individuals. I also compared their surveys with those who seemed to have experienced the most transformation, in the sense of challenging their own pre-conceptions. In both cases, I had conducted a pre-departure survey asking them specifically how 'ready' they felt to participate in the world. What was strikingly different was that those who seemed to end where they had started were those who expressed the *most* confidence in their knowledge about and ability to interact with the world. Those who experienced the most transformation were those who expressed the *least* amount of confidence in these two areas. What this signals to me is the

relevance of what Freire (1998) refers to as “the cultivation of humility and tolerance.” (p. 65) Because certain students already felt like they ‘knew’ what to expect, that is what they experienced, or ‘heard’. I want to clarify that there were not people who were ‘transformed’ and others who were not. Each person, including myself, had to struggle to make meaning and to remain ‘open to hearing’, in different places and in different ways.

Finally, the importance of dialogue was absolutely striking. By dialogue, I do not mean only discussion, but dialogue in the sense that Aronowitz (1998) describes:

Education takes place when there are two learners who occupy somewhat different spaces in an ongoing dialogue. But both participants bring knowledge to the relationship, and one of the objects of the pedagogic process is to explore what each knows and what they can teach each other. A second object is to foster reflection on the self as actor in the world in consequences of knowing. (p.8)

As I mentioned in Chapter 7, as a result of my efforts to protect my rights as a researcher, I inadvertently stifled dialogue in the first part of my on-campus course. I am glad that I chose to change that orientation, as what it reinforced for me was the power of dialogue. Suddenly, this group, who did not really know each other, really got to know one another, and began to challenge one another’s conceptions and learn from one another, from a position that was incredibly respectful of their varying orientations. In the case of the study tour, there were several contentious moments, especially in the evening chats that took place outside of the formal program. Yet these were reported as some of the most valuable learning experiences by the participants. One incident in particular, which was quite emotional, brought both participants to a place where they were required to reflect upon their own expectations to be ‘heard’ without first ‘listening’. Again, what this signals to me is the important relationship between pedagogy and curriculum. Dialogue cannot be ‘structured’ into the curriculum, whereas ‘space’ for dialogue can be; and it can be fostered from within the flow of the educative activities.

How are issues of identity used and challenged in this process? How has my own identity been challenged in this process?

Many of the students on the study tour spoke of the multiple ways in which their identity evolved and was challenged in the process of studying abroad. For example, one participant, who reflected at length on her own evolution, commented,

The process of identity formation is extremely personal and subjective which makes it difficult to evaluate. I was skeptical of the degree to which study abroad could significantly enrich a person's academic experience because I felt too many factors were involved for a sound judgment on the relevancy of study abroad to be made. Is it enough to learn about oneself and to experience personal development or are these secondary goals to the academic agenda of universities? What is the priority? How possible is it to track genuine growth once the nostalgia and "emotional highs" wear off? In essence, how real would the transformation be? ... Although originally doubtful, my experience in South Africa has challenged the reservation I had in believing that study abroad could initiate lasting and beneficial identity transformation. (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

Again, I expected identity to play a role in the process of coming to know, as I mentioned above. What I had not expected was how central identity was to understanding *the issues* (in this case, water) at hand. In other words, I had expected the 'flow' to go something like: using the topic of global water issues, approached from a perspective that encourages an examination of issues of historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination, students would come to more deeply understand water issues and in the process also learn a little something about themselves. What actually happened was quite different. The 'flow' was reversed: by examining global water issues *along with* examining issues of identity, students were able to incorporate issues of historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination into their process of coming to know. In other words, there were two 'lenses' in the end – that of water issues and that of identity. In terms of my evolving understanding of the purpose of each of these epistemic virtues,

I believe that this is a more appropriate implementation of relationality and reflexivity, than I had originally imagined. Another participant of the study tour summarizes this,

As a member of a study-abroad program, we each have the opportunity to evaluate individuals' opportunities and responsibilities within a particular context, perhaps a context very different from our own, and then to evaluate our own commitment to social change within those particular economic and political dimensions. (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

Though this was less blatant in the on-campus course, identity played a similar role, as a lens through which (or a pedagogical tool, in Moya's terms) students came to understand the complexity of the water issues, and water issues were a lens through which they were able to examine their identity.

In terms of the way my own identity has been altered in this process, that too was different than I expected. As I mentioned in the Introduction, this study has been a long and personal process. In the process of this study, my own identity has changed drastically as well – from a single graduate student, to a wife, mother, and full-time employee – all of which has helped to develop my understanding of what is at stake in the process of internationalization. Pat Sikes (1997) discusses the ways in which parenthood alters teachers' perceptions of their role and practices as teachers. The same is true for me. My own orientation toward the purposes and practice of education has developed significantly as it has become all the more personal.

My family accompanied me to South Africa, which, I believe, also afforded me a different kind of 'status' amongst the participants. Many were older than me, with grown children. Others were attempting to enter that stage of their life. I am fairly certain that those 'bonds of motherhood' set the stage for very different kinds of exchanges. One participant who was unable to have children commented that it had created for her a particularly difficult scenario, in that the 'off' hours were often dedicated to swapping 'mom' stories, in which she

was unable to participate. In addition, my husband was able to ‘bond’ with the male participants in a way that I would not have. This study is as much his as it is my own. He has offered insights into how the ‘other’ gender experienced the tour differently.

In a broader sense though, my understandings of the purposes and aims of internationalization and global studies has evolved through this process. I came back from my Peace Corps experience with a different kind of ‘mission’ than the one with which I was sent. I was determined to ‘educate America’ about those parts of the world that – through ignorance – it continues to exploit. As any ‘mission’ must be, it was subject to continual problematization as time progressed. At first, I was convinced that it was a lack of *information* about Africa that was missing from the curriculum. If only we *knew*, we would act/ be /understand differently. But, this is not the case – the point that I hope to have made in Chapter 5. There is more to it than merely adding information, and it is also not enough to merely send students to ‘see’, both of which I have advocated and participated in. In my time as an academic advisor for students in a major where study abroad is required, I came to understand the multiple ways in which student stereotypes were reinforced through their time abroad – increasingly *because of* the way that programs are now structured to prevent institutions from suffering any sort of liability issues, among other reasons. Yet, a handful of students would return transformed in their understandings of how the world worked. I questioned myself often as to whether I was only measuring this in terms of how I thought that they should be transformed, or if it was something deeper. That was the purpose of this study, to explore the possibilities of focusing on virtues of criticality over content (information) so that students would not only be learning what I think they should learn, but rather learning beyond what I, they, or we, currently consider to be within the realm of possibilities.

In addition, I have always identified myself as a ‘teacher’, even within my administrative roles, however my role as researcher altered the way that I would normally approach teaching. I was trying hard to place myself within a ‘framework’, work with methodologically sound principles, respect participant anonymity, and so on. Things that I have never needed to concern myself with in my past teaching experiences. In so doing, I was listening so hard for certain things, that I missed a great deal of very useful, very insightful and very pertinent learning opportunities. In the on-campus course especially, I felt like I had to be the ‘expert’, in order to justify my role as ‘researcher’, at the expense of focusing on the co-construction of knowledge. What this emphasizes for me is the need to view research, not in a definitive, positivist sense, but rather as a process that is integral to learning and teaching. I feel that this experience has allowed me to see myself in a research-role, but one that does not compromise the relationships with or between students. I too was stifled by the ‘research methods’ that I thought I knew, but have, in this process, also learned to imagine anew.

In what ways do students critically reflect on their own social imaginaries? In which ways do they engage with it in the process of imagining something new?

Another point that became clear to me is that whether or not an experience is ‘educative’ or not, matters. At the end of the study tour, another student wrote:

I was so touched by the fact that they were willing to let complete strangers into their world, which was so different than our own. They were open and honest with us. I began to truly get a sense of “Ubuntu”, which I had heard several people talk to us about. In this moment, I began to realize that perhaps South Africa did not need us from the West to come in and rescue it as much as we needed the people of South Africa to rescue us by showing us the true meaning of community, service, and humility that often times seems so absent from our daily lives.” (study tour participant in post-tour reflection)

Very few of the others on the trip reflected on the experience in this way. This represented a significant change in this person's attitude, from the beginning of the study tour. Dewey (1968) discusses the two integral aspects that constitute 'experience,

The two principles of continuity and interaction are not separate from each other. They intercept and unite. They are, so to speak, the longitudinal and lateral aspects of experience. ... As an individual passes from one situation to another, his world, his environment, expands or contracts. He does not find himself living in another world but in a different part or aspect of one and the same world. What he has learned in the way of knowledge and skill in one situation becomes an instrument of understanding and dealing effectively with the situations which follow. The process goes on as long as life and learning continue. (p. 44)

What this means to me is that this student, as a result of the 'interactions' experienced as a part of this study tour, will carry this new-found orientation toward the world into future experiences, which will then make those specific experiences different *because of* this new orientation. In short, this student's social imaginary has been altered, which creates the potential to imagine new possibilities that were not previously available.

What this study has helped me to understand is that social imaginary and identity are two very separate, yet interlinked constructs. Just as there are certain aspects of identity which are more firm and less likely to change, the same is true of the social imaginary. Though students on the study tour were presented with vast amounts of challenges to their social imaginary, many held firm to certain aspects of their identity in order to be able to come to terms with their new ways of imagining how the world might operate differently. On the other hand, I feel that in the on-campus course, it was quite the opposite. As an example, many students were unable to imagine an alternative to water distribution that was not strongly based in a market system, yet they were much more open to challenging aspects of their own identity. This may be a result of

the very different age ranges within the groups, or perhaps the differences in the types of previous experiences. This would be an interesting area for further research.

In what ways does the introduction of such epistemic virtues as historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality, and imagination influence the ways in which students come to understand the subject and themselves? In which ways did my emphasis on introducing these virtues influence the flow and outcomes of the courses?

As mentioned above, I feel that the ‘flow’ of the two courses was much different than I had originally expected. In the case of the on-campus course, I attempted to ‘introduce’ these virtues, as if topics of the course. This did not work as well as I had imagined. However, when I stopped trying to ‘introduce’ these virtues, and instead listened to the students, I was able to *foster* thinking and analysis that respected and pulled from these virtues instead. However, this was done very differently in the two courses. Dewey (1968) addresses this,

It is not enough that certain materials and methods have proved effective with other individuals at other times. There must be a reason for thinking that they will function in generating an experience that has educative quality with particular individuals at a particular time... Failure to take into account adaptation to the needs and capacities of individuals was the source of the idea that certain subjects and certain methods are intrinsically cultural or intrinsically good for mental discipline. There is no such thing as educational value in the abstract. (p 46)

In short, what this emphasizes to me, is the importance of fostering these values in those who will be doing the ‘internationalizing’, as it is important in incorporating them in the planning of internationalization efforts. For example, the participants on the study tour were Masters students, practicing educators, and people who had already been thinking long and hard about the meaning of ‘global-mindedness’. For them, it was more important to allow them to ‘practice’ these virtues and to reflect upon their practices. On the other hand, the undergraduates in the on-

campus course, for the most part, had not been exposed to these kinds of concepts or approaches, though were somewhat predisposed to the concepts. Again, according to Dewey (1968),

I have been forced to speak in general and often abstract language. But what has been said is organically connected with the requirement that experiences in order to be educative must lead out into an expanding world of subject-matter, a subject-matter of facts or information and of ideas. This condition is satisfied only as the educator views teaching and learning as a continuous process of reconstruction of experience. (p 87)

Again, the importance of praxis is highlighted here. It is the relationship between the teacher and the students and a practice informed by theory, which can lead to the process of beginning to imagine anew. Finally, what this also requires is the recognition that this is a ‘continuous process’, there is no end. It is not possible to ‘inject’ these virtues, which then leads to ‘epistemological curiosity’, which then leads to some sort of knowing, full stop. These virtues must continue to underlie the processes of teaching and learning in a continuous cycle of coming to know ‘better’, a continuous process of struggling in a dialogic fashion to negotiate the complexity of the world, the complexity of our identities, and the complexity of our social imaginations.

Outside of these specific questions, there were a few other issues which became clear throughout the course of this study. The first is the importance of flexibility. In each of these experiences, it became quite clear that there was a need for flexibility to allow students to come to know in ways that worked for them. Some experiences took more time and energy to process, some inspired very different kinds of responses, which participants benefitted from working through together. The other aspect that made itself clear, is the need for humility in the face of complexity. Students who were able to remain humble in the face of such large ambiguities as those with which they were presented, tended to benefit more from the overall experiences. Finally, the importance of the notion of complexity made itself known. Though these students

came in with a notion of complexity, they were very much engaged in both of the cases to understand what that complexity looked like. This was not a focus of either of the courses explicitly, though it was an underlying current throughout. The point of the virtues of historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination were to better understand and envision the meaning, purpose and relevance of complexity.

Chapter 9

Future Directions

Summary of Study

As a result of a push for increasing internationalization efforts, institutions of Higher Education in the U.S. have begun promoting a wide range of efforts toward campus internationalization, including the most well-known, that of study abroad. This study has looked at three traditions of these internationalization efforts to examine the potentials and pitfalls of the various approaches. These include an information-based, an experiential and a spatial approach. These modes of engagement are examined through the lens of a set of epistemic virtues, meant to complexify and deepen the meaningfulness of the experience. These virtues include historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination.

This story of internationalization efforts was told in three parts, reflecting my own developing understanding of the nature of internationalization. The first part looked at an information-based approach. This was done through the analysis of two different lesson plans about global water issues, designed as ‘add-ons’ to current curricula, which were both targeted at a secondary level audience. The other two traditions were examined through case studies in practice. The first case study involves a study tour to South Africa, or experiential education, that focused both on issues of water, but also on issues of study abroad as well. The students involved in this tour were all practicing educators who were pursuing a Masters degree in Global Studies in Education at the time. The second case involved an on-campus elective course that I taught called ‘Understanding Global Water Issues’. This was a course for undergraduate students

designed mostly for international and global studies majors. However, the group that eventually enrolled in the course was quite diverse in terms of disciplinary background.

I chose these three traditions, as opposed to just one, because all too often internationalization is equated with study abroad alone, yet it is, can be, and must be so much more. There is an extensive base of literature on study abroad, yet other forms of internationalization, which are far more wide-reaching, are left highly under-theorized. Currently, only about 6% of students in the U.S. study abroad, even with growing numbers. This means that effective internationalization must occur at multiple levels and what this study has attempted to illustrate is that it can – and that these levels can reinforce one another. However, what this study also shows is that an ‘add-on’ approach without a comprehensive plan or structure and without elements of criticality will not be as effective, and would potentially be ‘mis-educative’, which in turn closes down future possibilities to engage and learn.

“Part of Western epistemologies is tied up in a ‘historical predisposition to kinds of explanation that posit a single central governor; that such explanations appear... more natural and conceptually simpler than global, interactive accounts.” (Urry, p. 24, 2003) The goal of this study was to examine the ways in which people were coming to understand this issue – it was helpful for me to have a group that was more in-tune with their ‘global identity’ to assist in this process. This was a unique set of individuals, it would be interesting to see how the responses and reactions would be different if the groups were more randomized, as opposed to self-selected. What I feel this study has shown, however, is that the *mode* of internationalization efforts is not the primary issue, so much as the purposes and the processes involved in selecting and delivering.

In the case of the lesson plans that were examined, each had pedagogic potential. The main issue that emerged is that in both cases, they were teaching students to see water as a problem for ‘others’, which nurtures a paternalistic attitude toward those most affected by water issues, in that students are asked to propose solutions, but never asked to interrogate those aspects of the ‘story’ that they might not yet (or ever) know. In this sense, these lessons have a high potential to be ‘mis-educative’ in that they delimit the possibilities for both active self-reflection, and productive engagement with the issues at hand, leading to an attitude of disengagement, feelings of being overwhelmed or unaffected, or what Friere refers to as a sense of fatalism in regards to the inevitability of these kinds of issues. In both cases, they encouraged a dichotomy which discouraged practices of relationality and reflexivity. They allowed only for limited – and decontextualized historical accounts, and did not actively foster aspects of criticality. This does not mean that any of these virtues are precluded, they are just not fostered as an integral component, aim or goal of the original narrative of these lesson plans. To reiterate, this is important because these lessons are teaching much more than just water issues, they are teaching students how to view themselves within and against the wider world.

Though a study tour allows for a more intensive experience – this also means that that experience can be more intensively ‘mis-educative’. If students remain ‘on a veranda’ and are not challenging or asked to challenge their frame of reference, than there is a higher likelihood that their preconceived notions will be reinforced and deepened. In order to prevent this from being the case, there is a need for active interrogation of identities and social imaginaries. In other words, it is more important than ever to employ identity as a pedagogic tool. The main issues that emerged from the study tour were that what the students got out of the tour was

largely related to what they came in with (attitudes, points of reference, values, etc.) combined with their openness to critically examine their own positionality and histories.

The issues that emerged from the on-campus course were similar. However, there was another aspect that became quite clear from this third part of the study. That is the point that these epistemic virtues are not ‘content’ to be taught. The content and the attitude with which the content is approached are two separate but interrelated aspects, which signals the deeply intertwined relationship between pedagogy and curriculum. This has implications for internationalization and global studies in general, but also has wider implications for Higher Education in the U.S. which is undergoing a rapid change toward scaled-up market-based models of content ‘delivery’.

If I had to choose the ‘one’ thing that I learned from this study however, it is that the *depth* of criticality matters. It is not a matter of trying to provide a more in-depth experience for the ‘A or B’ students, those that can ‘understand’ the depth. We are all actors in this world. We act upon the world and upon one another. We all have experiences and we are all capable of learning ‘something’ from those experiences. We choose how we will act, and that choice is based upon our understanding of how the world works. In addition, we choose from within a set of perceived options. It is largely the role of the social imaginary that limits or expands our perceptions of what is within the realm of possibility. In this era of ‘globalization’, where our actions are so much more interconnected and impactful, what we *do* matters. How we choose what we will do matters. Doing without thoughtful ‘choosing’ also matters. Whether our students end up in upper echelons of government making policy decisions with wider reach or whether they end up starting up their own small business, they are acting on the world and on each other. As teachers, we have a small window of opportunity to assist them in their lifelong struggle in

coming to know the world, and their relationship and responsibilities to it, and this should not be wasted. I had the opportunity in my on-campus course to provide the students with a decontextualized list of facts and figures about the coming global water crisis. And they could have then left the course with the same sense of inevitability and ‘fatalism’, with which they leave many of their other courses; and some did. Others, however, left the course with a deeper understanding of themselves and their relationship to the world. They left with questions, not answers, with which they will continue to grapple, whatever their next stages might be.

If I were allowed to choose another ‘one’ thing, related to this, it would be the absolute importance of interdisciplinarity and that these kinds of approaches cannot remain only within the social science classrooms. Again, in the on-campus course, there were future engineers, future urban planners, future environmental policy makers and future teachers as well. All of them will be faced with decisions on how to approach issues of water, either on a professional or a personal level. If we continue to assume that history is only for historians, it will severely limit the ability of this generation – who will be faced with issues of water scarcity – to imagine anything outside of what is already being done, much less to imagine anything that does not perpetuate or increase the levels of inequality which both lead to and result from these kinds of issues. Some of my favorite ‘moments’ in the on-campus course were the exchanges between the ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ science types, with furrowed brows, trying to understand a language so foreign to them. This is what Urry (2003) is referring to when he describes the break down between the physical and social, within and through studies of global complexity. These are the mythical divisions of which both Latour (1991) and Willinsky (1998) were speaking. These are also, the kinds of ‘invisible knowledges’ to which Shiva (1993) is referring. Again, I had a group who was somewhat pre-disposed to these kinds of discussions, who voluntarily ventured into these

experiences for whatever reason. Not all teachers will be so fortunate, which makes it all the more important.

Directions for Future Research

What this latter issue signals to me is an important implication for internationalization in Higher Education institutions, and education in general. That is the need for a deep and meaningful re-analysis of the current disciplinary divisions and the purposes of post-secondary education overall. As Higher Education institutions are increasingly marketized, there is a growing need for the social sciences especially to redefine their purpose and their role within the institutions. This needs to be done from within a framework of increasing global complexity, interconnectedness and dependency. Though this study was informed by this perspective, it was not the focus. I feel that it is an area which needs a great deal more attention.

Another area for further research for me is in regards to the specific virtues that were used to frame this study. I chose to use Rizvi's (2007) set of epistemic virtues specifically because they were used in the framing of the study tour course goals, and because they incorporate the principles of critical pedagogy, post-colonial theory, and cultural studies that I find most useful. However, as is normally the case, more questions than answers in regards to their specific meanings emerged as the study progressed. In the future, I would like to explore the usefulness of these and other 'virtues' from within a framework of complexity as the organizing concept. In other words, I have no doubt that these are useful constructs in coming to understand complexity, but might there be others equally useful and constructive?

Finally, another direction that this research project has suggested is a more longitudinal study of the ways in which people come to understand global issues. These cases provided short-

term glimpses of how the participants were processing at that time. What I would be very interested in exploring is Dewey's notion of 'continuity' of experience – how do they make these experiences matter for themselves and on a larger scale, as they proceed into the next stages of their lives? Similarly, the role of identity in this study was one that regarded it as a pedagogic tool for understanding complexity. I would be very interested in using the same set of data and reversing the question a bit, to explore the ways in which internationalization acts on identity. There were a few people who took part in the study tour who were at some sort of transition in their personal lives. Each of them had a very particular experience as a result of the combination of that transition and the challenges to their new and emerging identities. This is a story separate from this one, but one that I feel would be interesting to explore.

Implications for Internationalization of the Curriculum

As we have seen, there are a number of meanings to internationalization, as well as multiple forms which it can take. What I feel that this study means in terms of larger internationalization efforts, including study abroad, is that there is a need for reexamination of the purposes and processes involved. If the goal of campus internationalization efforts is a deeper and more meaningful educative experience for students, internationalization and study abroad cannot be approached as extra-curricular or 'add-ons' to set curricula. It means a re-thinking of existing curricula, to incorporate at its base the fostering of such virtues as historicity, relationality, reflexivity, criticality and imagination. It also means starting from the perspective of global complexity, rather than trying to arrive there through traditional processes. Mostly, I believe this study has shown that students today understand that they are living in a complex global society, and that they are seeking to understand what that means. It is less useful to

attempt to identify the ‘best’ mode of internationalization, as we have seen, each have their potentials and limitations, than it is to evaluate the purposes and goals on a wider scale. There are multiple ways in which institutions of Higher Education have chosen to incorporate or value internationally and globally oriented curriculum initiatives, but what remains clear is that there is an understanding that it must be a ‘campus-level’ strategy. I would argue, however, that if that campus-level strategy remains at a level of ‘additional knowledge’, the results will continue to be disappointing. I presume, as the world becomes increasingly interconnected, that these surface level interventions will, in turn, become increasingly disappointing as well. Finally, though it is outside the scope of this study, what I feel that this study hints at is that creating space within the academy for multiple voices and multiple perspectives, and by this I mean *real* multiple perspectives, including those which are outside of the norms, and challenge the academy to think, act and be in different ways, much of the groundwork for effective internationalization will have been laid. Without a respect for and an active opening to multiple and competing perspectives, internationalization efforts, whether abroad or at home, will remain ‘on the veranda’.

Emerging global studies programs in particular have an opportunity to participate in this practice of opening the academy to new and insightful perspectives. They have the opportunity to move beyond interdisciplinary approaches to curriculum to one that is far more in-tune with the ways in which the world operates. In general, they need to be aware of the limitations of traditional disciplinary divisions and the ways in which these divisions have served to perpetuate ‘mis-educative’ experiences and which in turn could de-legitimize the field of global studies. The importance of the ‘strange attractor’ is specifically relevant to the field of global studies, where information is vast, multi-faceted, and limitless. The point is not to teach a set of knowledge, but

a set of skills combined with a set of virtues that will help students navigate the complexities of our world.

References

- Anderson, L. F., Becker J.M. (1976). *The role of social studies in the international education of children and young people. working paper for the international meeting of experts on the role of social studies in education for peace and respect for human rights*. Paris, France: UNESCO.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large : Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appadurai, A. (2000). Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. *Public Culture*, 12(1), 1-19.
- Arum, S. and Van de Water, J. (1992). The need for definition of international education in U.S. universities. In C. B. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 191-203). Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators.
- Basso, K. H. (1996). *Wisdom sits in places: Landscape and language among the western apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge; Malden, MA: Polity Press; Blackwell.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bowers, C. A. (2005). *Revitalizing the commons: Cultural and educational sites of resistance*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Buell, R. L. (1925). *International relations*. New York, NY: Henry Holt & Co.
- Chavez Chavez, R., & O'Donnell J. (1998). In Chavez Chavez R., O'Donnell J. (Eds.), *Speaking the unpleasant: The politics of (non)engagement in the multicultural education terrain*. Albany NY: State University of New York.
- Che, S. M., Spearman, M., & Manizade, A. (2009). Constructive disequilibrium: Cognitive and emotional development through dissonant experiences in less familiar destinations. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 99-116). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. (2005). *Global competence and national need: One million americans studying abroad*.

- Darder, A. (2003). Teaching as an act of love: Reflections on paulo freire and his contributions to our lives and our work. *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 497-510). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. (2003). Critical pedagogy: An introduction. *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 1-23). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Denzin, N. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Deutsch, S. E. (1970). *International education and exchange: A sociological analysis*. Cleveland OH: Case Western University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1968). *Experience and education*. Toronto, Ontario: Collier Books Colliers-Macmillan.
- Dirlik, A. (2001). Place-based imagination: Globalism and the politics of place. In R. Prazniak, & A. Dirlik (Eds.), *Places and politics in an age of globalization* (pp. 15-52). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. Berg Trans.). New York, NY: Herder and Herder.
- Freire, P. (1992). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage* (P. Clarke Trans.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Giddens, A. (2000). The globalizing of modernity. In D. Held, & A. McGrew (Eds.), *The global transformations reader* (pp. 92-98). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Goankar, D. P. (2002). Toward new imaginaries: An introduction. *Public Culture*, 14(1), 1-19.
- Gruenewald, D. A., & Smith, G. A. (2008). *Place-based education in the global age : Local diversity*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Hanvey, R. G. (1982). *An attainable global perspective*. New York, NY: American Forum for Global Education.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. G. (2000). *The global transformations reader : An introduction to the globalization debate*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press; Blackwell.

- Hutchison, D. (2004). *A natural history of place in education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Inda, J. X., & Rosaldo, R. (2008). Tracking global flows. In J. X. Inda, & R. Rosaldo (Eds.), *The anthropology of globalization: A reader* (2nd ed., pp. 3-46). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Latour, B. (1994). *We have never been modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lynch, J. (1989). *Multicultural education in a global society*. Barcombe, Lewes, East Sussex: The Falmer Press.
- Mahalingham, R., & McCarthy, C. (2000). *Multicultural curriculum: New directions for social theory*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. (2003). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 69-96). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Merryfield, M. M. (1986). *Making connections between multicultural and global education: Teacher educators and teacher education programs*. Washington DC: AACTE Publications.
- Moya, P. M. L. (2006). What's identity got to do with it? Mobilizing identities in the multicultural classroom. In L. M. Alcoff, M. Hames-Garcia, S. Mohanty & P. M. L. Moya (Eds.), *Identity politics reconsidered* (pp. 86-117). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Noddings, N., & Boston Research Center for the 21st Century. (2005). *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Ogden, A. (2006). Ethnographic inquiry: Reframing the learning core of education abroad. *Frontiers*, 12, 87-112.
- Ogden, A. (2007). The view from the veranda: Understanding today's colonial student. *Frontiers*, 15, 35-56.
- Paige, R. M. (2003). The American case: The University of Minnesota. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 52-63.
- Peacock, N., & Harrison, N. (2009). "It's so much easier to go with What's easy": "mindfulness" and the discourse between home and international students in the united kingdom. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(4), 487-508.
- Rizvi, F. (2007). Epistemic virtues and cosmopolitan learning. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 35(1), 17-35.

- Rosaldo, R. (1999). A note on Geertz as a cultural essayist. In S. B. Ortner (Ed.), *The fate of "culture": Geertz and beyond* (pp. 30-34). Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Rosaldo, R. (2006). Identity politics: An ethnography by a participant. In L. M. Alcoff, M. Hames-Garcia, S. Mohanty & P. M. L. Moya (Eds.), *Identity politics reconsidered* (pp. 118-125). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Said, E. W. (1994). *Culture and imperialism* (1st Vintage Books ed.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Scanlon, D. G. (1960). *International education: A documentary history*. New York, NY: Columbia University: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College.
- Scanlon, D. G., & Shields, J. (1968). *Problems and prospects in international education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Shane, H. G. (1969). *The united states and international education: The 68th yearbook of the national society for the study of education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shiva, V. (1993). *Monocultures of the mind: Perspectives on biodiversity and biotechnology*. Penang, Phillipines: Third World Network.
- Sikes, P. (1997). *Parents who teach: Stories from home and from school*. London: UK: Continuum International.
- Smyth, J. (1989). Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(2), 2-9.
- Sobel, D. (2004). *Place-based education: Connecting classrooms and communities*. Great Barrington, MA: Orion Society.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Steger, M. (2003). *Globalization: A very short introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2004). *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sylvester, R. (2002). Mapping international education: A historical survey 1893-1944. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 1(1), 90-125.
- Sylvester, R. (2003). Framing the map of international education: 1969-1998. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 4(2), 123-151.

- Sylvester, R. (2003). Further mapping of the territory of international education in the 20th century: 1944-1969. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 2(2), 185-204.
- Taylor, C. (2002). Modern social imaginaries. *Public Culture*, 14(1), 91-124.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Malaysia: Zed Books.
- Tye, Barbara Benham, Tye, Kenneth A. (1992). *Global Education : A study of school change*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- UNESCO. (1974). *Recommendation concerning education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms. general conference. 18th session*. Paris, France: UNESCO.
- Urry, J. (2003). *Global complexity*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. New York, NY: Oxford.
- Vestal, T. (1994). *International Education: Its history and promise for today*. Westport CN: Praeger Press.
- Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to Divide the World*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Appendix A

Global Water Supply High School Curriculum

Please see supplemental materials for a copy of the Global Water Supply High School Curriculum. This can also be found at: <http://water.org/learn-about-the-water-crisis/lessonplan/>

Appendix B

Got Water?

Got Water? Lesson plan reprinted below is also available at:

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/globalconnections/mideast/educators/resource/lesson2.html>. The article referenced in this lesson plan can be accessed from the same website and also found within the supplementary materials.

Got Water?

Lesson Snapshot

Learning objectives

Students will learn that delivering clean, fresh water to citizens around the world involves and affects politics, economics, international relations, and technology.

Grade level

9-12

[Assessment](#)

[Resources](#)

[NCSS standards](#)

Time estimate

Three class periods, with homework

- Part 1: Introduction to topic, homework assignment
- Part 2: Developing a proposal for water-sharing, presentations
- Part 3: Presentations and discussion

What you'll need (see [Resources](#) for links)

- Computer with [RealPlayer](#) streaming audio for radio segment
 - ["Turkish Dam"](#)
- Copies of article
 - ["Middle East Water: Time Running Out"](#) ([Acrobat](#) required)

Lesson Plan

Fresh water is a limited natural resource. Communities throughout the world are faced with the same question: Is there enough water to support local industry, agriculture, and human consumption?

Part 1

- Begin this activity by asking students to brainstorm a list of factors that might affect their town's ability to provide water to its citizens. Are the issues the same on a state and national level? What are similarities and differences?
- Once the list is complete, ask students to identify where the water comes from, and why. Consider the following factors: water sources, technologies, governmental policies, and the economics of water. You may want to use a graphic organizer to explore these issues.

Water sources

Groundwater

What issues affect the quality of groundwater?

- Depletion and/or salination of [aquifers](#), pollution, access and delivery issues, utilization rights (when the water table underlies more than one country or lies under one country but is fed with runoff from another country)

Rivers

What issues affect rivers?

- Pollution (industrial and recreational), flooding, dams, fishing, commercial uses, boats

Oceans

What issues affect oceans?

- Salination, pollution, commercial uses, disasters (oil spills), ships, ports/harbors

Rain

What issues affect rain?

- Pollution, drought, collection, urbanization

Water technologies

What technologies are used to manage the water supply, including controlling use, quality of water, and delivery mechanisms?

- Pipelines, [desalination](#), dams, irrigation, recycling, purification

Water policies

What policies and programs have governments instituted to manage water?

- Renewable resource programs (brown water), building codes to prevent increased water runoff, wetlands management, etc.

Water economics

How might water affect the economy?

- After the discussion, introduce your students to the water issues among Turkey, Syria, and Iraq. Distribute copies of the article ["Middle East Water: Time Running Out"](#) as background reading, and listen (if streaming audio is available) to the ["Turkish Dam"](#) segment from NPR

as an introduction.

- A massive irrigation and hydropower project is in development in Turkey. Syria and Iraq fear that a significant portion of their current supply of fresh water may be cut off by their neighbor. NPR's Sylvia Poggioli reports from Turkey that its plan to build 22 dams has the region realizing that water is as strategic a resource as oil has been to the area's politics and economies.
- After reading the article and listening to the report, divide the students into three teams: Turkey, Syria, and Iraq. Each team's task is to come up with a national position on the water issues regarding Turkey's dams. The ultimate goal is to find a cooperative solution for all three countries.
- Each student will be responsible for conducting research and completing a written report. The reports should include the following:
 - information about the water issues facing their assigned country (agriculture, economy, environment);
 - the impact Turkey's dams will have; and
 - the political context and outstanding issues with the other two countries.

Part 2

- After the students have completed their research, they will come together as a team to formulate their country's water position and elect a team spokesperson. The following questions can guide their discussion:
 - Where does your country get its water?
 - How does your country provide water for its citizens? Make sure you address all water needs, not just domestic consumption.
 - How does your team advocate cooperation with the other two countries?
 - Has your country had any conflicts (military or political) with the other two countries attending the summit? In what ways have they involved water issues?
 - What are your proposals for resolving these problems?
 - Can you come up with ways that would provide the basis for a water-sharing plan?
- As students develop their country's proposal, remind them to consider the costs and benefits of all actions.
 - Does your country have water resources that it can afford to share?
 - If so, what will you expect in return for sharing your water?
 - If your country does not have enough water and needs to secure water from the other countries, what can you offer in return (e.g., other natural resources) that would encourage the other countries to share water with you?

Part 3

- After the teams have developed their proposals, ask each spokesperson to present the team's proposal. Students representing the other countries should keep in mind their own country's needs and concerns. As they listen, ask students to note which parts of the proposal they can accept, which they cannot, and the reasons why.
- After all three countries have presented their proposals, consider the following questions for debriefing:
 - What were the strongest and weakest points in each proposal? Ask students to give evidence for their answers.
 - What are the competing demands for water? Should a system for prioritizing water usage be established?
 - What might this look like? Can you arrange priorities to offer differing solutions to the problem?

Assessment

- How well can the student articulate positions presented, discuss pros, cons, relevant examples, and consequences of all positions?
- How well does the student write a personal position on this or a related issue (e.g., water policy in states in the western U.S.), providing examples and reasons to support the position?

Resources

Core Resources:

- All Things Considered: Turkish Dam
http://search.npr.org/cf/cmn/segment_display.cfm?segID=41762
Turkey's plan to build 22 dams has the region realizing that water is as strategic a resource as oil.
- **PDF** Middle East Water: Time Running Out
<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/globalconnections/mideast/educators/resource/gotwater.pdf>
The *Christian Science Monitor* reports on the Middle East water crisis.

Global Connections Essays:

- Economics: It's More Than Oil
<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/globalconnections/mideast/themes/economics/index.html>
National economies throughout the Middle East struggled in the 19th and 20th centuries to develop their natural and human resources, to modernize their societies, and to raise their standards of living.
- Geography: An Ancient and Modern Crossroads
<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/globalconnections/mideast/themes/geography/index.html>

The Middle East is at the junction of trade routes connecting Europe and China, India and Africa, and all the cultures of the Mediterranean basin.

- Natural Resources
<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/globalconnections/mideast/questions/resource/index.html>
What role have natural resources played in the politics and economy of the Middle East?

Internet Resources:

- All Things Considered: Golan Water
http://search.npr.org/cf/cmn/segment_display.cfm?segID=68818
Control over water resources is being discussed in the Israeli-Syrian peace talks.
- Morning Edition: Water Shortage
http://search.npr.org/cf/cmn/segment_display.cfm?segID=71914
The World Water Forum is calling for an urgent solution to the growing world water shortage.
- Weekend Edition: Middle East Water
http://search.npr.org/cf/cmn/segment_display.cfm?segID=1934
How should the Middle East divide and conserve the limited water resources?
- **Audio** The Connection: Water Series
<http://www.theconnection.org/features/waterseries.shtml>
In a four-part series, *The Connection* looks at privatization, interstate conflict, declining faith in public drinking water, and one culture's solution to the fresh water problem.
- The World Factbook 2001
<http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>
The Central Intelligence Agency publishes information on the geography, people, government, and economy of each Middle Eastern country.

Print Resources:

- *The Dictionary of Ecology and the Environment*.
Peter H. Collin. London: Peter Collin Publisher, Ltd., 1999.
- Middle East: Crossroads of Faith and Conflict (map)
Supplement to *National Geographic*, October 2002
- *Hammond Atlas of the Middle East*.
Maplewood, N.J.: Hammond, 2001.

Related Activities:

- *Global Connections*. Middle East: Land, Resources, and Economics
<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/globalconnections/mideast/educators/resource/lesson1.html>
Connecting geography, natural resources, and economic conditions in the Middle East
- Dealing with Dry Days

<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/extra/features/jan-june02/drought.html>

Students will explore the following question: How important is this drought that experts say is the worst one in 100 years?

NCSS standards

People, places, and environments

- Examine, interpret, and analyze physical and cultural patterns and their interactions, such as land use, settlement patterns, cultural transmission of customs and ideas, and ecosystem changes.
- Propose, compare, and evaluate alternative policies for the use of land and other resources in communities, regions, nations, and the world.

Science, technology, and society

- Identify and describe both current and historical examples of the interaction and interdependence of science, technology, and society in a variety of cultural settings.
- Evaluate various policies that have been proposed as ways of dealing with social changes resulting from new technologies.
- Formulate strategies and develop policies for influencing public discussions associated with technology-society issues.