

Making Room in the Curriculum

The Raced, Classed, and Gendered Nature of Preservice Teachers' Experiences Studying Abroad

ERIK MALEWSKI
Purdue University

JOANN PHILLION
Purdue University

OVER THE LAST FIFTEEN YEARS, appeals for the internationalization of curriculum have been met with an infusion of study abroad programs into college and university departments (Citron & Kline, 2001; Gray, Murdock, & Stebbins, 2002; McCabe, 2001), in part because they are believed to be an optimal mechanism for improving students' language acquisition, career readiness, and multicultural understanding. Students have also cited increased capacities in each of these areas as the rewards for academic study in an international context. Educational researchers have found that students choose to study abroad because they have an interest in international travel, wish to enhance their future career opportunities, and hope to improve their intercultural awareness (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990; Orahod, Kruze, & Pearson, 2004; Williams, 2005). After engaging in study abroad, students have reported increased ability to navigate unfamiliar cultural and national contexts, improved foreign language skills, a more critical attitude toward the U.S. and other countries of origin, and heightened interest in future study abroad opportunities as some of the gains arising from their experiences (Segalowitz, Freed, Collentine, Lafford, Lazar, & Díaz-Campos, 2004; Teichler & Steube 1991).

Along with the growth of study abroad programs, educational researchers have begun to recognize the diverse array of experiences undergraduates have while pursuing academic study in international contexts and, accordingly, have begun to question the supposition that study in another country invariably leads to outcomes such as heightened multicultural and global understanding,¹ and increased language learning. In particular, researchers of study abroad have begun to ask more complex questions about opportunities to purposefully and deeply engage the host culture in ways that allow students to develop heightened sensitivity to cultural differences and improved linguistic abilities (Kline, 1998; Twombly, 1995; Wilkinson, 1998a, 2000). As a remedy, numerous study abroad programs have developed curricula that infuse undergraduates'

out-of-class experiences into coursework in order to deepen multicultural and linguistic understanding (Laubscher, 1994; Wilkinson, 2002). Unfortunately, there has been limited research on students' informal experiences interacting with their peers and members of the host culture (Willard-Holt, 2001) or how those experiences have been integrated into formal course curricula (Talbur & Stewart, 1999). Furthermore, assessing the depth of students' cultural knowledge and language acquisition after partaking in international study has proven difficult, particularly in regards to programs of a short duration (those under eight weeks) that are increasingly becoming a part of offerings in universities in the U.S. and globally, such as the one that is the focus of the study discussed in this article (Gorka & Niesenbaum, 2001; Jones & Bonds, 2000).

Working under these terms, two faculty members (and authors of this article) who direct an annual study abroad in Honduras have engaged in a six-year study of a five-week summer program for preservice teachers to better understand their experiences relating with members of the host community, as well as with their peers in the program. Our investigation has centered on: 1) reasons for partaking in the Honduran study abroad program, 2) preconceived beliefs as to what the experience of study abroad in Honduras might be like, 3) shifts in perceptions of the host culture and peers over the duration of the visit, and 4) how changes in perceptions of the members of the host culture and peers impact students' experiences inside as well as outside their courses and school-based field experiences. More specifically, we have examined the relationship between course readings and activities in two required teacher education courses and students' interactions in local schools conducting field observations and teaching elementary and middle school youth. Our aim was to better understand how courses focused on multiculturalism and globalization might help students to engage purposefully and critically with Honduran culture, particularly as it related to issues of public education.

With the overall goals discussed above, we have engaged in research with the 49 undergraduate students who have participated in the program. We have collected data on these students through focus group interviews conducted two or three times while on site and individual interviews conducted twice within the first year of completing the program. We have analyzed journals and assignments written during and after the program and electronic portfolios completed by students after the trip. In addition, we have composed field notes that focused on observations of students both inside and outside of school settings.

For the purposes of this article, we focus on the perceptions of two preservice teachers that typify the ways that race, class, and gender shape student experiences abroad. Through course discussions, formal and informal observations, and reflective journals, Morgan,² a White, female, preservice teacher from a working class socioeconomic background, shared the struggles she had relating to members of the host community and course readings on multiculturalism and globalization. She connected those struggles to social class issues, particularly the experiences she had growing up in an economically disadvantaged family that had to compete with Latinos for scarce resources and job opportunities. In contrast, Vicente, a Latino also from a working class background, described an almost immediate and profound connection to members of the host community, one that rewarded him with greater access to cultural knowledge but also distanced him from his peers, the majority of whom were White middle and upper middle class female students. He related the ease with which he developed relationships with Hondurans to his racial and ethnic background—particularly experiences growing up in a relatively poor, predominantly Latino community made up of many nationalities—and his fluency in English and Spanish.

As we analyzed our data and found events that brought to the surface themes of race, class, and gender—from preservice teachers' interactions with and perceptions of members of the host

community to the possibilities they envisioned for cultural learning and linguistic acquisition—we searched the study abroad and teacher education literature in hopes of finding some intellectual insights that might guide our practice. Regrettably, what we found was a near complete absence of research in both bodies of scholarship that took into account the effect cultural differences and social group memberships had on student perspectives.³ With a few exceptions (Polanyi, 1995; Wagner & Magistrale, 1995; Wilkinson, 2000), the literature offered non-specific, generalized representations that washed over the diverse array of student experiences and outcomes. Little attention had been given to the ways formal curricula might account for how cultural differences among students shaped not only access to and interactions with members of the host community, but also peer-to-peer relationships.

This gap in the literature not only distorts the design, implementation, and assessment of study abroad programs, but at the level of individual students, it does not make clear the ways that race, class, and gender might enhance or limit their ability to meet baseline program requirements. Furthermore, this void in the literature requires immediate attention if recent calls to “promote ethnic, socioeconomic, and gender diversity among study abroad participants” (American Council on Education, 2002, p. 18) are to be actualized in practice by study abroad faculty. During the 2004–2005 academic year, U.S. students studying abroad were 83 percent White and 35 percent male (their socioeconomic background remains unknown) (Institute of International Education, 2007). When placed alongside current U.S. demographic figures and projected demographic shifts over the next decade, which indicates trends towards an increasingly diverse population in the U.S. (U.S. Census, 2002), the need to attend to cultural differences and social group affiliations within the study abroad curriculum becomes evident.

In one investigation of the ways that race and gender shape undergraduate experiences, Talburt and Stewart (1999) recounted, in their study of U.S. students in Spain, the struggles of the only African American student on the program who described “unwelcomed comments and the ways racism impinged on her actions and interactions” (p. 164). Analysis of the ways race, class, and gender impact student experiences enables a reconfiguration of study abroad curricula such that cultural differences and experiences interacting with members of the host community become integral to academic study. Kitsantas (2004) has noted that although research has found that overall study abroad programs increase the development of cultural knowledge, “students who reported they wanted to study abroad in order to improve their cross-cultural skills . . . were more likely [post-trip] to report higher levels of cross-cultural skills and global understanding than those who did not” (p. 447). We must begin to account for the ways cultural differences and diverse lived experiences among students who elect to study abroad shape their expectations and outlooks, the ways social group affiliations enable and constrain their ability to gain access to the host culture, and the implications of both for the conceptualization of study abroad curriculum. Thus, in spite of the recent emphasis on learner-centered practices in teacher education (Darling-Hammond, 2006) and higher education (Huba & Freed, 2000), formal curricula and instructional practices within study abroad have not accounted for students’ diverse backgrounds or the ways that cultural differences have shaped their out of class experiences.

In this article we aim to situate students of study abroad through an examination of the implications of race, class, and gender to profoundly shape experiences abroad and the implications of those effects for formal onsite curricula. We provide a description of the Honduran study abroad program followed by an overview of the methodology that underwrites this study. We continue with an in-depth analysis of the meaning two preservice teachers made of their experiences taking courses, conducting field observations in public and private schools, and interacting

with members of the host community and their peers as representative of the ways race, class, and gender shape cross-cultural international experiences. We conclude with a discussion of key themes as a prelude to a call for formal on-site curricula that opens spaces to explore the ways that the raced, classed, and gendered nature of study abroad is shaped by the various cultural differences and linguistic abilities and the negotiation tactics students' develop from their interactions with each other and members of the host community.

Program Characteristics

The majority of the preservice teachers who participate each year in the Honduras study abroad program are elementary education majors at the end of their first year of college. Most have had little experience in other countries; for some this is the first time they have travelled outside their home states. The program commences with two meetings on campus prior to departure. After arrival in the capital city of Tegucigalpa, the group commutes to a university in the nearby town of Zamorano. For the remaining 21 days of the program, with the exception of two nights in the city of Copán, preservice teachers live at a residence center on campus. Each day preservice teachers walk to the Esperanza School where they assist teachers and observe in classrooms that span preschool to sixth grade. Preservice teachers also work in the surrounding community where they offer lessons in art at two nearby rural schools and lead informal educational activities at an orphanage for male children and youth. On weekends and evenings, when preservice teachers are not involved in courses and school-based activities, they travel to various cultural sites, such as the United Nations Park in Tegucigalpa, and an archaeological site in Copán, where the remains of the Mayan civilization indigenous to the region are on display.

Preservice teachers in the study abroad program are enrolled in two teacher education courses: 205 (Exploring Teaching as a Career) and 285 (Multicultural Education) taught by the two faculty members who conduct the program. Course curricula address issues that include but are not limited to the history of the educational system in Honduras, global and national policies that impact the local economy and culture, multicultural theories of education, and various teaching philosophies. Instructional practices involve lectures and group exercises; however, the primary emphasis is on discussions that draw out relationships among course readings and experiences observing classrooms, assisting teachers, and conducting lessons in the schools. Assignments concentrate on reflective journaling, autobiographical writing, crafting teacher portraits, and conducting critical analyses of pedagogical and curricular issues. In order to infuse the cultural knowledge of the local community into the curriculum, guest speakers are invited to talk with preservice teachers about education-related issues that impact the schools, surrounding communities, and the country.

Methodology

The methods we use to collect and analyze our data are associated with interpretive phenomenology, a form of inquiry that focuses on human perceptions and experiences (Merleau-Ponty, 1962/2002; Willis, 2001). We chose this method to allow for an in-depth exploration of the complexity of student experiences; many other studies are quantitative in nature and focus on the general effects of study abroad. Interpretative phenomenology shares with narrative inquiry

and biographic studies an interest in lived experience but goes beyond commonsense viewpoints and natural attitudes to endow such experiences with new and deeper meanings. As Ricoeur (1979) explains, phenomenology commences with “an investigation into the structures of experience which precede connected expression in language” (p. 127) and involves “the descriptive study of the essential features of experience taken as a whole” (p. 126). Life experiences and the meanings attributed to human interaction are understood when subjective states—emanating from the interpretations of those who have engaged in the experience—are brought into view (see Willis, 2004). Experiences are not merely described but attributed deeper meaning by way of the subjectivity it evokes in those who have shared in the phenomenon under study.

Self-report, which features autobiography, biography, and narrative as pathways to understanding human consciousness and its embeddedness in social context and language, is central to interpretive phenomenology (Conroy, 2003; Lopez & Willis, 2004; Slattery, Krasny, & O’Malley, 2007). The aim of interpretive phenomenology, then, is characterized less by attempts to create generalizable narratives or forecasts of what others will experience than depictions of themes that arise from the intricacies of the life situation of individuals (see Aoki, 1988). Thus, the interpretations offered by preservice teachers who lived through the situations under study do not lead to universal statements about what will be experienced when studying abroad; their perceptions are believed to stem from their place in the world. Accordingly, our research offers situated representations of study abroad as it is lived, and it is guided by the question, “How does educational experience shape the cognitive lens, change the vision so that the world is, in fact, encountered differently?” (Grumet, 1992, p. 42).

Our selection of course assignments was also informed by interpretative phenomenology. Preservice teachers kept daily reflective journals in which they explored the meaning they made of their everyday experiences while studying abroad, with particular emphasis on their understanding of themselves, their peers, members of the host community, Honduran culture, and the schools they visited. Preservice teachers also kept reading logs to explore the implications of reading assignments on multiculturalism, immigration, globalization, and social justice issues for understanding their interactions with members of the host community and each other. Writing requirements included an autobiographical essay on their life experiences; an educational philosophy that compares their field experiences with education as they remember it when they were students in U.S. schools; and a life portrait of one teacher from the Esperanza School. Other data were also gathered during study abroad trips through a series of semi-structured, focus group interviews and from informal observations of preservice teachers’ interactions. In addition, we conducted two post-trip interviews with preservice teachers who were willing to continue as participants in the study.

In accordance with an interpretative approach that emphasizes localized, concrete, practical understanding from the perspective of the participant (Denzin, 2001), phenomenological interviewing, as Sorrell and Redmond (1995) argue, is an attempt “to understand shared meanings by drawing from the respondent a vivid picture of the lived experience, complete with the richness of detail and context that shape the experience” (p. 1120). Our emphasis on interviews along with other data sources reflects our understanding that the discourse preservice teachers use to describe their experiences informs their actions. Their narratives provided, “insight into an ‘inside-out’ experience of the respondent” captured “through an engaged, profound approach to listening” (Sorrell & Redmond, 1995, p. 1120). Interviews with numerous preservice teachers not only offered insight into the knowledge of individual participants in relation to an event but

also knowledge that stemmed from shared encounters with their peers and members of the host community.

Data analysis involved coding across each preservice teacher's interviews in order to isolate the thematic statements (van Manen, 1984) that compose the whole of his or her experiences. As van Manen (1990) and Silverman (2001) describe, conducting narrative analysis allows researchers to construct portraits (see Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997) or montages (see Pinar, 2004), as well as identify thematic structures that run through the experiential descriptions offered by participants. Data from the individual interviews were triangulated with program meeting minutes, field notes, focus group interviews, reflective journals, and reading logs so as to situate the two portraits and common themes within the broader context of the program. Conducting an investigation from numerous data sources provided an opportunity to concurrently map overarching programmatic themes alongside themes unique to each preservice teacher as we made meaning of their lived experiences. It also allowed us to garner deeper insight into the significance attached to events and the ways sense-making strategies in one context shaped the meaning attributed to experiences in other contexts.

Rationale for the Study

Although our investigation began with detailed analysis of experiential descriptions before moving to thematic dimensions, once we had established thematic structures, we compared our findings with the literature on the effects study abroad has on cultural learning. For example, Dolby (2004) found that study abroad extended global understanding and heightened cultural awareness, particularly awareness of one's own national identity. Pires (2000) reported that study abroad experiences for U.S. students in countries such as Kenya challenged myths and stereotypes about Africa and deepened economic, political, and cultural knowledge of the host country. From his study, Cooper (2007) concluded that "cultural-immersion experiences can challenge preservice teachers' prior beliefs and stereotypes about the students they teach, their students' families, and the locations of their home communities" (p. 253). Most relevant to this article, Opper, Teicheler, and Carlson (1990) discovered that the effects of study abroad on cultural knowledge were not the same across students; rather, its impact was contingent upon a number of factors that included individual students' intellectual and personal interests, career aspirations, pre-trip preparation, post-trip debriefing, and the general meaning made of experiences while abroad.

In a prior essay (Phillion, Malewski, Rodriguez, Shirley, Kulago, & Bulington, 2008), we described that while study abroad provided opportunities to grow academically and culturally in ways not available on the home campus, it also reinforced—rather than challenged—feelings of blessedness and engendered what we termed a "revival" of White privilege. From these findings, we suggested it is possible that cross-cultural learning encounters heighten sensitivity and awareness *and* national, racial, and ethnic feelings of superiority, although these two perceptions are often assumed to be mutually exclusive in the literature. This seems particularly an issue among White preservice teachers who study in short-term programs in "developing" countries inhabited predominantly by economically disadvantaged people of color.

In directing our focus to the effect race, class, and gender—themes that are typified in this article through two student portraits—have on preservice teachers studying in another culture, we attend specifically to the ways race, class, and gender shaped Morgan's and Vicente's experi-

ence coming to know Honduran culture, were infused into course discussions, and shaped other preservice teachers' understandings of themselves and others. In order to contextualize what we have termed the raced, classed, and gendered nature of study abroad, we start with a description of the character of the teaching and learning that comprised teacher education courses 205 and 285. Next, we explore in detail the ways Morgan's and Vicente's perceptions while abroad were shaped by cultural differences as a preface to an overview of select additional themes that help explain the varied experiences of preservice teachers who take part in study abroad. This analysis reveals some of the promises and limitations in regards to the unexamined outcomes of study abroad. From this analysis, we explore the ways that the inclusion of race, class, and gender in course curricula—including assignments, readings, and discussions—might deepen preservice teachers' self-awareness and cultural understanding in ways that remain largely unidentified within the literature.

Two Portraits and Five Emerging Themes⁴

Morgan's Perceptions

Morgan perceived the events of study abroad differently from other preservice teachers. She questioned the “romantic views” held by her peers, drawing from her own lived history observing Mexican-Americans—experiences she would initially generalize to all Latinos regardless of national origin or cultural attributes, including Hondurans. As she explained in an interview,

All I knew were the Mexican Americans who bought houses in our subdivision . . . there were no blinds in the windows . . . no one took care of it [the houses]. My family was really bothered. We didn't have much already and this devalued our property.

This prior experience, along with a myriad of struggles that shaped her life growing up in a small Midwestern U.S. city hit hard by changing economic conditions, framed her encounters during the study abroad and eventually became the reason for the distance between Morgan and the other preservice teachers.

In course discussions, Morgan offered counter-images to those her peers constructed of Honduran children and youth as innocent—simply victims of their circumstances—that offended some of the other preservice teachers. Taken from our notes on one exchange, Morgan pointed out that the ways preservice teachers discussed Honduran children and youth were shaped more by their own sense of guilt than they were by some authentic purity or virtue manifested in the children and youth themselves (“[the preservice teachers] are being sentimental because they feel bad”). Furthermore, in her characterization, one verifiably related to the experience of growing up in a community where Latinos were regularly blamed for suppressed wages and the lack of employment opportunities, such images of innocence would not have been possible if Hondurans were perceived as threats to the economic opportunities of preservice teachers (“where I grew up there was no feeling sorry for poor [Latinos]; they were our competition for jobs we needed”). It was not surprising, then, that in her recollection of visits to the orphanage, whereas other preservice teachers remarked on the sorrow they felt for and the affection they received from the parentless children and youth, Morgan focused on the violence she witnessed. As she explained, in her prior experiences in the U.S., boys manifest their aggression through play with toys and

action figures but rarely through aggression aimed at each other, whereas in Honduras she described being “frightened” by how the boys and young men “play with each other very violently” and “grabbed each other’s throats” and “didn’t think a thing of it.”

In instances where preservice teachers had more culturally conventional (and therefore socially acceptable) responses to the raced, classed, and gendered nature of study abroad, most closely resembling liberal multicultural viewpoints that emphasized natural equality and common humanity, Morgan’s outlook was shaped by a history of social and economic struggles that made it difficult for her to think in terms of a shared, universal humankind (“it doesn’t matter if we think everyone should be equal . . . the reality is when basic needs are met then you can feel sorry for someone else”). Her family relationships, where she had gained much of her self-definition, were in part predicated upon suspicion of people with economic, political, and cultural backgrounds different from their own. These differences in outlook also translated into a difference in preferred language. Morgan did not use terms such as “pity,” “unfortunate,” or “sad” to describe her perceptions of children and youth. Rather, as revealed in her personal journals, emotive language regarding good or bad fortune and feelings of happiness and sadness were reserved for reflections upon her family (“I’m not emotional unless it’s had to do with my mom or dad”). Descriptions of her experiences during her time abroad, while clearly revealing Morgan’s processes of perceiving, remembering, and judging, were most telling in the emphasis on empirical accounts of behavior and correspondingly the absence of any description of how those experiences made her feel.

Even with the risks associated with being perceived as politically incorrect, Morgan refuted multicultural theories that portrayed White people as privileged, ones that she knew, by way of her own hardships, did not represent her experiences. Communicating her unsettling, yet sometimes insightful, viewpoints came at a cost. Morgan struggled throughout the study abroad trip to develop meaningful friendships with some of her peers. Differences in background, perception, and belief meant that Morgan often conducted field observations and worked on assignments alone. Morgan grappled with maintaining a commitment to communicate what she knew to be true and making the compromises necessary for developing rapport with preservice teachers who held more socially acceptable attitudes toward people of different cultures (“when I say what I don’t like about Honduras or the people [other preservice teachers] stop talking to me”).

Even as Morgan made what some of her peers considered “racist remarks,” she described a strong awareness of social injustice, which she traced back to the fourth grade. During a history lesson,

someone raised their hand and asked why there weren’t any Hispanic people in our textbook . . . particularly because we had a Hispanic student in class . . . and the teacher didn’t have a good explanation. She said, ‘Most of us are White, and that’s his history too because he’s American’ . . . I thought, we should teach everyone’s history.

Interestingly, Morgan’s understanding of Eurocentric school curricula combined with her family’s struggle to compete with Latinos culminated in viewpoints that were more advanced than and situated in knowledge structures different from other preservice teachers, particularly the middle and upper middle class White females who were the majority in this cohort. During a post-trip interview, Morgan was asked if any of the curricular exclusions she described from when she was a student in U.S. public schools were evident in the Honduran schools:

I was working in this classroom and they had this activity about technology and the definitions of technology the teacher was using from [a U.S.] American textbook just didn't fit. The students kept saying a machete was new technology and then another said fire was new technology just before another shouted so are computers. The teacher tried to clarify the definition but the students kept using her words to come up with their own categories: like a horse and buggy is old technology but just a horse is new technology to them because people still rode horses . . . She was forcing them to think like [U.S.] Americans.

In a final interview, the unique character of Morgan's perceptions remained pronounced. When asked about what it felt like to return to the U.S., most preservice teachers described the experience of reuniting with their family and friends, appreciation they developed for the personal and professional opportunities available to them, and desire they had to translate what they learned into action through volunteerism and teaching abroad. In contrast, Morgan described in detail how on the way home from the airport she realized that in the U.S. the "roads are smooth." That is, she further clarified, they are smooth until "getting off the highway near home."

With perceptions shaped by race, class, and gender, any dreams that Morgan might have for the people she visited would need to be tempered by the reality of their life situation:

I never had much growing up. We didn't even have a house until a little while ago. But in Honduras, they kept their kids from school so that they could help grow food because otherwise they might starve. If they could get a chance to go to school and maybe get a better job then future generations might have more. They can't even think like that though because they are hungry right now.

Even with an accumulation of what she considered to be negative experiences prior to study abroad involving issues of class and race, Morgan remained committed to the ideals of multicultural education, possibly because she recognized those ideas and concepts validated her own lived history. Throughout the program, Morgan made assertions about the pivotal role multiculturalism should play in the curriculum: "multiculturalism isn't a burden; it's about respect for everyone's histories and values, even when it means teaching history that not everyone wants to learn." In interviews, personal journals, and course discussions, violence ("the boys fought hard"), danger ("walking by the banks they had machine guns"), and harassment ("coming out of the store a man outside grabbed one of the girls") and "the importance of being immersed in a different culture in order to understand multiculturalism" were intertwined as themes that represented her experiences interacting with Hondurans.

Vicente's Perceptions

Vicente was passionate about helping materially disadvantaged children and youth. Nearing completion of his second year as an elementary education major, he was raised in a low-income predominately Latino area of a major Southeastern U.S. city. For Vicente, racial, linguistic, and cultural differences defined key moments of his life from an early age. In primary school, he recalled receiving disparaging treatment because he was a Spanish-speaking student. In an interview, Vicente offered the following example:

This one time [in a fourth grade English only class] the teacher put questions in a hat and then we had to draw out a question and answer it. When I drew out my question, and it was in English, I couldn't read it. So, when I couldn't answer, the teacher [who was White and spoke only English] yelled at me. I was embarrassed . . . that was a bad experience.

Rather than allow negative experiences like this one to impinge upon his sense of self-worth (“I stayed confident”), he used them to develop an unrelenting drive to succeed academically and professionally (“I put my mind to it”), which turned into a compelling interest in teaching within communities where “kids just don't have enough.” The Honduras study abroad program was appealing to Vicente for the exposure it offered to schools located in impoverished communities and a Latin country outside of Mexico where he had visited relatives many times.

Whereas in the past Vicente's Mexican heritage and Spanish speaking skills were looked upon negatively, or at best neutrally, in educational settings, he explained that they enriched his experiences abroad: “I was comfortable instantly in Honduras because I could relate to the students. I would play with them, talk with them in Spanish and English, and I looked like them. That gave the students confidence to talk to me.” Vicente also noted how his racial and ethnic background and Spanish-speaking abilities differentiated him from his peers: “Some other preservice teachers don't like talking to the students because they can't relate. So, the students revealed a lot more to me about a lot more things.” Vicente further clarified that what they revealed involved more about “who they were every day” and not just “who they were on their best behavior” around outsiders less familiar with their language and culture. By the end of the trip, after observing the majority of preservice teachers who were middle to upper middle class White females, Vicente concluded that—in addition to his race, ethnicity, and language abilities—his social class background also proved beneficial to his experience studying abroad. Growing up in a “low income family” in a “small house” and “how we struggled with that and to make ends meet,” he explained, allowed for a more personal understanding of “how some of these kids struggle.”

In response to an interview question that focused on what it was like to be one of two males involved in the program that year, Vicente described, “it seemed like the students related to Mark [the other male preservice teacher] and me more.” He characterized the relationships between the students and female preservice teachers as cordial, but more formal, ones where students asked, “how are you doing?” but did not pursue deeper, more authentic, and meaningful interactions. In contrast, Vicente explained, the students pressed the male preservice teachers to engage in interactive activities which led him to determine that in comparison to the female preservice teachers “the students could actually relate to us.” Consequently, as Vicente understood it, “when the students needed help they would ask for Mark and me instead of them.” He acknowledged that while the female preservice teachers did not relate as deeply with students on an interpersonal level, they related with them “in other ways.” Whereas Vicente characterized himself as “disorganized,” it was the female preservice teachers who planned and led lessons and organized activities. Accordingly, when it came to developing in-class activities, he declared it was Vanessa, a White female preservice teacher, who among all his peers “established herself as the leader.” Vicente was asked if he could characterize the gender dynamics across the span of the trip:

And for me it was like Mark and I connected and we were really close . . . but we connected with the girls too, especially on trips to cultural sites, because then we all talked together . . . but, overall the dynamics were different . . . there were different personalities, of course, but also the girls could not go places alone, weren't supposed to play soccer, and all that. That made the dynamics different.

When it came to Vicente's vision for Honduras and his role in its actualization, it was "going to the outskirts" and "being in the poor rural schools" that, he noted, "got my attention." For him, the emphasis on material gain and the unequal distribution of resources had devastating economic effects, perpetuated poverty, and resulted in the lack of educational opportunities for Hondurans:

We come here, we get an education, and we pretty much stay over here [near the university campus], and then we leave. A lot of people stay over here because it's nicer and there are more resources. I don't see a lot of teachers [in the Esperanza School] going out to the rural areas because they are focused on economic stability . . . but the teachers in the rural areas, they are sacrificing something to help out those kids that need help. . . . That was an important lesson: that after I get my degree I could take a risk and come help out in the rural schools.

When helping others eclipsed material gain as more essential to Vicente's notion of a purposeful life, it set in motion a redirection in his career pursuits, one that brought him to education and ultimately to study abroad. When he matriculated from high school, Vicente was "going to be an engineer . . . to get lots of money" but the experiences of "sitting in front of a computer all day" and "typing and coding" made him reconsider teaching, in part because Vicente had a deep interest in "how children think as well as what they are thinking." Working with a Spanish teacher in Honduras not only reaffirmed his career choice but also his commitment to helping those in need. Juan, the Spanish teacher with whom he was placed for his field experience, taught him that education is not merely about rote memorization and problem solving but can also involve "posing questions" with no easy or right answers that, for example, encourage "kids to think about a poem." Even though Vicente was from a low-income community by U.S. standards, from observations, interviews, and personal journals, it became clear that understanding the perspectives of "people who really, really need help," building academic confidence in bilingual children and youth, and using his cultural background to make deeper and more meaningful connections with teachers and students were themes that characterized his experiences in Honduras.

Vicente did not question the cultural logic that underwrites the drive to transform "third world" countries, such as Honduras, into schooled societies—forms of reason that might be too close to his past achievements and future goals for him to critically analyze. When asked if the nature of the education Hondurans were receiving, particularly the emphasis on the English language and importation of U.S. teachers and curricula, might be harmful over the long term for Honduran children and youth, Vicente was uncertain how to respond. Yet, in two interviews he spoke about the sacrifices of a Honduran farmer who "spends most of his money on his son's education" so that he can "get ahead." And, in one of Vicente's most revealing interviews, he questioned, "they can get to this level, primary school, but how are they going to get to the next level, or to college? They don't have enough to get them through life." Vicente was invested in

Westernized notions of public and higher education and accordingly described how he was willing to make financial sacrifices to become a teacher in a poor school “so others might have better lives.”

Emergent Themes

The portraits of two preservice teachers illustrate the implications of race, class, and gender for the lived experiences of students engaged in study abroad. Other themes emerged in our analysis that further illuminate the essence of study abroad for Morgan and Vicente and other preservice teachers who were a part of this study. This essence is expressed through five inter-related themes that embody the various ways preservice teachers described their encounters in Honduras and functioned as frames of reference for the ways race, class, and gender shaped their understanding of and attitude toward study abroad. The first two themes describe the effect the world had on their perception while the last two themes focus on the ways self-perception shaped sense-making strategies; the third theme is a blend of the two. These themes emerged in all data sources and across all participants. We have determined that the consistency of these themes in the data is related to several factors: the age and lack of prior cross-cultural international experiences for preservice teachers who participate in the program; the program location in a developing country, Honduras, with a recognizable disparity between the wealthy and poor; the focus on the program on impoverished rural schools; and course assignments and discussions which encourage reflexivity. In the remainder of this section, we briefly describe each theme and offer select excerpts that provide a sense of the richness of the narratives and the depth of meaning behind various explanations.

Theme 1: Culture and context. Preservice teachers described different dimensions of Honduran culture and community and school environments. In particular, they offered narratives that focused on differences from the U.S. and the experience of coming to terms with unfamiliar surroundings and customs. Descriptions focused on body-oriented encounters that incorporated touch, sight, smell, and sound as well as mind-oriented encounters represented by terms that included “naïve,” “stressful,” “guilty,” and “tranquil.” The essence of individual descriptions and the collective experience were captured in a heightened awareness of cultural practices and a feeling of increased consciousness in regards to the host environment:

In Honduran culture, it’s really physical. That’s the whole thing I’ve noticed about Latin cultures, hugs and kisses are just the norm, while for a lot of White people, especially in the U.S., we don’t touch as much and it’s more like “get away from me.”

Everything is different for women here. The ways they relate to men and each other. Even how women touch each other is really different.

Theme 2: Prosperity and poverty. The theme of prosperity and poverty was most prominent in preservice teachers’ descriptions of their experiences in settings marked by extreme wealth and impoverishment. While notions of plenitude and paucity are conceivably different dimensions of their experiences abroad, they were repeatedly connected such that they emerged as a single theme with parallel dimensions (Theme 4 also emerged this way). The expansiveness of some estates and planned communities and the slight character of the dwellings of the poor

were frequent topics of discussion, as was the uneven nature of the development of modern infrastructures, such as roads and sewers, across the country:

You come to Honduras and you see hills lined with these shanties that are up on stilts and washed out roads and it seems like you entered a whole different world than you have ever known.

Class issues are big here because there are so many people with so little and then around the corner there will be a big estate and it just sticks out.

Theme 3: Discomfort and uncertainty. Preservice teachers offered frequent descriptions of experiences fraught with uncertainty and ambivalence, rather than what might be characterized as feelings of comfort and certainty. Numerous narratives focused on the journey from a sense of trepidation at the unknown toward one of confidence as they developed baseline cultural knowledge and successfully negotiated everyday life within the host community. Also telling, on a few occasions, preservice teachers described changes in the opposite direction as they identified a sense of discomfort with some gender differences or frustration at the inability to help improve the conditions under which many Hondurans lived. As one preservice teacher commented, “I want to help so badly but I don’t know what one person with such a small voice can do”:

There were times in Honduras when I got uncomfortable with how the men treated women who dressed more fashionably. It seems like a lot of Honduran men think that if they can see your figure through your clothes at all then you are available to them.

Being the only White guy observing in a class made me uncomfortable at first. I think now I know just a little better what it is like to be a minority.

Theme 4: Blessedness and guilt. Preservice teachers described feelings of both blessedness and guilt in regards to their material possessions and consumer lifestyles when confronted with the reality that in Honduras basic needs go unmet for a significant portion of the population. Many preservice teachers reported being thankful that they were White and middle class; yet, this privilege weighed heavily on their minds as they conveyed beliefs that ideally all people were created equal. For most, a sense of culpability and righteousness emerged as the two key motivating factors for taking part in social action projects that included, for example, sponsoring the education of a child and raising money to cover the cost of food for students in poor rural schools:

Going to Honduras made realize that it’s nice to be White, middle class, and from the U.S. where you can take things for granted. I’m not going to say it’s not.

We went to a rural school with malnourished children . . . after we saw that we felt terrible and pooled the rest of our money . . . bought a ton of oats and grains and juice . . . and took it to the school . . .

Theme 5: History and experience. Explorations of life histories and how they shaped contemporary outlooks and viewpoints were evident in journals, course assignments, and interviews and comprised a prominent theme in preservice teachers' perceptions of study abroad. Vivid and detailed accounts were often given so as to illustrate those elements of the past that shaped attitudes toward and understandings of the present. How preservice teachers worked, relaxed, spent their free time, organized their studies, and related to and interacted with others was linked to events and experiences from preceding years that conditioned their perspective on life and outlook on the world:

I am from a small town of White farmers where diversity was the four Black kids and four Hispanic kids in high school . . . so until Honduras I'd never been asked to look at things differently.

Trips with my church to Mexico to help build churches . . . changed how I see the world [and] motivated me to learn more about Honduras . . . where I wanted to go see it and experience it for myself.

Curriculum in Context: Difference, Complexity, and Experience

As suggested earlier, to date the literature on study abroad provides few frames of reference for how race, class, and gender affect preservice teachers' experiences while abroad or how such experiences might be incorporated into course curricula. Furthermore, this gap in the literature remains at issue despite mounting evidence that additional research is needed (Mahan & Stachowski, 1990; Smith, 2004). In one illustrative study, Wilkinson (2000) related cultural learning to the misunderstandings that arose from students' use of U.S.-centric lenses to make sense of their experiences in France. In particular, she found frequent misinterpretations among program participants limited their access to knowledge of the host community and ultimately led to negative stereotyping. These findings, she pointed out, contradicted much of the existing research that found participants make significant gains in cultural knowledge. Drawing the conclusion that the emphasis in study abroad research on general trends among international program participants masked the great variety in individual student experiences and outcomes, Wilkinson (2000) noted:

If we pose questions that allow for multiple, complex, individualized responses, we may not find complete answers, but we will be more apt to honor the reality of the study-abroad experience as unique and dynamic, shaped through a myriad of personal backgrounds, opportunities, and choices. (p. 40)

The experiences that students have and the struggles they face are "always situated by race, social class, physical abilities, as well as by gender, educational level, or 'flair for foreign languages'" (Talbert & Stewart, 1999, p. 291). Not the "disembodied abstract student" common in the literature, who students are is integral to the cultural learning they do and do not undergo while abroad. Furthermore, a heightened awareness of these issues among study abroad faculty seems crucial in order for them to help students understand and deal with their experiences. As Twombly (1995) noted, based on a study of women's experiences studying abroad in Costa Rica,

when an “immersion experience” became an “alienating experience” for women participants who felt disassociated from local women and belittled by local men (the latter particularly through the practice of *piropoing* or “cat calling”), the situation was made more difficult when “those responsible were not fully aware of the seriousness of this ‘gender dynamic’ for female students” (p. 2). Thus, study abroad programs must offer opportunities to discuss how race, class, and gender are constructed in other cultures, made meaning of by students, and enable and constrain the ability to meet program goals.

Formal on-site curricula should open up spaces to explore the ways that the raced, classed, and gendered nature of study abroad is shaped by the various cultural and linguistic insights and negotiation tactics students’ take from their interactions with each other and members of the host community. When these dimensions of multiculturalism are addressed in course meetings, it enables students to understand and grapple with how they contribute to and are shaped by cultural and material contexts and also how to employ race, class, and gender in an effort to make sense of their experiences. In addition, course discussions focused on encounters with others who hold different beliefs, attitudes, and understandings act as a supplement to the focus on national identity (Dolby, 2004, 2007) by way of introducing the discursive nature of U.S. students’ understanding of and positioning within cross-cultural contexts.

These lenses are particularly important for the alternative perspectives they offer to scholarship that assumes the individual learning outcomes of study abroad can be adequately assessed outside of cultural circumstances.⁵ The creation of culture through individual interpretation and reproduction of culture through the positions the host community makes available constitute a situated living curriculum, one that is dynamic and continuously reconstituted at “the intersections of embodied beings within an embodied culture” (Talbert & Stewart, 1999, p. 173). Twombly’s (1995) focus on women students’ diverse interpretations of their experiences suggests individual lived histories, social group affiliations (whether more obvious, such as gender and race, or less obvious, such as social class), and host culture are in concomitantly generative relations. Rather than a “cultural tourism” approach to study abroad whereby preservice teachers seek exposure to a pre-existing culture, we must begin to understand the ways their attitudes, interpretations, and understandings fashion cultural knowledge. When it comes to meaning making, Lather (2000) aptly reminds us that our interpretations are “less a repository for what has happened than a production of it” (p. 154).

Dolby (2005) notes that the possibility of “being able to truly experience and absorb others’ perspectives and daily realities” can be limited for U.S. students, particularly if they remain focused on “making sense of their American identity” (p. 112). In the same vein, Wilkinson (1998b) calls into question the commonly held belief that study abroad leads to greatly increased cultural understanding and linguistic ability. Citing contact with the host culture that “led to stereotyping and denigration” rather than openness to people who are culturally different and problems communicating in the host language that “tended to discourage subsequent attempts” (p. 33), she concluded that the study abroad experience is more complex and varied than program recruitment literature and researchers (e.g., Freed, 1995) have led others to believe. Her conclusions are particularly relevant for short-term study abroad programs, such as ours, where preservice teachers have less time to engage the perspectives of the host community or reattempt target language interactions after problems have occurred.

Given these constraints, an alternative with the ability to meet the promise of study abroad might be found in ongoing course discussions that focus on the pitfalls and perils of preservice teachers’ attempts to make sense of the host culture and improve their linguistic abilities. These

discussions build upon the peer support network that students report is an important feature of short-term programs (Nash, 1976; Wilkinson, 2000). If, as Mendelson (2004) found in a follow up study of two programs in Spain, “The majority of students reduced their descriptions . . . to one-to-two phrase generalizations, often troubling in their superficial nature” (p. 51), students’ uncritical and cursory understandings of the host culture might be countered by the proliferation of tentative readings regarding the experience of studying in an international context. Focusing on the variety of preservice teacher vantage points, such as Morgan and Vicente’s portraits reveal, as opposed to correct cultural knowledge complicates cultural learning and limits the generalizability of interpretations by rendering them partial and incomplete. Such course discussions might feature sustained questioning among preservice teachers and comparison of multiple viewpoints that lessens the authority of a single concept or experience.

Reconfiguring formal curricula to account for the ways different lived histories, outlooks on the world, and self-understandings innately affect experiences studying in another country, it becomes plausible to invite discussion that is simultaneously personal, academic, and cultural. As our research suggests, multicultural theories of race, class, and gender provide important analytic tools for understanding the diversity of experiences preservice teachers have while abroad. For example, it is possible for preservice teachers of color who experience discrimination in their home country, such as Vicente, to find that when they study abroad their race and ethnicity provide a form of social capital. Or, equally important, it is possible for preservice teachers from working class backgrounds, such as Morgan, to find that study in another country raises to the surface differences in outlook that lead to alienation from middle and upper-middle class peers on the trip.

Although there is no guarantee that immediate acclimation to the host culture will take place or experiences with isolation from peers will be overcome, opening spaces within the curricula to explore these types of experiences contributes to the texture and depth of cultural learning. A focus on the different ways preservice teachers produce and learn from cultural and linguistic contacts lessens reliance upon taken-for-granted perspectives such that preservice teachers are confronted with the variability of interpretations among the peers with whom they share in the study abroad experience. Course-based discussions that are centered on cultural differences and raise to the surface a variety of readings on the positions preservice teachers and members of the host community hold might help facilitate more realistic program goals and honor the great variations among preservice teachers’ experiences and outcomes. Certainly additional research that examines the ways formal curricula can deepen cultural learning is needed for developing mechanisms that enable the “cross-cultural experiential learning” (Wilson, 1987, p. 581) that helps meet the promise associated with study abroad programs in program recruitment and research literature.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank our College of Education and International Programs for providing funding for this research. We also wish to thank the undergraduate students who have participated in the program for generously giving their time to the research project, and graduate students who have gone with us to Honduras and have engaged with us in research on the program. We particularly wish to thank Eloisa, a native Honduran, who has worked with us in implementing the program and engaged in research on the program since its inception.

NOTES

1. Multicultural understanding in this context is defined as awareness and appreciation for those cultural attributes, beliefs, and values that are different from one's own cultural knowledge and backgrounds.
2. Pseudonyms are used for the names of all participants, and the school site.
3. We recognize that other bodies of work in cross-cultural psychology (e.g., Kitsantas, 2004) and sociology (e.g., Newman & Chen, 2007), and so on, have dealt with this topic. However, for the purposes of our work we restricted our review to study abroad and teacher education literature.
4. Following the work of Max van Manen (see 1990) on phenomenological inquiry, which aims to orient the reader toward the lived world of students via the pedagogical relationship the researcher has with them, intermittently we break with the tradition of quoting from our data "in-text" and offer our analysis followed by supporting data in parentheses. At these points, our aim is to provide the reader with rich descriptions of what is experienced followed by meaningful examples from the data.
5. Without detailed study of the raced, classed, and gendered nature of study abroad, and with the emphasis on pre and post-trip tests for assessing language acquisition and cultural knowledge among study abroad participants, it becomes possible to attribute differences in learning gains to differences in the abilities of particular social groups. Much of the study abroad research has focused on individual ability (separate from context and experience) rather than the cultural conditions that shape participants' learning. When the various dimensions of multiculturalism are infused into formal on-site curricula, and featured in study abroad research, it shifts attention from the capacities of individual participants to the issue of what it means to be a particular race and gender, and from a particular social class background, within a particular culture and among particular peers (see also Polyani, 1995).

REFERENCES

- Aoki, T. T. (1988). Towards a dialectic between the conceptual world and the lived world: Transcending instrumentalism in curriculum orientation. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Contemporary curriculum discourses* (pp. 402–416). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- American Council on Education. (2002). *Beyond September 11: A comprehensive national polity on international education*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Carlson, J. S., Burn, B. B., Useem, J., & Yachimowicz, D. (1990). *Study abroad: The experience of American undergraduates*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Citron, J., & Kline, R. (2001). From experience to experiential education: Taking study abroad outside the comfort zone. *International Educator*, 10(4), 18–26.
- Conroy, S. A. (2003). A pathway for interpretive phenomenology. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2(3), 36–62. Retrieved August 15, 2007, from <http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/IJQM/article/view/4511/3658>
- Cooper, J. E. (2007). Strengthening the case for community-based learning in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(3), 245–255.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Denzin, N. K. (2001). *Interpretive interactionism* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dolby, N. (2004). Encountering an American self: Study abroad and national identity. *Comparative Education Review*, 48(2), 150–173.
- Dolby, N. (2005). Globalization, identity, and nation: Australian and American undergraduates abroad. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 101–118.
- Dolby, N. (2007). Reflections on nation: American undergraduates and education abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(2), 141–156.

- Freed, B. F. (1995). *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gorka, B., & Niesenbaum, R. (2001). Beyond the language requirement: Interdisciplinary short-term study-abroad programs in Spanish. *Hispania*, 84(1), 100–109.
- Gray, K.S., Murdock, G. K., & Stebbins, C. D. (2002). Assessing study abroad's effect on an international mission. *Change*, 34(3), 44–51.
- Grumet, M. R. (1992). Existential and phenomenological foundations of autobiographical methods. In W. F. Pinar & W. M. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding curriculum as phenomenological and deconstructed text* (pp. 28–43). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Huba, M., & Freed, J. E. (2000). *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Institute of International Education. (2007). *Open doors 2006*. New York: Author.
- Jones M. E., & Bond, M. L. (2000). Personal adjustment, language acquisition, and culture learning in short-term cultural immersion. *International Review*, 10, 33–49.
- Kennedy, M. M. (2000). Learning to teach in a different culture. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 6(1), 75–100.
- Kitsantas, A. (2004). Studying abroad: The role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. *College Student Journal*, 38(3), 441–452.
- Kline, R. R. (1998). Literacy and language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 4(6), 139–165.
- Lather, P. (2000). Reading the image of Rigoberta Menchú: Undecidability and language lessons. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(2), 153–162.
- Laubscher, M. R. (1994). *Encounters with difference: Student perceptions of the role of out-of-class experiences in education abroad*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., & Davis, S. H. (1997). *The art and science of portraiture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lopez, K. A., & Willis, D. G. (2004). Descriptive versus interpretive phenomenology: Their contributions to nursing knowledge. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(5), 726–735.
- Mahan, J. M., & Stachowski, L. (1990). New horizons: Student teaching abroad to enrich understanding of diversity. *Action in Teacher Education*, 12(3), 13–21.
- McCabe, L. T. (2001). Globalization and internationalization: The impact on education abroad programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5(3), 138–145.
- Mendelson, V. G. (2004). Hindsight is 20/20: Student perceptions of language learning and the study abroad experience. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 43–63.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2002). *Phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, trans.). New York: Peter Lang. (Original work published 1962)
- Nash, D. (1976). The personal consequences of a year of study abroad. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 47(2), 191–203.
- Newman, K. S., & Chen, V. T. (2007). *The missing class: Portraits of the near poor in America*. Boston: Beacon.
- Opper, S., Teichler, U., & Carlson, J. (Eds.). (1990). *Impacts of study abroad programmes on students and graduates*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Orahood, T., Kruze, L., & Pearson, D. E. (2004). The impact of study abroad on business students' career goals. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10(7), 117–130.

- Phillion, J., Malewski, E., Rodriguez, E., Shirley, V., Kulago, H., & Bulington, J. (2008). Promise and perils of study abroad: White privilege revival. In T. Huber (Ed.), *Teaching and learning diversity: International perspectives on social justice and human rights* (pp. 365–382). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Pinar, W. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pires, M. (2000). Study-abroad and cultural exchange programs to Africa: America's image of a continent. *African Issues*, 28(1/2), 39–45.
- Polanyi, I. (1995). Language learning and living abroad. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 271–291). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ricoeur, P. (1979). The model of the text: Meaningful action considered as text. In P. Rabinow & W. M. Sullivan (Eds.), *Interpretive social science: A reader* (pp. 73–101). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Segalowitz, N., Freed, B., Collentine, J., Lafford, B., Lazar, N., & Díaz-Campos, M. (2004). A comparison of Spanish second language acquisition in two different learning contexts: Study abroad and the domestic classroom. *Frontiers: The International Journal of Study Abroad*, 10(1), 1–18.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Slattery, P., Krasny, K. A., & O'Malley, M. P. (2007). Hermeneutics, aesthetics, and the quest for answerability: A dialogic possibility for reconceptualizing the interpretive process in curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 39, 537–558.
- Sorrell, J. M., & Redmond, G. M. (1995). Interviews in qualitative nursing research: Differing approaches for ethnographic and phenomenological studies. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 21(6), 1117–1122.
- Smith, M. C. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Talbur, S., & Stewart, M. (1999). What's the subject of study abroad?: Race, gender, and "living culture." *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 166–175.
- Teichler, U., & Steube, W. (1991). The logics of study abroad programmes and their impacts. *Higher Education*, 21(3), 325–349.
- Twombly, S. B. (1995). *Piropos* and friendships: Gender and culture clash in study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 1, 1–27.
- United States Census Bureau. (2002). *United States Census 2000*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- van Manen, M. (1984). *Doing phenomenological research and writing*. Monograph No. 7. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Wagner, K., & Magistrale, T. (1995). *Writing across culture: An introduction to study abroad and the writing process*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Willard-Holt, C. (2001). The impact of a short-term international experience for preservice teachers. *Teacher and Teaching Education*, 17, 505–517.
- Williams, T. R. (2005). Exploring the impact of study abroad on students' intercultural communication skills: Adaptability and sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(4), 356–371.

- Wilkinson, S. (1998a). On the nature of immersion during study abroad: Some participant perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 4(5), 121–138.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998b). Study abroad from the participants' perspective: A challenge to common beliefs. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31, 23–39.
- Wilkinson, S. (2000). Emerging questions about study abroad. *ADFL-Bulletin*, 32, 36–41.
- Wilkinson, S. (2002). The omnipresent classroom during summer study abroad: American students in conversation with their French hosts. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(2), 157–173.
- Willis, P. (2001). The “things themselves” in phenomenology. *The Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 1(1), 1–14.
- Willis, P. (2004). From “the things themselves” to a “feeling of understanding”: Finding different voices in phenomenological research. *The Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 4(1), 1–13.
- Wilson, A. H. (1987). Cross-cultural experiential learning for teachers. *Theory into Practice*, 26(1), 519–527.

