2015

Study Abroad, Global Knowledge and the Epistemic Communities of Higher Education

Rebecca Hovey
Smith College, rebecca.hovey@gmail.com

Preliminary draft.
Please do not circulate without permission of author.

"Study Abroad, Global Knowledge and the Epistemic Communities of Higher Education"

Rebecca Hovey
School for International Training
Brattleboro, Vermont
rebecca.hovey@sit.edu

Paper presented at the International Studies Association conference, Honolulu, Hawaii, March 1-5, 2005

I. Introduction

This paper aims to develop theoretical concepts for examining the role of study abroad within the disciplinary fields of the US academy and, further, to pose the question of whether study abroad can serve as an integrative and potentially transformative role in knowledge generation in the academic disciplines. Study abroad is a key element of the *global turn* in US higher education, reflecting the impact of globalization on the university through the internationalization of higher education and the shift to a call for global citizenship (Hovey 2004). Acknowledged outcomes of study abroad include the experience of knowledge acquisition outside the formal US academy, the experiential learning through immersion in another culture, and an intentional appreciation of different cultural perspectives or worldviews.[1] The pedagogical value of study abroad speaks to the core of the liberal arts mission, the moral preparation of students to serve as knowledgeable and responsible citizens of their community.

International education and study abroad change the boundaries of who is included in the community of US higher education as more and more colleges and universities incorporate mission statements with aspirations of global citizenship. I argue that this changing frame of the community, moral purpose and appreciation of different worldviews has profound and significant implications for the academic and professional disciplines that constitute the academy. The impact of study abroad can be – and perhaps with a new generation of scholars will be – an epistemological shift within the disciplines to include both new modes of knowledge acquisition as well as new understandings of global realities.[2] As knowledge positions become equivalent to positions of power within the disciplines, this paper also questions whether we can construct a global democracy of knowledge production.

[1] Among the many sources describing the purpose and desired outcomes of study abroad, see the 2002 Special Issue of the Journal of Studies in International Education, "Globalizing Education at Liberal Arts Colleges in the United States" 6:3.
[2] See Cornwell and Stoddard (1999) and Rosow (2003) for critiques of international studies as a discipline of the western academy. From a third world or postcolonial perspective, see Canagarajah (2002) and Nandy (2000).

I propose that one way of understanding the role of study abroad for the US undergraduate curriculum and the academic disciplines is through the epistemic communities approach. In that study abroad is most generally supported as a means of enhancing our knowledge of other cultures and languages, and that it forms part of the university as a knowledge-centered institution, this approach provides insight into the policy, practices and domains of global knowledge production.

The theoretical concepts explored here aim to elucidate processes of global knowledge generation that occur as different epistemic communities are engaged by students and faculty in the field and on their return to the university. Understanding these processes and the challenges of integrating non-hegemonic knowledge claims can help articulate how study abroad, as a professional field of practice and inquiry, contributes to international studies, the university as an institution, and even the moral claims of global civil society.

Depending on the discipline or approach, an epistemic community is generally defined as the social network of those engaged in interpreting, legitimating, and advocating for a shared and often specialized form of knowledge or expertise, often even a specific set of scientific solutions or policy recommendations. It might be considered, at the simplest level, as a community of knowing subjects who share a worldview. In a world that is increasingly linked through knowledge or information-based technology and the so-called knowledge economy, the role that knowledge-producers or epistemic communities play as social agents differ from "interest groups" which has dominated much of the public policy literature.[3] Peter M. Haas (1992) is the most frequently cited reference to the use of epistemic communities in international relations and policy studies. Haas, and Adler and Haas (1992), outline a typology and research program for the study of epistemic communities that is central to the literature on how knowledge-producing agents influence social policy, technological advancement, cultural meanings, and organizational decision-making.

A wider set of literature associated with epistemic communities, different disciplines and varying theoretical positions offers a greater context for thinking about the role of these communities within the university. In critical literary theory, Stanley Fish's notion of interpretive communities (Fish 1975) established a path-breaking notion of reality-as-text central to a narrative theory approach in the social sciences. Foucault's use of *epistemes*, or world-views, that shape disciplinary practice has been used widely in the poststructuralist literature and is the conceptual frame used by Ruggie (1975) in his early notion of epistemic communities and institutional change.[4] Within technology studies and the sociology of science, Knorr-Cetina's (1999) work on epistemic cultures offers a social constructivist approach to knowledge, as does Latour and Woolgar's (1991) work on the practice of science. The sociology of science literature has been influential in two distinct emerging literatures: the communities of practice analysis of digital knowledge networks (i.e. information technology) (Van House 2002) and the business literature on corporate culture of the firm (Wenger, McDermott and Snyder, 2002).

[3] Although the interest group literature has been problematized in other ways that could draw similar parallels in work that examines the internal processes by which interests are negotiated and contested.
[4] Ruggie (1975) did not fully develop this notion of *epistemes* in this work and is more concerned with a typology of international regimes and institutionalized responses to complex environmental and technological change.

These varying disciplinary understandings of epistemic communities each contribute to a global perspective on knowledge I attempt to develop here in understanding the impact of international education on the formation and legitimation of academic and professional disciplines. This literature contributes to at least two levels of analysis. At one level is the formal professional involvement of epistemic communities as they shape policy and disciplinary knowledge. At a second level are the day-to-day practices of educators in the workplace, with academic peers and with students that involve knowledge construction outside the formal channels of professional networks or associations as epistemic cultures or communities of practice.

In addition, I want to broaden this notion of communities of practice further and introduce global sites of knowledge production as counter-hegemonic, dissident challenges to dominant paradigms and models of western academic knowledge.[5] The feminist critique of scientific methodology and models (Squire 2004) provides some important parallels for considering the impact of internationalized undergraduate curriculum; anthropology and postcolonial studies provide important understandings of other cultural world-views and their relation to the western academy. Mignolo (2000) borrows from the African philosopher Mudimbe's notion of gnosis as a world-view or form of social knowledges distinct from the privileging and categorizing tendencies of western academic thought. This idea of gnosis, developed as "border thinking" by Mignolo, serves here as a counter-point to question how the epistemic cultures of international or global knowledge construction are constituted. In my conclusion, I summarize the differences between approaches to epistemic communities in order to question how we think of transforming disciplinary knowledge in an era of the globalizing university.

II. Policy-oriented epistemic community analysis

Within the epistemic communities literature, Haas' work on transnational scientific networks and international policy coordination is generally considered a foundational basis for epistemic community research and methodology.[6] Haas defines an epistemic community as a "network of knowledge-based experts" (1992: p.2) who " …hold in common a set of principled and causal beliefs, …shared notions of validity and a shared policy enterprise"(1992: p.16). At the level of the state, Haas is interested in how transnational epistemic communities engage in articulating, defining, framing and negotiating policy alternatives that "may convey new patterns of reasoning to decision-makers" (1992: p.20).

Within this conceptualization of an epistemic community, the professional associations of international education, as distinct from the individual university, consortia or provider organization, and the wider network of higher education organizations represent an epistemic community in their interaction with national education policy. Many of these associations

[5] See Youde (2005), Ashley and Walker (1990), Squires (2004) overview of feminists' critiques of dominant theoretical paradigms in both natural and social sciences.
[6] Haas (1992) is the introduction to a special issue of International Organization (46:1) dedicated to the topic of epistemic communites and international policy coordination.

Initial preliminary draft for distribution to session participants only.
Please do not circulate.

emerged in the latter half of the 20th century through the support of Area Studies and expansion of US universities associated with the Cold War national security regime.[7]

Most recently, the Lincoln Fellowships Commission is an example of the role of an emerging international education epistemic community engaged in the formulation of educational policy with outcomes linked to national security, higher education, and in particular, to a shared goal of the internationalization of the US undergraduate curriculum. The Lincoln Commission is a joint congressional, public sector and university initiative to increase the number of US undergraduate students studying abroad. The intent is increasingly international study among undergraduates will have an impact on undergraduate education in the way the Fulbright Fellowships have for graduate, faculty and professional development. NAFSA: The Association of International Educators, has been a leading organizational proponent of the Lincoln Commission. In considering at least three of the four categories of the Haasian definition of epistemic communities, this initiative demonstrates the existence and cohesion of such a community in international education.

The concept of the Lincoln Fellowships was first proposed in NAFSA's Strategic Task Force on Study Abroad, chaired by the Honorary Chairs former Senator Paul Simon and former Secretary of Education Richard Riley. Membership on the Strategic Task Force represented ten public and private universities,[8] the Council on Opportunities in Education (COE), the Coalition for Foreign Languages and International Studies, and representative, the Archibald Bush Foundation, and two independent provider organizations. Given the historical moment of the September11th attack and the resulting war on terrorism, the Commission's report (NAFSA 2003) argued that a more internationally sophisticated citizenry, with enhanced language skills and knowledge of the world beyond our border, was our greatest source of national security. The report recommended increased support for study abroad, language training and promotion of international studies.

Since the release of the Strategic Task Force, and with the institutional capacity of NAFSA and other organizations to advocate for this proposal in Congress, a formal Commission has been appointed with Congressional representatives, public officials, and university leaders, office space through the American Council on Education, and a preliminary guarantee of funding from Congress for $250,000 to pursue the goals of the commission. Michigan State University president Peter McPherson was named Chair of the Commission and the first meeting was held in Washington DC on Feb 8, 2005. Membership and participation on the Lincoln Commission has widened since the original Strategic Task Force. The current commissioners include a US senator, 2 congressional representatives, a state senator, a former governor, three Directors of International Programs, and six presidential-level university appointees. An Advisory Council and additional working groups consist of representatives from leading international education

[7] Mestenhauser (2002) discusses this in relation to international education. See also the 2000 special issue on "Perspectives on Area Studies and Study Abroad" of Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad.
[8] Drake University, Georgetown University, Montana State University, Ohio University, Old Dominion University, St. Cloud State University, Southern Illinois University, State University of New York – Buffalo, Syracuse University, University of Nevada-LasVegas,

associations, organizations, non-profits and influential individuals, such as a representative from the Simon Family maintaining the late Senator's commitment to this initiative.[9]

Three of these organizations, NAFSA, the Forum on Education Abroad and the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange all serve an important role in shaping this group of organizations and educators as an epistemic community.[10] Through conferences, publications, task forces, working groups and informal networks, these groups have demonstrated the shared norms, causality relations and common policy enterprise.[11]

The fourth Haasian dimension of a shared set of validity norms is found in a separate area of initiatives and disciplinary practice that is recently emerging from the study abroad field. In 2000, when the Forum on Education Abroad was established, members of the study abroad profession felt the field needed professional grounding and legitimacy in shared standards and research. While the Institute for International Education (a member of the Lincoln Commission Advisory Council) has been working with universities for several years in the compilation of data on international education, published through the annual Open Doors survey, the accuracy of data collection on campuses and the quality of educational programming was of increasing concern. The numbers of students going abroad had more than doubled in the decade between 1990 and 2000, with many projecting that the current number of students would double again by the end of the current decade.[12] The Forum identified five strategic areas for legitimizing practices in the field of study abroad and has spent the past three years developing criteria, holding working groups and conferences on these topics, and publishing working papers toward establishment of norms and guidelines that set parameters for best professional practice.

Among these initiatives is a working group on outcomes assessment and research (Forum 2002). For the purposes of this paper, this work is significant because it helps establish that these groups meet Haasian criteria for epistemic communities and further, they offer an emerging set of research from which to evaluate the contribution of study abroad, as global learning, to the transformation of academic knowledge.[13]

[9] The organizations represented are the Institute for International Education (IIE), International Student Exchange Program (ISEP), the Forum on Education Abroad, Educational Testing Service (ETS), Mobility International, the Council on Opportunities in Education (COE), and the Alliance for International and Cultural Exchange.
[10] The Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) is another group with overlapping membership in the organizations listed.
[11] See NAFSA (2003) Johnson (2005), Lincoln Fellowships Commission (2004).
[12] The Strategic Task Force report (NAFSA 2003) projected an increase of up to 500,000 by the end of the decade. Minutes provided of the first Commission meeting (AIEA 2005) discuss current rate of increase in study abroad participation would reach 300,000 by the year 2010 and many supporters believing the Lincoln Commission should augment that rate. Discussion was raised about the capacity of international education offices and providers to accommodate this growing trend.
[13] A well-known assessment tool of international learning, for example, measures the enhanced intercultural sensitivity, awareness and respect reported by the learner. Many studies cite the increased "tolerance for ambiguity" as an important outcome of learning abroad, a measure purportedly representing greater comfort levels with uncertainty as an operational context for thinking and action. Given that Haas was particularly concerned with policy coordination in realms involving high levels of uncertainty, such as climate change, the capacity for international education to prepare future leaders, scientists and citizens to participate effectively in such contexts could suggest the impact in social learning that Haas also sees as central to epistemic communities. From an entirely different perspective challenging the privilege of dominant knowledge hierarchies, Ashley and Walker

Initial preliminary draft for distribution to session participants only.
Please do not circulate.

The institutional support for and emphasis on outcomes assessment research shows overlapping networks with the NAFSA-led policy initiatives supporting study abroad.[14] It is through these networks that the analysis of international education as an epistemic community reveals the dimension of sharing validity norms. A critical feature of Haasian epistemic communities is the capacity for knowledge generation and the role of these communities in advancing policy through parallel advances in new knowledge. The formation and active pursuit of agreed upon research norms and methods in study abroad shows that while even an emerging field of research, it is a dynamic field of normatively-grounded research and innovation.

It is through this work in outcomes assessment that the impact of international education on academic disciplinary knowledge may be evaluated.[15] While most international educators would support national level policy objectives contributing to greater national security and capabilities in the global economy, many of these same organizations and individuals work with a wider range of academic communities who argue that the pedagogical or human development outcomes of study abroad are much more intrinsic to the cognitive and moral development of the student. Many faculty in particular want to see substantive learning in the disciplinary fields and ask how the intercultural learning objectives contribute to substantive learning? And, to further complicate the debates, as colleges and universities increasingly seek to integrate study abroad learning, some practitioners question whether this integration refers to standardization of curriculum in the international higher education community or respect for differences and a concept of integration that accepts differences in coursework, learning methodologies and frames of analysis.[16]

III. Communities of practice and the university context

A second level of analysis on epistemic communities is an emerging literature on what is referred to as "communities of practice" within knowledge-based professions, organizations or institutions. Communities of practice are informally linked networks "bound together by shared expertise and passion for a joint enterprise" (Wenger and Snyder 2000). An important distinction between this dimension of an epistemic culture and Haas' notion of epistemic communities in the policy arena is that participants in a community of practice are often not predominantly the recognized experts in a field, but the practitioners, technology "users", or, with a manufacturing analogy, the "factory floor" level of workers engaged in a knowledge-

(1990) suggest that ambiguity is a resource and desired frame of "extraterritorial" space for dissident thought in the disciplines.
[14] The emphasis on outcomes assessment is not unique to international education and reflects a far-reaching emphasis on results-driven measures to demonstrate educational success.
[15] For example, one of the first initiatives of the Forum on Education Abroad was to establish a set of five critical working groups, one of which is the Committee on Assessment and Research (Forum 2002). The Fall 2004 issue of Frontiers is a special issue on The Assessment of Study Abroad Learning. The Journal editor's opening letter refers to this issue as "one of the most important publications in the history of study abroad" (Whalen 2004 p.v) and the Guest Editor's Introduction also refers to the emerging work in assessment as reflecting a "paradigm shift" in the professional field of study abroad (Vande Berg 2004 p.xii). See also Franco and Overton (2005) and ACE (2005) for a report and updates on an American Council on Education and Department of Education Title VI research project establishing criteria and standards for assessing international education at a range of institution.
[16] Personal conversations with Jane Edwards, Harvard University and David Macey, Middlebury College.

based field. In the business community, these communities of practice are similar to the "total quality control" circles fashionable at one time in manufacturing. Mojta (2004) writes of the students and support staff at a campus IT help desk who engage in practices of informal knowledge-sharing that forms a community. These informal knowledge-sharing networks can lead to the mobilization of new ideas and be a catalyst for new knowledge generation in a professional field. The prevalence of list-serves, discussion boards and chat rooms in many professional communities are an example of ways in which these communities of practice engage in a knowledge-based field or institution.

Van House (2002) discusses the significance of these communities with a particular concern for the practices of trust and credibility they lend to the outcome or product of a knowledge-based enterprise. If, in the Haasian definition of an epistemic community, the establishment of norms of validity and causal relations of a scientific methodology are critical, the emphasis on trust and credibility in communities of practice speaks to both the acceptance of these norms and the intersubjective quality of the social relationships that are built through interaction in the field.[17]

The promotion and creation of credibility in the study abroad field can be found in practitioner responses to mass media accounts of "wild partying" in study abroad or even faculty perceptions that study abroad is not "serious" academic study. For example, a few years ago the anthropologist Ben Feinberg published a commentary in the Chronicle of Higher Education on the irony of how students purportedly go abroad to learn about other cultures but return writing and talking about how much they learned about themselves (Feinberg, 2002). This piece spurred an intense debate on the list-serves and office discussions in large part because practitioners felt their credibility was threatened.[18] The responses to Feinberg, though, demonstrated a social learning in the field and re-articulation of the purpose and value of study abroad in ways that are not as widespread or influential as a published piece of formal research on knowledge claims.

Mestenhauser's analysis of the international education field from a systems perspective offers an excellent institutional mapping for thinking about study abroad communities of practice within the university and the politics of negotiating across the internal boundaries of international studies (Mestenhauser 2002).[19] He describes seven learning domains relevant to international education: international studies and International Relations; area studies; foreign languages; international aspects of the academic disciplines; scholarly and student international exchange; development and inter-university affiliations; and the administrative functions behind international education. Mestenhauser describes the "conceptual clarity and coherence" of the field supported by five different perspectives. The first of these, the "stakeholders and constituents" would correspond to the notion of a communities of practice developed here (2002: p.174). The four other perspectives pertain to the more specific contexts of practice or the formal policy and knowledge legitimation functions of Haasian level of epistemic community.[20]

[17] The notion of lived experiences of daily life supporting structural patterns, ideologies or formal knowledge is not new and offers an important dimension for thinking about these communities. See de Certeau (1984) and Bourdieu (1977) among others, on social practices. Much of the work in the field of Cultural Studies also offers perspectives on how dominant practices and knowledge originate from and are maintained through popular cultural forms.
[18] Cite the Section on US Students Abroad (SECUSSA) May 2002 archive responses. (SECUSSA 2002).
[19] For another perspective on the institutional context for international education, see Knight (2004).
[20] These are the scope of international education practice (i.e. country focus), the pedagogical practices, institutional context, and the meta-knowledge of the field (Mestenhauser 2002: p.174).

Initial preliminary draft for distribution to session participants only.
Please do not circulate.

As members of a community of practice, international educators, as stakeholders in the field, situate their role both within contextual perspective and a domain within the university. However, the knowledge practices engage stakeholders with other communities of practice associated with those domains. For example, interdisciplinary faculty advisory committees often oversee and approve of study abroad programming at a university. As the study abroad professionals interact with these faculty, advocate for programs and learning outcomes, they have the capacity to disseminate knowledge of their field to those faculty and administrators who serve as gatekeepers to the disciplinary curricula of the campus.

While the Haasian definition is useful in understanding policy dynamics and a narrow set of common norms and beliefs in the field, it does not offer insight into the debates, contested meanings, internal disagreements or emerging challenges to a dominant view of international education. Youde's (2005) description of counter-epistemic communities is an example of how different perspectives and/or practices can emerge which challenge a prevailing approach. Extending the notion of knowledge-networks to a wider field of practitioners in an interconnected institutional setting provides a context in which we can observe and follow the dissenting views and questions that emerge from practice.

IV. Global sites of knowledge and the boundaries of epistemic communities

In some of my other work (Hovey 2004) I explore the dialogical aspects of knowledge construction possible through international education, and specifically the dilemma of assuming that authentic intercultural communication, as the basis for learning about other world-views and cultures, can occur in a world profoundly marked by power imbalances. This work follows Gayatri Spivak's question, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in considering the problem of voice and identity in intercultural communication.

I want to further develop this line of thought here with questions regarding the underlying knowledge claims about the world that students and faculty bring back to their respective learning, teaching and research in the academy – specifically speaking to the US academic disciplines and their dominant or even hegemonic position within the contemporary global knowledge-based or information-network economy. Increased study abroad opportunities expand the access of students to sites of global knowledge that are, ideally, unmediated by the formality of academic learning. Although standardization pressures exist to universalize international higher education curricula (Currie and Newson 1998, de Wit 2002, and Scott 1998), a stronger "principled norm" of the study abroad community is to value direct cultural immersion and appreciation of different world-views as the distinguishing and most value-laden dimension of study abroad.

As students and faculty increasingly gain knowledge of the global "other" through international study, how then does this knowledge translate back into the home campus curriculum, a goal supported by the many "integration of study abroad" and "internationalization of the curriculum" efforts? And as it does, how do we conceive of the global "others" as members of a global epistemic culture that transforms academic knowledge? As international education policy

increasingly supports study in non-traditional, i.e. non-western, sites, this question of how we teach our students to appreciate and learn from other knowledge sources is ever more critical.

As a way of examining this global dimension of epistemic cultures, and to problematize the cohesiveness of epistemic norms, I turn to Mignolo's notions of border thinking, local histories and global designs (Mignolo 2000). Mignolo's contribution is important as it allows us to understand both critical dimensions at work within the university as a site of knowledge production, but also to understand the limits by which Western knowledge, both as interpretation and reason - as hermeneutics and epistemology - can comprehend the realities and experiences colonized by globalization. He borrows from the African philosopher Mudimbe in reclaiming *gnosis* as an alternative form of knowledge – neither hermeneutics or epistemology – but a locally derived "understanding of the world" that can represent alternative or indigenous knowledge systems not fully explained by western traditions. He applies this to an understanding of globalization as the new project of modernity. Mignolo, along with Dussel Peters and others, view the emergency of modernity through the imposition of coloniality. He describes the hegemony of western academic thought as an expression of the "coloniality of power" through which ways of knowing and forms of knowledge shape the borders or boundaries of power, especially in their capacity to marginalize (Mignolo would say to "subalternize") local knowledge.

From Mignolo's perspective, globalization, then, becomes a new colonizing power that marginalizes and appropriates the "other" knowledge through western epistemology. *Gnosis*, however, provides a site in which local histories and knowledge can emerge in their own right. The question of validity of local knowledge forms has surfaced in the controversy over the past two decades around the Rigoberta Menchu *testimonio*, or narrative, as a source of knowledge.[21] Alternative approaches are possible and are a growing set of literature in global studies and interdisciplinary approaches to international studies. Florencia Mallon (2003) addresses some of the critiques of the *testimonio* literature through a dialogical research methodology in which she "edits" the reflective interviews and dialogues with an indigenous feminist leader from Chile. While creating a set of filters that help "translate" indigenous knowledge, it also acknowledges the indigenous subject as an active partner in a dialogue between two worlds of the power borders described by Mignolo.

The exploration of how global knowledges are formed outside the methodological norms of the western academy raises profound philosophical questions about knowledge, the relationship between science and reality[22], and a political reading of the university as an institution. It is critical to explore this question, however, in attempting to understand how international education impacts disciplinary knowledge.

If our students are learning in a host culture, engaged in dialogue and experiential education with local subject who share their local knowledge, how is this knowledge "translated" or synthesized

[21] Ironically Menchu's narrative is now considered part of the canon in Global Studies. These debates have also been central to the rethinking of identity and narrative in anthropology, as local interlocutors (previously referred to as "informants") are seen as co-authors of the ethnographic text. See Clifford and Marcus (1986), among others.
[22] See Haas' discussion of the ontological claims underlying the capacity of epistemic communities to influence policy.

Initial preliminary draft for distribution to session participants only.
Please do not circulate.

back into the home campus curriculum? Many campus study abroad programs are increasingly concerned with what is called "re-entry", focusing largely on the reverse culture shock that occurs as students confront their culture of origin after an extended absence. At some campuses that support a majority of students studying abroad, the question of how the off-campus international learning is supported by faculty in coursework, honors' theses, and other mentoring relationships that help students integrate their study abroad learning with their course of study. A critical perspective on this re-entry would warn against the re-packaging or reductionism of the international learning.

Another question is what relationship the local subjects, or global "other", have in the epistemic cultures of higher education. Some initial work on the role of homestay and host communities as partners in the delivery of study abroad programs suggests that this relationship also plays a valuable role in the reproduction of local culture and negotiation of cultural identities, as well as their contribution to international education programs.[23] Can we think of communities of practice expanding beyond a tight, formal policy-oriented epistemic community, to the wider communities of the university, and even further to the global sites of international study that include international scholars, host communities, indigenous ways of knowing and marginal subjects?

At the heart of this question are two key dilemmas: One, does study abroad, through students' and faculty immersion in other cultural practices and forms of knowing, have the potential to transform academic knowledge. If so, this would demonstrate the capacity for an inclusive epistemic culture or communities of global knowledge. Two, can this inclusive approach to epistemic communities of higher education be based on a respect for difference and identity that would allow for a global democracy of knowledge production? If transformation of the disciplines serves only to re-assert hegemony under changing conditions of global knowledge, what implications does this have for the goal of international education to promote appreciation and respect for other cultures?

In considering the impact of international education on the university, it is important to also understand a wider set of globalizing influences on higher education: corporatization, privatization, commodification of knowledge, massification of the student as consumer, and a shift from the university as a site of national identity formation to the university as a site of either national security and/or surveillance. This transformation of the university, primarily in the West but associated with economic development in the global south, raises questions about the role of the University in the 21st century. What are the processes of knowledge construction and inquiry associated with the global university? How does knowledge shape and constitute social identity at the local level, and is it even possible to have "global knowledge"? Can we imagine a global cosmopolis who are the citizenry of the global university, a global democracy of knowledge production? Or, will the social costs of inclusion in the globalizing university be too high?

[23] Levy (2004), Rodriguez (2004)

References

Adler, Emanuel and Peter M. Haas (1992). "Conclusion: Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Program," International Organization 46:1, pp.367-390.

AIEA (2005). Feb 22 2005 e-mail to AIEA members: "AIEA -- Alliance -- Lincoln Fellowships Commission - Summary of Feb. 8 Meeting". AIEA: Duke University.

American Council on Education (2005). Working Group on International Learning. http://www.acenet.edu/programs/international/fipse/.

Ashley, Richard K. and R.B.J. Walker (1990). "Introduction: Speaking the Language of Exile: Dissident Thought in International Studies," International Studies Quarterly 34:3, pp. 259-268.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977). Outline of a Theory of Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh (2002). A Geopolitics of Academic Writing. Pittsburgh, PA: Pittsburgh University Press

Clifford, James and George E. Marcus (eds.) (1986). Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Cornwell, Grant H. and Eve W. Stoddard (1999). Globalizing Knowledge: Connecting International and Intercultural Studies. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities.

Currie, Jan and Janice Newson (eds.) (1998). Universities and Globalisation: Critical Perspectives. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

de Certeau, Michel (1984). The Practice of Everyday Life. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

de Wit, Hans (2002). Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States and Europe: A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis. Greenwood Studies in Higher Education. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Feinberg, Ben (2002). "What Students Don't Learn Abroad." Editorial of The Chronicle of Higher Education. May 2, 2002: p.B20.

Fish, Stanley (1980, 1975). Is There a Text in this Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities. Cambridge,MA: Harvard University Press.

Forum on Education Abroad (2002). http://www.forumea.org/goals03.html.

Franco, Robert and Joseph Overton (2005). "Integrated versus Intensive Program Outcomes at Kapiolani Community College, University of Hawaii." Paper presented at the International Studies Association conference, Hawaii, March 1-5 2005.

Haas, Peter M. (1992). "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination," International Organization 46:1, pp.1-35.

Hovey, Rebecca (2004). "Critical Pedagogy and International Studies: Reconstructing Knowledge through Dialogue with the Subaltern," International Relations 18:2, pp.241-254.

Johnson, Marlene (2005). Letter to the Commissioners of the Lincoln Fellowship Program, February 14 2005. Washington DC: NAFSA.

Johnson, Victor C. (2005). February 14th 2005 Letter to the Commissioners of the Lincoln Fellowship Commission. NAFSA: http://www.nafsa.org/content/publicpolicy/NAFSAontheIssues/lincolnnafsaltr020305.pdf

Initial preliminary draft for distribution to session participants only.
Please do not circulate.

Knight, Jane (2004). "Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales." Journal of Studies in International Education 8:1.

Knorr-Cetina, Karen (1999). Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Latour, Bruno and Steve Woolgar (1991). Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Levy, Julie (2004). "Communities as Centers of Knowledge/Learning." Presentation at the 12th World Congress of Comparative Education Societies, Havana, Cuba October 2004.

Lincoln Fellowships Commission (2004). The State and Future of Study Abroad in the United States. A Briefing Book for the Bipartisan Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Fellowship Program. Produced by the Research and Analysis Working Group and edited by Carl Herrin. Washington, DC: Lincoln Fellowships Commission.

Mallon, Florencia E. "Introduction." (2002) In Rosa Isolde Reuque Paillalef, When a Flower is Reborn: The Life and Times of a Mapuche Feminist. Edited, translated and with an introduction by Florencia E. Mallon. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mestenhauser, Josef A. (2002). "In Search of a Comprehensive Approach to International Education: A Systems Perspective" in Nana Rinehart and Walter Grunzweig (eds.) Rockin' in Red Square: Critical Approaches to International Education in the Age of Cyberculture. London: Transaction Publishers.

Mignolo, Walter (2000). Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges and Border Thinking. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mojta, Debbie (2004). "Communities of Practice: Dare to Share the Knowledge," Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM SIGUCCS Conference on User Services. New York: ACM Press and http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1027801.1027811.

NAFSA. (2003). Securing America's Future: Global Education for a Global Age. Report of the Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad. Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Nandy, Ashis. 2000. "Recovery of Indigenous Knowledge and Dissenting Futures of the University," Inayatullah, Sohail and Jennifer Gidley (eds.) The University in Transformation: Global Perspectives on the Futures of the University. Westport, CN: Bergin & Garvey.

Rodriguez, Karen (2004). "Engaging the Space Between Us: Self, Other and Social change." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Council on International Educational Exchange, Nov 10-12 2004, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Rosow, Stephen J. (2003). "Toward an Anti-disciplinary Global Studies," International Studies Perspectives 4:1, pp.1-14.

Ruggie, John Gerard (1975). "International Responses to Technology: Concepts and Trends," International Organization 29:3, pp.557-583.

Scott, Peter (ed.) (1998). The Globalization of Higher Education. Birmingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and the Open University Press.

SECUSSA (2002, various). Archive of list-serve discussion in response to Feinberg article. NAFSA: SECUSSA archive, May 2002.

Squires, Judith (2004). "Symposium: Feminist Methodologies; Introduction." European Consortium for Political Science, http://www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/publications/eps/onlineissues/spring2004/research/squires.htm.

Van House, Nancy A. (2004). "Trust and Epistemic Communities in Biodiversity Data Sharing," Proceedings of the 2nd ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on Digital Libraries, New York: ACM Press and http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/544220.544270.

Vande Berg, Michael J. (2004). "Introduction." Special issue on Assessment of Study Abroad Learning. Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Education Abroad. X: Fall.

Wenger, Etienne and William Snyder (2000). "Communities of Practice: The Organizational Frontier," Harvard Business Review 78:1.

Wenger, Etienne, Richard McDermott and William Snyder (2002). Cultivating Communities of Practice: A Guide to Managing Knowledge. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Whalen, Brian (2004). "From the Editor," Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Education Abroad. X: Fall.

Youde, Jeremy (2005). "Counter-Epistemic Communities and International Regimes." Paper presented at the 2005 International Studies Association conference, Hawaii, March 1-5, 2005.