Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad

Volume 37, Issue 2, pp. 1-33
DOI: 10.36366/frontiers.v37i2.658
www.frontiersjournal.org

Being Bad Guests: Teaching Ethnic Studies with Study Abroad

Natchee Blu Barnd[1]

Abstract in English

In this essay, I argue that Ethnic Studies-based approaches to racism and colonialism can improve student learning during study abroad. These approaches can further extend learning impact beyond that of diversity, equity, and inclusion goals. I outline how every host site can support attention to race and colonialism, explain the dangers of ignoring racism and colonialism during international learning sojourns, describe the need to specifically attend to whiteness, and illustrate my argument with three brief case studies of pedagogical and program design outcomes from recent study abroad trips to England and Japan. The essay intends to expand the "locations" where attention to issues of race and colonialism can be appropriately applied in order to make interventions in program design. For faculty who lead programs and to study abroad staff who organize and initiate programs, the essay offers tools and frameworks to more effectively combat racism at home and abroad as well as to avoid colonial travel practices.

Abstract in Japanese

著者は、民族研究に基づくアプローチが、留学中の学生の学習を改善し、多様性、公平性、包括性の目標を超えてその影響を拡大できると主張しています。この論文では、どのホストサイトでも人種と植民地主義を考慮する方法を概説し、海外での学習中に人種差別と植民地主義を無視する危険性を説明し、白人性に特に注意を払う必要性を述べ、最近のイギリスと日本における研修旅行で得られた教育およびプログラム設計の成果に関する 3 つの簡単な事例研究を提供しています。この論文は、人種と植民地主義の問題に注目すべき「場所」を拡大し、プログラム設計に介入

1 Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, United States of America

Corresponding author: Natchee Barnd, natchee_blu@yahoo.com

Date of Acceptance: January 19th, 2025

するための適切な運用を目指しています。この記事は、プログラムを主導する教員やプログラムを計画し行う留学スタッフに、国内外での人種差別と戦い、植民地的な旅行を避けるためのツールとフレームワークを提供することを目的としています。

Keywords

Colonialism; ethnic studies; pedagogy; program design; racism; whiteness

1. Introduction

During study abroad learning, I want students who are “bad guests.” In fact, I intentionally try to train them to be bad guests.

At first glance, the idea of bad guests may seem counterintuitive. After all, most of us strive to train undergraduates to be positive representatives of our institutions during study abroad. We tend to think of the “bad” guest as one who exhibits disregard for or ignorance about local context, while centering their own cultural sensibilities. However, as I illustrate here, I use “bad guest” to mean applying critical and interrogative skills, specifically around racism and colonialism, throughout the study abroad experience. Rather than being a passive sojourner or tourist, a bad guest in this mode means being an engaged, self-reflective learner. Thus, being a bad guest is an act of balancing graciousness for one’s host with an insistence on engaging social justice. I will explain and offer some context for this approach to study abroad by describing two short-term, faculty-led study abroad programs—one to England and one to Japan. In both cases, I taught courses rooted in my home discipline, Ethnic Studies, which prioritizes critical analysis of race, colonialism, and social dynamics of power more generally. Using lessons from these two study abroad sites, I argue that being a “bad guest” entails being a good student.

To justify this counterintuitive positioning of student “behavior,” I need to offer a brief explanation of the origins and goals of my discipline, as well as to suggest some of the reasons why Ethnic Studies and study abroad may not initially seem to align with one another. I then make the case for how and why their alignment actually makes a great deal of sense, and how an intentional synthesis of Ethnic Studies types of analysis and study abroad can better facilitate international learning goals as well as broaden and enrich transnational Ethnic Studies learning possibilities.

Particularly important during this ongoing moment of national racial reckoning, I share these insights from study abroad experiences in order to suggest how we can provide students an opportunity to utilize a global framework for understanding and comparing how race and racism work, as well as how different systems of race are linked. While the particular techniques and examples I use may not all be translatable for every study abroad offering or instance, I argue that this approach goes to the heart of study abroad. Currently, study abroad programs and offerings underutilize their capacity for learning about racism and colonialism both abroad and at home. Applying key elements of an Ethnic Studies model for study abroad can help faculty leaders and programs to effectively challenge the persistent misunderstandings about addressing difference and normativity that shape current practices of study abroad design and delivery. I especially want to disrupt the dominant discussions about diversity, equity, and inclusion within study abroad that continue to reproduce inequity and dominant racial norms.

2. Being Bad Guests and Framing Ethnic Studies

Although I intentionally position students in the role of being a "bad guest" in that they engage with materials, ideas, and communities that challenge the dominant narratives of our host country, it is important to state that I absolutely expect respectful behavior in interpersonal and social encounters. I think it is safe to say that most students are appropriately polite in their daily interactions when traveling abroad (Dolby, 2007). Yet scholars also observe that polite deference is often already sealed-off within consumer-centered and touristic bubbles (see Miller-Idriss et al., 2019; Sharpe, 2015). This can generate a different challenge, since faculty are often operating under the pressures of neoliberal economic models that Julie Ficarra (2017) says create pressure to appeal to students as customers, and thus to "straddle a widening divide between critical educator and travel agent" (p. 1). For these reasons, my study abroad design actively aims for more "confrontation" in both the mode of student engagement and the model of study abroad design.

At its most basic, I see "being a bad guest" as an intentional learning strategy for enhancing comparative self-reflection opportunities. Asking students to be bad guests can expand their ability to *responsibly* engage with the nuances and contradictions of their hosts' cultures and practices, as well as to reflect on their own more fully. I ask students to pay attention to the nuances and contradictions regarding race, racism, and colonialism. To do this means to

look for and to look at normative "breaks," and to actively center issues of social justice through the analytics of race and colonialism.

Because Ethnic Studies is, in my professional experience, not a widely understood or even widely available discipline, I want to quickly clarify what it is and is not. I start by stating that Ethnic Studies is not anthropology, since that is the most common misrecognition I encounter both within academia and beyond. Anthropology takes as its primary subject the understanding of cultures and societies, with a traditional focus on "foreign" cultural practices and their differences, as well as attending to the self-reflections that those studies ideally generate about one's "home" context (American Anthropological Association, n.d.). While culture and self-reflectiveness are also important analytics within Ethnic Studies, the field is not primarily concerned with cultural differences per se, nor with seeking out and learning from "external" practices and differences. Despite the admittedly misleading name, Ethnic Studies is only partially interested in interrogating the building blocks of ethnicity (which is essentially group identity/lineage and culture). Ethnic Studies is much more interested in formations and resistances to power, through a central analytic of race/racism along with simultaneous intersections across ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, citizenship, and more (Critical Ethnic Studies Editorial Collective, 2016; Ferguson, 2017; Okihiro, 2016). These axes, however, are mostly important to the extent that they are established as crucial and common social "sites" for systemic and institutional oppressions.

As my description hints, Ethnic Studies is an activist discipline. It was founded by student and community activism, with the purpose of intentionally and explicitly supporting empowerment of marginalized communities and peoples. While the interdisciplinary approach and anti-imperial stance of the field allows for a wide range of topics and techniques, it originates from US-based activism of the 1960s and 1970s (Ferguson, 2017; Okihiro, 2016). Students of color and Indigenous students, in conjunction with their constituent communities, created Ethnic Studies as a response to US-specific conditions of institutional and systemic racism, white supremacy, imperialism, and settler colonialism. These students challenged and protested racist university curricular content, and sought to eliminate the discriminatory policies and practices they daily experienced. They also worked to redirect the interests and resources of higher education institutions that had historically (often officially)

ignored or exploited communities of color and Indigenous communities (Dong, 2019; Ferguson, 2017; Khanmalek, 2019; Okihiro, 2016).

Even as its core of activism keeps the field firmly anchored to the US context, the overarching analytic of power dynamics which drives Ethnic Studies is a useful and transferrable toolset for a variety of cultural, social, and political spaces. It asks students to pay attention to non-dominant experiences, narratives, and perspectives. It requires examining the social implications for those deemed not "belonging" as a citizen or cultural subject, and then activating an analysis of power that is attentive to the matrices of ethnicity, race, and Indigeneity. Given that the field is attuned to the possibilities and necessities of fluidity and hybridity, Ethnic Studies also provides a potent approach to study abroad learning and its goals of encouraging comparative analyses. Thus, being bad guests represents a long-embedded Ethnic Studies approach.

This US-specific lineage is one reason the pairing of Ethnic Studies and study abroad may appear misaligned, especially compared to anthropology's centering of international engagement and learning. Yet, this apparent misalignment actually offers one of the more profound points of confluence. One core value of study abroad rests on the benefits of travelling abroad to learn and gain cultural experiences and tools for self-reflection. This value rests, however, on an imagined study abroad student. It presumes certain normative frames out of which that student is being asked to exceed or to extend beyond. Students are thus encouraged to travel to other countries in order to gain new cultural exposure, to broaden their worldly knowledge and experiences, to make business or social connections, and to reflect on their own contexts and self-understanding.

Ethnic Studies scholarship and practices, however, are heavily informed by the experiences and knowledges of culturally and racially marginalized communities. It was founded precisely in response to the experiences and consequences of difference, including the often violent expectations that immigrants and other "ethnic" Americans submit to assimilation and dominant cultural norms and epistemologies (Ferguson, 2017; Okihiro, 2016). Most of the students majoring in Ethnic Studies and almost all the faculty are likewise directly/personally experienced in the navigation of race and culture, as well as practices of migration, immigration, and transnational linkage. So, while US-centered, Ethnic Studies has always necessarily operated from a multi-ethnic,

multiracial, transnational, and often global set of lenses, perhaps most clearly visible within the sub-fields of Latinx and Asian American studies.

These observations help us lay bare the unexamined presumptions that locations of "difference" are to be found beyond the borders of the nation, and that such difference is a variation or divergence from normative Whiteness and European American cultures. These normative assumptions clearly ignore those communities already living in multi-cultural, Indigenous, racialized, and immigrant contexts *within* the US, as well as beyond. At the same time, then, study abroad presumptions predetermine which social-cultural contexts are valued and which are devalued in terms of cultural experiences and learning. Whether study abroad experiences are framed as personally or professionally beneficial, for example, depends on the destination site/culture; such that the meaning of traveling to European and Western nations like France or Germany will generally be interpreted quite differently than traveling to nations like Nigeria or Cambodia (Hoffa, 2007; Onyenekwu, 2017; Whalen & Woolf, 2020; Woolf, 2010). Lastly, even within this hierarchical valuing, it is also clear that the basic *capacity* and *inclination* to voluntarily travel abroad and have international experiences are sometimes just as valuable in terms of social capital as any specific experiential or learning outcomes.

3. Confronting Whiteness

With these frameworks in mind, I now turn to an applied review of literature that helps contextualize the value of combining Ethnic Studies approaches and study abroad. As a first step, study abroad must reframe its understanding of race/racism and colonialism, and it should explicitly confront Whiteness in its design and student learning.

There are too few studies about programs or courses that use racialized experiences as a substantive point of analysis within study abroad in conjunction with the host country experience or in their pedagogical design. This is not to suggest we lack good work addressing issues of race and racism in some aspects of study abroad. I want to differentiate those works, however, from the race-as-analytic approach that I hope to encourage and want to amplify.

I start by emphasizing that Ethnic Studies requires engagement with race regardless of the demographics of the student or faculty travelers. As I outline below, the majority of my students identified as White. The program was thus consciously and actively designed with this demographic information in mind.

In the US, most programs are constructed with a presumed White student as its subject, although mostly by default and without critical reflection on what this means for the study abroad experience. This mirrors the common perception that race ultimately translates to people of color. We often see this slippage in discourse about diversity, for example, where individuals are labeled as "diverse" such that the term is implicitly but clearly meant to signal someone as non-White, woman, queer, or disabled.

The same slippages happen in discussions about diversity and study abroad. In their recent introductory essay for the *Frontiers* special issue on "equity and inclusion," for example, the guest editors explain that they selected articles that "relate to student identity *when it intersects* with systems of power and privilege" (Contreras et al., 2019, p. 3; emphasis added). What I must presume they meant was that they selected articles directly dealing with the experiences of students of color during study abroad, and specifically ones addressing discriminatory or exclusionary concerns. Clearly, these are important concerns to research, to hear, and to convey. This information must help us reframe how study aboard works, and for whom it works better and worse (Chang, 2017; Johnstone et al, 2020; Pulsifer et al, 2020; Quan, 2018; Talburt & Stewart, 1999; Willis, 2015). Yet the editors' claim offers a misleading frame, since it works to re-articulate the notion that only racialized students are impacted by race, and that race in effect resides within them and their "differently" marked bodies. Thus, they argue that we must (only) attend to the experiences of race and racism as lived by students of color.

In this articulation by Contreras et al. (2019), Whiteness once again becomes invisible and unmarked. The editors might have (more accurately) said that racialized students are the ones who are usually *negatively* impacted by power and privilege based on race. This subtle but important distinction would better lead them (and readers) to recognize that experiences of racial discrimination simultaneously points to the ways that White students typically experience and can passively expect that their identities will intersect *positively* (although invisibly and thus unremarkably) with those same "systems of power and privilege." This important clarification requires explicit recognition that the dominant White demographic, which comprises the bulk of study abroad participation, will almost always find their Whiteness rendered effectively invisible and de-racialized, except *sometimes* in cases where they travel to a majority non-White or non-Christian host nation and may expect to be

continually "noticed." As I will describe, this was one of my motivations for choosing Japan for the second trip.

Concerns about race and racism may sometimes rise to consciousness, or make their way into curricular design, when programs expect significant participation from students of color and thus when some form of racial confrontation or discomfort is expected. In these cases, emphasis is placed on preparing those students of color for their study abroad experiences. This begs the question of why only some students need to prepare for their encounters with race and racism. Students of color are asked to armor up and groom themselves for their encounters, to gather tools for tackling "their" unique obstacles. Or, in some cases, motivated program staff or facilitators will seek to design alternative or "heritage" opportunities to destinations in Africa (see Gearhart, 2005; Landau & Moore, 2015; Lee & Green, 2016; Tolliver, 2000) or Latin America (see Chang, 2017; Wick et al., 2019) where presumably such concerns will be reduced.

In all of these approaches, the neutral or positive experiences of Whiteness is simply given an unspoken "pass." Since White students are less likely to be negatively impacted by their racialization, it remains left uninterrogated. In effect, the problems of racism and colonialism are not "theirs" to notice, let alone solve. So, they will not be asked to contemplate or prepare for one of the things that will most likely "conspire" to offer them a positive experience, at least in terms of their racial embodiment.

While this results at least in part from a larger context of Eurocentrism and a legacy of White supremacy, the imbalance also manifests through curation of destinations. In his history of study abroad programs in the US, William Hoffa tells us that after World War I "many Americans still thought they needed to live and learn in Europe in order to be fully educated. These sentiments were often a 'class' belief, reflective of the Eurocentric orientation" of the US (Hoffa & Forum on Education Abroad, 2007, p. 62). Ficarra (2017) reports that study abroad marketing likewise continues to feed into Eurocentric programs that overemphasize travel to European nations. Che et al. (2009) similarly note that programs are heavily weighted toward European and Western nations, while arguing that the simple choice to provide more diverse offerings can dramatically shift the individual learning developments and overall global awareness for students.

To be sure, part of the ongoing appeal of these locations is their relative cultural familiarity and promise of comfort for the presumed, middle-class White American student. This appeal of familiarity, of course, simultaneously tends to restrict the degree of cultural divergence and self-reflection students will experience. Thus, uncritical modes of travel abroad can easily reproduce stereotypes and deeper investments in nationalistic patriotism or colonialism rather than actually challenge or complicate these perspectives (Dolby, 2007; Kubota, 2016; Sharpe, 2015; Whalen & Woolf, 2020). From design to pedagogy, we need more attention to what we mean by race, including explicit attention to how Whiteness shapes both the offerings and experiences of *all* study abroad students.

4. Engaging Racism and Colonialism Within and Without

The resistance to "locating" race and racism persists, of course, even when White students travel to non-European sites. As Onyenekwu et al. (2017, p. 73) remind us, "study abroad programs can easily serve as a sanitized strand of a controlling colonialist mindset that commissions the next generation of white students to learn about (not from or with) the subaltern subjects in colonizing lands". Thomas and Luba (2018) noted that experiential learning opportunities in the Global South, for example, did not guarantee that students or service volunteers would develop critical perspectives and understanding based on their "exposure" alone. Without guidance such travelers will most likely continue to be shaped by dominant frames of race and empire, and thus directed by and engaged in practices of colonialism or "white fragility" (see also DiAngelo, 2018; Dolby, 2007; Ficarra, 2017; Kubota, 2016; Miller-Idriss, 2019; Orpett Long et al., 2010; Onyenekwu et al., 2017; Pipitone, 2018; Sharpe, 2015; Tikly, 2004). Thomas and Luba's (2018) interviews showed that the White students travelling to India were "largely unaware of their own whiteness" pre-departure and that upon return they still "failed to reflect deeply on race, racism and their own position within global racial hierarchies" (p. 188). "[I]t became evident," they tell us, "that after spending almost two months in a majority non-white city and country, respondents still either neglected to mention race altogether or mentioned it almost parenthetically after discussing gender" (Thomas & Luba, 2018, p. 189). They found it telling that the students – all White women – easily discussed and expressed awareness of differences in sex/gender, even as they largely failed to ever discuss or consider race. Their Whiteness no

doubt proved important in the experiences of the students, yet it was never examined or assessed explicitly. As a result, their post-trip interviews found only "one interview [where] racism [was] emphasised more than sexism, and this was with a black woman pursuing a medical-based internship" (Thomas & Luba, 2018, p. 189).

The potential for students missing critical examination of their own identities is mirrored by the potential for missing critical examination of the diversity within their host nation. This danger is compounded by the fact that most "study abroad only provides experience in a single host culture" (Kubota, 2016, p. 354). In effect, travelers go looking for and too often "find" a singular France or South Africa or Japan. In contrast, Pipitone (2018) describes two well-designed and intentionally critical visits to Indonesia and Morocco. Given the proper tools, the students came away with a more "complicated understanding" of Morocco and a more "layered understanding" of Indonesia. The program design guided students to shift from a model of consuming an exotic Other, to a "focus on similarities and complexities *within*" the host countries (Pipitone, 2018, p. 65; emphasis in original).

In my course offerings, I similarly challenged the dominant and normative social, cultural, and political constructions of our host nations. Turning a critical eye toward the Black Lives Matter movement in the UK, for example, allowed us to actively engage with the tensions of Blackness and Britishness in a place where class distinctions are supposedly the only salient social differences. Likewise, by framing Japan primarily through its relations to immigration, citizenship, and Indigenous rights, we immediately disrupted common reiterations of the country as a homogeneous culture, people, and space.

For Pipitone (2018), diversifying student exposure within the host nation allowed students to "engage with difference and renegotiate preconceived notions of homogeneity" (p. 65). She emphasizes the value of attentiveness to place, and the divergent processes occurring on the ground in different scales and locations. The result was that "in Morocco, student learning centered around the diversity of beliefs and religious expression within the country, while in Bali students drew connections to cultural practices or artifacts seen in one place to another place" (65). This comparative and deconstructive approach also had long-term impacts. A year later, Pipitone (2018) was able to measure the students' sustained "acknowledgment and renegotiation of representations

of Moroccan-*ness* and Bali-*ness*, deconstruction of the exotic, and enhanced relationality between self and other" (p. 67).

This technique matches recommendations from Che et al. (2009) who argue for more opportunities that truly produce "constructive disequilibrium" in challenging what students know, who they think themselves to be, how they imagine their nation, as well as how they go about understanding their host nation.

Ignoring such realities, by offering a "pass" whenever they will produce "positive" racial experiences (as I argued above about Whiteness) simply naturalizes a singular host country "difference" and usually reproduces White supremacy and the ongoing effects of colonialism. Programs that ignore this opportunity for disequilibrium thereby reinforce the uncritical acceptance of dominant processes of racialization and empire precisely when we are supposed to be using travel to open up and interrogate experiences of difference. Yet, it is clear that if we engage this opportunity, if we ask all students to be bad guests while they travel we can create powerful learning possibilities that enhance students' depth of exposure and improve their overall reflective capacities both abroad and at home.

5. Why Our Frames Matter

As this discussion helps illustrate, attention to access, diversity, and inclusion alone will continue to miss how aspects of "power and privilege" can and should be integrated into the principles and framework of study abroad (Bolumole & Barone, 2020; Contreras et al., 2019; Salisbury et al., 2011; Sweeney, 2013). As Hartman et al. point out, "growing diversity does not inherently disrupt the many assumptions embedded within education abroad discourse and practice" (2020, p. 39; see also Hartman, 2016, 2017; Landau & Moore, 2001). Concerns over power and inequality must also be integrated directly within the curricular, cultural, and experiential offerings. In these ways, I echo Hartman et al.'s (2020) "call for robust engagement with critical global citizenship for individuals advancing inclusivity and equity across cultural contexts" (p. 34).

To be sure, most study abroad is aiming at an introductory engagement with a host country. Most programs thereby intend to narrow their goals to either offering a "representative" and satisfactory experience or disrupting basic stereotypes or discourses about the host site. This is especially consequential in terms of race and racism, ethnicity and diversity, immigration,

or colonialism. Consider the two most common models for study abroad. On the one hand, a study abroad trip to France can seek to more deeply "expose" students to French culture, language, geography, and history. While there is certainly value in this principle, because it is simplified it will homogenize understandings of France, largely ignoring its multiple cultures, languages, and histories (see Kinginger, 2004). As Whalen and Woolf (2020) argue, by seeking authenticity "students are directed toward myth" (p. 77).

On the other hand, efforts to disrupt such stereotypes can also run into the same problem, albeit from an "opposed" intent and position. A trip pushing back on simplistic exposure, perhaps one designed for more knowledgeable or experienced travelers, might intentionally seek to interrupt stereotypes of France and French people and push beyond tourist adventures. In effect, the goal here might be to say, 'no, France is more than sipping coffee at cafés and visiting the Eiffel Tower' and to more fully explore a long history of regional, political, and social tensions within French borders. Again, a worthy goal, and yet both of these approaches tend to reify and recover dominant cultural and political frames unless we intentionally account for more expanded lenses on power, race, and colonialism. As I have argued elsewhere (Boovy & Barnd, 2019), learning about a nation or a language should not preclude beginning with non-dominant (particularly anti-racist, anticolonial) frames. Using those as the starting point actually offer a kind of double-work. Such an approach must still convey the dominant discourses about culture and nation (about France, for example), even as it complicates them from the start (let us begin with colonialism in Vietnam and Algeria). If we start our learning by centering Blackness in Germany, for instance, we cannot do so without also generating robust contextual frames for learning about and understanding the "core" German history, culture, language, and geography. The critique still happens within a frame.

One might still object to this critique, calling it unfair, and point out that all learning begins with overly simple constructs. This is no doubt true and accurate. I do not want to entirely dispute that criticism here. Rather, I want to humbly point out and to argue that the particular frame of simplification that we adopt matters and that our choice of frame says quite a bit about what we privilege and give priority as subjects of study or as learning objectives. Being a bad guest simply means keeping and using critical tools that consider the frame as much as the (national) picture within.

Next, I want to briefly describe my programs and make a few remarks about positionality and power. This will help contextualize the three brief examples, or "case studies", from my own study abroad programs, each of which is intended to further flesh out how a revised design can treat both the "picture" and the host country "frame."

6. Program and Student Descriptions

I have led two study abroad trips where I implemented the idea of teaching students to be "bad guests"—one to England, one to Japan. In both cases, my primary goal was to help students consider the histories and practices of racism and colonialism within the host nations. Secondarily, I expected them to reflexively transfer and use those tools of analysis back toward their own experiences and identities, and to the context of the United States.

Both trips were short-term and faculty co-led programs, run during the summer term and hosted by our university's Honors College. Despite their programmatic similarities, the history, structure, and support of the two programs were quite divergent. The program in London had a well-developed history and support infrastructure because of our institution's international education partnership with a global learning organization (called INTO) headquartered in that city. That partnership offered on-the-ground guidance once we arrived and made local purchases or reservations on our behalf pre-departure. Students stayed in a student residence building in the East End, and classes were held in central London at the INTO facility. The Japan program was a first-time offering and lacked in-country support. My colleague and I coordinated and designed every aspect ourselves, and all participants stayed in student hostels. Course meetings were held within the hostel facilities.

In the summer of 2017, we traveled to London with twenty-six students for a three-week program. Three faculty members co-led the trip, with each teaching independent courses. We collaboratively generated the experiential learning components, consciously creating effective content overlaps where we could. My colleagues were faculty from the history department and from the business (design) school. Most of the structured program took place in London, with the main exception being an all-day trek to Liverpool, which was part of my required course excursion to the International Slavery Museum (discussed below). My course was named *London, Sugar, and Slavery*, and half of the students enrolled in the course, the other half in my business colleague's design

course (*Icons of London*). All of the students enrolled in a third faculty member's course, *Scientific Controversies*.

In the summer of 2019, we traveled to Japan with eleven students for a fifteen-day program. The trip consisted of two faculty leads, with accompanying spouses playing unofficial but helpful roles. The locations for our visit were more varied, with about half of the time being spent in Tokyo, five days in Kyoto, and two in Hiroshima. All of the students enrolled in both instructors' courses. My colleague was faculty in the world languages department, primarily teaching Japanese. For this visit she taught a course focused on Japanese history and culture. My course was named *Race, Ethnicity, and Indigeneity in Japan*. Like the London trip, we co-designed all of the experiential components, and I relied heavily on her expertise as a Japanese citizen (US resident) and fluent speaker.

The students on both trips were all enrolled at a large research university in the US. The majority of the students were White women, reflecting the demographics for most study abroad programs (Dolby, 2007; Salisbury, 2011; Institute of International Education 2020), as well as our university's status as a predominantly White institution (or PWI). Approximately 84% (31 of 37) of the students on both trips combined identified as White and 60% (22 of 37) identified as women.

As major global cities, London and Tokyo share a great deal in terms of political, economic, and cultural significance. In both spaces, students were expected to engage with the host country's differences from the United States, including the simple experience of being an American abroad. Both London and Japan offer a number of important disruptions for students. In scale alone, the cities we visited far exceeded the urban and global possibilities available in the state where our host university is located. Most of our students grew up in the rural or semi-rural areas of the state, and so the megacity experiences of London and Tokyo were uniquely engaging for them, to say the least.

These locations also presented distinct opportunities and cultural contexts for thinking about racism and colonialism. Although London is certainly a global city, too much of our experience still actually privileged tourist and White London. While we were certainly engaged with "disruptive" topics, e.g., slavery, racism, empire, the largely historic topic and the familiarity of a Western, English-speaking nation created too many conveniences of cultural habit. In short, London looked and felt too familiar. Some of the gaps here were

mine, as I was unfamiliar with the city and unable to effectively (and remotely) generate sufficient relationships that would have allowed me to better extend beyond those practices. Despite my own limitations and weaknesses of design, the overall course design still emphasized leaning into disruption, or what Che et al. (2009) call "constructive disequilibrium" (discussed above).

Our student demographics are further relevant considering the two locations. In terms of the two trips, most of the students either "passed" racially or stood out, depending on whether they traveled to London or Japan. Indeed, my decision to create a new study abroad experience in Japan was partly based on my experiences in London. I decided to initiate the program in Japan because of my sense that White students in particular would benefit from even greater cultural, racial, and personal disruption to their identities and experiences than the first group had experienced in London. Since none of our students appeared "phenotypically" Japanese by dominant Japanese standards, they all experienced being racially "othered" and constantly "recognized" as cultural and linguistic outsiders everywhere they went in Japan (even though one student did identify as "mixed" Japanese). This was a new and important experience for most of the students.

I offer these descriptions with the understanding that while the change in locations alone was never expected to be sufficient for fostering critical engagement with race and racism, it certainly helped me to enhance students' personal dissonance, emphasize the need to stretch their thinking in making effective comparisons, and challenge them to push beyond monolithic and "official" characterizations.

7. Brief Considerations of Positionality and Power

Before discussing my examples, I must address a couple of important caveats related to power dynamics and cultural imposition. Being a bad guest presents the potential for study abroad learning to be framed in a culturally de-contextual manner. In the confines of a short-term visit in particular it can be easy to apply external measures and assessments that may not be appropriate. Along the spectrum of assessing cultural differences, I fall somewhere closer to cultural relativism rather than embracing values based on notions of universalism. As someone trained and experienced in issues of racism, xenophobia, discrimination, and colonialism, I am deeply aware of how easy it can be for dominant ideologies and moralities to imagine and project their

particular values as if they were universal and objective and to attach real consequences and costs to those who resist them. On the other hand, my intellectual and on-the-ground concerns over issues of social justice means that I must also attend to dynamics of power that rub against dominant cultural norms and ethics, especially in the context of oppressions of marginalized, Indigenous, and racialized peoples. This means that concerns over the rights of women or my positions on feminism, for example, might easily run counter to or test the boundaries of cultural frames that delineate patriarchal sex roles and/or clearly differentiated sex and gender identities.

So, there are always two concerns here that must be considered carefully. The first concern emerges from global power dynamics and issues of ethnocentrism. As a citizen of the US bringing students from a US university, we bring a great deal of power with us, including the potential to impose our particular values on other societies—consider the burka, or notions of private property, individualism, and religious versus secular states. The White students who comprised most of the travelers in my cases likewise bring additional globally recognized racial privileges that are not enjoyed by every student or visitor. The outcomes of our learning, likewise, have the real possibility of unknowable but material impacts on our host nations depending on how my students might help shape future policy and practices.

A second concern is the capacity for imposing knowledge or real consequences on marginalized communities. For example, I would be hesitant to unleash such a "bad guest" perspective on an Indigenous community in the US, knowing the legacy of harm and the continued uneven impact on those communities resulting from settler colonial practices of knowledge production. Students, by nature of their position as new learners in their visiting experiences, often lack the knowledge or ability to effectively frame their observations and experiences within larger and more complex contexts. This contextual framing is the reason more knowledgeable guidance is required (Che at al., 2009; Johnstone, 2020). In short, the instructor's job is to both design a responsible pathway of learning and to ensure that the learning does not take this dangerous turn, in part by explicitly discussing and presenting the impacts of this potential mistake. In the cases I present here (Japan and the UK), it is important to note that we are focused on recognizing and critiquing the dominant social structures, and thus we can generally avoid exacerbating any

vulnerabilities of marginalized peoples if we "get things wrong" in the short term.

Again, course and program design matter a great deal. In my course plans, teaching students to be bad guests means we actively engage with the tensions between dominant representations and practices, and the counter images or activities of those marginalized within that society. In the learning materials and experiential plans, I offer students a more complicated picture of their host nation, without using a simplistic binary model. Rather, I emphasize the need to use a "both/and" framework that allows students to understand and begin constructing a sense of the host nation from both dominant and subordinated constructions, knowing that "answers" are often complicated and incomplete, and yet that it matters in economic, material, social, and economic ways.

I now turn to three brief pedagogy and learning examples. Although not every faculty-led program will focus on racism and colonialism, these small learning moments should offer any faculty leader some ideas and tools for enhancing their engagement and structuring of such learning. As one of my colleagues noted, for example, he saw how he could meaningfully embed similar ideas and techniques within his ongoing study abroad course, even as it is topically centered on wildlife in Botswana and Kenya.

8. Case Studies

8.1. Case Study 1: Anti-Blackness and Multi-Raciality

In the photograph in Figure (1), we can see a standard sunscreen display set just outside a small Tokyo convenience shop. I want to use this image, and the act of taking this "mundane" photograph, to illustrate one insightful way that student learning about racism unfolded during our visit to Japan.

We can observe that the display presents some level of prominence in both sales efforts and in cultural significance. Japanese shops are efficient given the premium on space. Convenience stores amplify that efficiency in order to offer a diverse range of products within their small spaces. While the allotted space here may not initially seem like much to American eyes used to vast shopping landscapes, in Japan this display represents a considerable investment in prime advertising "real estate." Displayed in a metropolitan shop, placed at

the front door, and located on a major intersection, the display must appeal to customers and produce profit.

FIGURE (1)
SUNSCREEN PRODUCTS DISPLAY IN TOKYO CONVENIENCE STORE, 2019.

Note: Photo by author.

I took this photo while strolling past during one of my open-ended explorations of the city. It stood out to me for a number of reasons. The display

clearly advertises sun care products. It is typical in many ways to the displays used for just about any product. Yet, the product here presents an additional opportunity for considering its value for both skin care and for cultural values related to skin color and race.

The product is being marketed with the image of internationally renowned and champion professional tennis star, Naomi Osaka. Osaka is both Japanese and Haitian. She was born in Japan, and is a Japanese citizen, although she mostly lives in the US. Thus, this product is leaning on celebrity to increase its appeal to customers. In addition to the core messaging that any product good enough for an international Japanese celebrity is good enough for the average Japanese citizen, it must be considered alongside the mechanisms and broader discourses by which this message is (at least partly) delivered and received.

Seeing the display, I immediately also thought about the stigma surrounding darker skin in Japan, commonly understood to signal either lower social status or foreignness, and often both. As we had already learned in our course, Japanese media frequently trades on anti-immigrant rhetoric while official policies have historically maintained tight restrictions on non-citizen rights and recognitions. More pointedly, Japanese understandings of race and citizenship have continually placed Osaka's racial identity and skin color ("Black") under scrutiny. In 2018, one of her sponsors, Nissin Foods instant noodle company, publicly apologized for lightening a likeness of Osaka in one of their animated advertisements, which made her appear nearly white and with light brown hair (McKirdy, 2019). A year later, a comedy duo, A Masso, "joked" that she needed to bleach and lighten her skin, which they called "too sunburned" (Reuters Staff, 2019).

The Japanese often deny that they practice racism if only because, they say, there is supposedly no one to practice it against. Yet, Japanese people and the government openly discriminate in housing access, service, employment, and relationship choices with regard to those they consider foreigners. As part of our learning, we booked a walking tour with a non-profit organization focused on this discrimination and whose director talked explicitly about these realities, including the fact of the quasi-segregated International District itself. Korean-Japanese, some of whom have been in Japan for multiple generations and are culturally Japanese in every way, for example, are usually denied citizenship (both officially and socially) and thus learn to deny or hide their origins in order to avoid differential social and employment treatment. During

our course, we also read a number of articles about the difficult experiences of mixed-race people (like Naomi Osaka) born into a country that prizes not just Japanese-ness, but ideas of "pure" Japanese lineage, perhaps best exemplified by the formal family tree documentation required for marriage certification, which is closely examined by a prospective spouse's family (Robertson, 2017; Yamashiro, 2013).

With these contexts in mind, we used the sunscreen display to discuss the layered meanings and "work" of this advertisement. On the one hand, it serves to sell the sunscreen, and like many products, it deploys a famous person as its spokesperson. Clearly, Japanese marketers expect consumers to make the leap between celebrity endorsement and a desire to use what that famous figure has promoted. Yet, the choice of Osaka and her positioning within notions of citizenship and racial belonging has to also be considered from the point of view of skin color values. As the students noted, the advertisement can be celebratory and filled with national pride, while simultaneously sending racially coded messages about the need for sunscreen to protect against darkening skin. If Osaka, with her darker skin needs sunscreen, it suggests, you too must use it to protect your lighter skin against UV damage and against darkening. In effect, the message can be saying in the same breath, 'be like Naomi Osaka' in terms of achievement and as a symbol of Japan which includes using our sunscreen, *and* be sure to use it so you avoid looking too much like Osaka with her darker and "obviously" non-Japanese skin.

The Japanese-specific entanglements of race, color, and gender further extend this layering of meaning, as lighter skin is considered a mark of beauty and a goal for women. As sociologist Miho Iwata (2020) has noted about her own experience as someone who enjoyed darker skin and being tan from outdoor activities, "having dark skin as a woman in Japan is seen as problematic" (p. 50). In fact, her appearance continually created confusion for fellow Japanese citizens, who "couldn't fathom the idea of a Japanese woman with dark skin" (Iwata, 2020, p. 51). It is likewise relevant that Japan, like many Asian nations, promotes skin lightening practices and leads a robust global trade in skin-whitening, which often intertwine as both class and racial signifiers (see Glenn, 2009). In the 1960s, Japanese anthropologist Hiroshi Wagatsuma (1967) mapped out such entanglements, which began with European and African contacts in the 1500s and took root in the twentieth century. Minimally, this case opens up the fluid tensions in contemporary Japan that engage the meanings and modes

of "Whiteness" in complicated and even contradictory ways, and which are always "shifting," including in newer constructions of Blackness and Japaneseness (see Bonnett, 2022).

More important than my observation and interest in this display, were the student observations and interest. Several students, it turned out, had also noticed this display, or a similar one elsewhere, during their daily excursions. One student, in fact, snapped a photograph of it in order to share it with the class as well. Not everyone who saw this image knew precisely what to make of it. But they did know that they should stop and consider it, and that there may be something to make of it. When I presented this image in class, those who had noticed it were able to frame their observation and the larger discourse informing the ad in terms of race, racism, and anti-Blackness. This seemingly simple social "artifact" provided an instructive and organic learning opportunity drawn directly from our engagement with Japan daily life, allowing us to discuss it as an active site of culture and practice (Pipitone, 2018).

My core teaching goal in that brief class session was to interrogate this object within a larger cultural analysis and discussion about how race and racism works in Japan (see Kawai, 2020). We did not try to establish a definitive or simplistic answer ("is this display racist or not?"). We did not have time for such an extended research question, nor enough cultural context to make a fully-supported case. We did attend to these questions carefully, and use various forms of research and data to help us with our learning and our preliminary critiques ("how might this display work within Japanese racial discourses, and in what ways?"). The fact that the students saw this display and either understood the layers of information and meaning that it represented, or saw it and simply understood that there were layers of information and meaning that could be extracted with more guidance illustrates an achievement of a vital learning outcome, even using a rather mundane example. Not every student saw this display or took a photo of it for later discussion, but each did see other similar things that caught their eye during our visit, and initiated a series of other questions and sets of analyses about race, ethnicity, colonialism, or citizenship in Japan.

In the end, our focus on race and racism in Japan allowed the students to both see and begin to extract easily ignored or potentially "hidden" meanings generated within their host nation and its everyday cultural practices. Importantly, this approach did not negate their ability to experience and learn

about Japan. Quite the opposite, this approach *enhanced* that ability. Not only were they experiencing the joy and curiosities of a Japanese convenience store, for example, they were also analyzing and evaluating it in ways that extended well beyond a "cultural immersion" that only highlights the normative, touristic, or hegemonic Japanese lens. These lessons allowed the students to engage a place as an interpreter of images and symbols, actively operating as "bad guests," instead of passive tourists or consumers.

In short, the students were learning more than just the blunt differences between Japan and the US. They were doing more than trying to uncritically absorb the (dominant) cultural context. They were learning to be a "bad guest" in that they were digging below the surface to also consider cultural experiences and reflections that a host nation would not likely facilitate, and yet could be easily and generously served up by this sort of "accidental" or incidental display. While we approached this from an ES perspective directly aimed at analyzing race, it should be noted that other faculty/students could easily engage in a parallel analysis (even using the same example) from many disciplinary approaches including media, marketing, tourism, art, sports, globalization, gender, economics, history, and politics/citizenship.

8.2. Case Study 2: Transatlantic Slavery

My example from the UK begins with a more traditional site of learning and cultural representation – the museum.

Our engagement with the history of slavery in the UK required that students develop an understanding of England as a central hub in the global network of human bondage. Coming from their US context, most of my students were relatively unfamiliar with other nations' involvement in slavery and the slave trade. Few understood, for example, that only around four percent of enslaved Africans were taken to the US (around 388,000). Compare that to 17% for the British Caribbean, 22% for Spanish colonies, and 34% for Brazil (for a global total of 10.7 million arrived out of the 12.4 million that departed Africa). In fact, the sheer numbers show that more than four times as many enslaved Africans died or drowned in the ocean before arrival (1.7 million) than were delivered alive to the US. The ironic twist of US-centric thinking leads most students to think of the slave trade as being centered in or unique to the United States.

So, the first step was to map out the centrality of the slave trade to the UK and European development and to outline its parallels and distinctions from the US context. Overall, the course required the students to specifically explore how London and Liverpool built vast wealth from slavery, and how England used that trade and its related resource extractions and commodity productions to grow the UK's global political and economic power.

Their journey began at the Museum of London, Docklands site. In terms of commodity connections, most enslaved Africans in the US toiled for cotton, while British slave labor was directed to the production and distribution of sugar. The Docklands museum is a repurposed, former sugar warehouse along the docks of the West Indian Quay (see Fig. 2). London's glaring contrast of new and old architecture often serves as a point of observation for its visitors. Thus, for our students, this refurbished warehouse also offered a visually and somatically-impactful lesson about the multiple and enduring "infrastructures" of human bondage for London, the Atlantic world, and beyond.

FIGURE (2)

ENTRANCE TO THE MUSEUM OF LONDON, DOCKLANDS. BLUE LOADING DOORS ARE STILL VISIBLE IN THE CENTER OF THE BUILDING, AS WELL AS A PULLEY AT THE TOP

Note. Photo courtesy of Joyofmuseums.org, Creative Commons license, 2018.

Within the museum students found extensive displays of material, sonic, and textual artifacts cataloging the city's embrace of slavery, abolitionist activity, and the experiences of enslavement. As they moved through the museum they walked within a structure that was directly involved in the slave trade and a site

of early racial capitalism (commercial wealth generation via/as racial structures). Walking through the space, they directly experienced this beautifully/terribly preserved architecture of life and death, freedom and enclosure.

While the course title borrowed directly from the main Docklands Museum exhibit (London, Sugar, and Slavery), our short trip to Liverpool even more firmly consolidated many of the students' grasp of the systemic nature of slavery and colonialism. Liverpool is home to the International Slavery Museum, a truly magnificent model for visitor engagement and deep contextualization of its subject. At this site, students were asked to confront the ideas of implication and responsibility. Who is responsible for the slave trade and its legacy? How are individuals and societies implicated in structures of race and racism? How does implication work precisely? How do we responsibly confront our past implications, our present and future implications?

During the visit students quickly learned that Liverpool was not just home to the Beatles rock band, but historically served as England's main shipbuilding port, an important network hub directly linked to London's economic and political hub at the West Indian Quay. In addition to learning about the city's shipbuilding role in the larger system of the slave trade, the museum helped us explore how such economies implicated more than just the slavers, plantation owners, and shipping industry. In our course discussions, we had described the example of mid-1800s gold rush in the western US to better understand how ancillary business often become inextricably woven into larger "economic" systems, including slavery. I explained how in the western US, especially California, most of the wealth generated from the gold rush did not come from finding gold. The greatest wealth came from selling land, equipment, supplies, services, and wares to those mythologized miners seeking golden fame and fortune.

In Liverpool, the shipbuilding industry was obviously predicated upon slavery and directly benefited from the slave economy. Yet, the museum helped us see that a great deal of the city was also implicated in providing ancillary services and support through equipment, supplies, services, and wares for the shipbuilding industry and its crews. Ships are complex vessels, and the transport of slaves and slave labor commodities was a global venture. Both required numerous support industries. They needed iron workers who could produce anchors, chains, canons, fastenings, and nails. Ships needed sails, ropes,

carpentry, pulleys, and weapons. Crews required clothing, cooking pots, hand tools, barrels, navigational devices, maps, medicines, food, and alcohol. Thus, most of the local merchants and craftspeople were firmly if indirectly implicated as participants in the transatlantic slave trade even as most never owned, sold, captured, or transported an enslaved person.

These insights allowed students to consider how individuals and societies can uphold structures of violence and inequality even without participating directly. By considering the role of an 18th century bureaucrat and artisan, they could both differentiate and connect such roles with those of the ship captain or financier. By understanding how the scale of the system generates a kind of social and economic gravity that pulls everyone inward, the hope is that students will also see current analogies and more effectively reflect on how we are all implicated within structures of racism and colonialism.

In this way, my approach parallels a program run by Blake et al. (2020), which brought together Black students to travel to London and intentionally re-positioned the city as a powerful site for engaging with Blackness. Since they were hosting only Black students from the US, they wisely leveraged the famous US abolitionist Frederick Douglass' historic escape to the UK as an initial point of engagement. This subtle adjustment to how travelers could engage with London drew Black students who might otherwise be wary of or uninterested in traveling to Europe. While our trip to London featured mostly White students, it involved a corresponding act of "leveraging study abroad infrastructures in more common European destinations to host culturally relevant programs" (2020, p. 160). In my case, the "cultural relevance" required structured commitments to having all students actively engage with issues of race and colonialism, including those who might easily evade full and genuine engagement with such topics in a place like London. By framing our experiential learning around implication and responsibility (not guilt or fault) and creating a linkage to contemporary issues like the Black Lives Matter in the UK (and the US), we confronted the role of race/racism including Whiteness and the structures of White supremacy.

8.3. Case Study 3: Indigenous Japan

The last brief example I want to share comes from my course treatment of colonialism, racism, and Indigeneity. In many ways it represents potential more than outcome. Yet, I offer this story to encourage further interrogations,

and to serve as a reminder of the vision for further possibilities within my own study abroad programs. It suggests that being bad guests means always looking to make more thoughtful choices regarding power dynamics.

As discussed above, Japan is typically framed as a homogenous society. The people of Japan likewise see themselves, and their nation, in the same way. A good deal of this vision depends, of course, on the definition of what is Japanese and who counts as Japanese. We tackled this directly by considering the experiences of all those who do not fit the definition, including the growing pools of migrant laborers, as well as longtime residents who have clearly acculturated to Japan, such as the Zainichi (Korean-Japanese).

Our attention to Indigenous peoples provided (perhaps) the most powerful tool for disrupting this simplified, and hegemonic, model of Japan. In experiencing our host country, we held in tension the contradictions of cultural and racial "purity" with the legacy of colonization. We learned about the history of the Ainu people (from Hokkaido, the northernmost island), and their contemporary efforts to revitalize their culture, seek legal recognitions, and demand repatriation of artifacts and ancestral remains. Indeed, Japan conceded official recognition to the Ainu as Indigenous peoples just two months before our trip, in April 2019. We also learned about the ongoing battle for self-determination being waged by the Ryukyu (or Okinawans) who are subject to both Japanese occupation and more recent US impositions, since 75% of all American military space in Japan is located on Okinawa (just one percent of the nation's geography).

We were fortunate that our Zainichi tour host made a concerted effort to point out the only Ainu restaurant in Tokyo, called Harukor (see also Budgen, 2020). When we had a break for lunch, I was pleased and surprised that most of the students chose to accompany me to this easily missed and cozy establishment offering just five tables (Fig. 3). Already largely familiar with Japanese cuisine, and knowing they would have numerous opportunities for the entirety of the trip, they sought out the rare chance to experience Indigenous foods. We quickly found parallels to the traditional foods of the US Pacific Northwest region, with its strong emphasis on salmon and use of carved wooden spoons. The numerous flyers and posters on the restaurant walls clearly indicated that it serves as a cultural and community hub, which further confirmed our readings about how large numbers of Ainu have migrated to Tokyo. We left calling out our support for the Ainu people, and found the staff

quite pleased, as well as surprised! No doubt they expected that we had stumbled in by chance alone. When we articulated our purpose, it was clear they felt acknowledged even though our small gesture did little to help their larger cause. We knew who they were and had come to their establishment intentionally.

This small excursion was a minor but significant learning moment. Because of travel and cost limitations, we chose not to travel to either Hokkaido or Okinawa on this trip. Nor were we able to secure a planned experiential opportunity to enhance our learning and directly engage with these communities. Yet, this modest and emergent moment illustrates a wider set of opportunities to enhance the ways students engage in study abroad. It suggests that we can collectively build our own frames for understanding a place like Japan as well as offer intentional and increasing support for those peoples combatting the structures of racism or colonization within their own local conditions. In the mix of the world's largest city, we consciously (by design) zoomed in on a unique and rarely acknowledged aspect of Japan to offer our emergent practice of recognition and care. In the larger context, our visit was probably insignificant and not particularly impactful. Yet, this is often the way of confronting power. Small acts do matter, especially as they become normalized to change common sense which can then lead to greater and more impactful acts.

As universities have come to standardize articulations of land acknowledgements in the US and Canada, for example, many observers have come to argue the need to expand actions beyond this initial embrace of settler limits and responsibilities. Acknowledgements are intended as first steps, however, toward shaping or sustaining one's view of the world, and of recognizing our relations to others. As I have tried to suggest, this ethic should be no different whether at home or abroad. Our choice of actions reflects our views, and it can also help shape them and reshape the world itself.

In this context, being a bad guest also means practicing better "guesting" – firstly by acknowledging and prioritizing our Indigenous land hosts. Therefore, it must also mean that students cannot conclude that settler colonialism is precisely the same everywhere even as they develop the impulse to acknowledge and ideally respond to these histories wherever they may travel.

FIGURE (3)
TERUYO USA, OWNER AND FOUNDER OF HARUKOR, WEARING AINU ROBES.

Note. Photo courtesy of Irving Wong

9. Conclusion

As outlined by Thomas and Luba (2018), we cannot expect that such trips will necessarily make a deep change immediately, or that any design can guarantee such outcomes. Rather, as Pipitone (2018) argues, good design and implementation that centers social justice concerns can begin a process of development that falls nicely in line with many of the primary goals for study abroad. Thomas and Luba (2018) tell us that "while many layers and forms of racism within our society will not be identified and challenged in a short pre-departure training initiative, participants could at least be equipped with the tools to begin a process of racial consciousness" (p. 194). This limitation is certainly true of efforts to teach critical approaches to race and facilitate anti-racist outcomes. Thus, the models offered by Hartman et al. (2020), and others, are crucial for helping us design and implement study abroad opportunities that can simultaneously facilitate cultural exposure and competences, expand participation, attend to issues of social justice, and work to disrupt unequal global dynamics.

Good Ethnic Studies students and those trained to be "bad guests" in international contexts cannot avoid locating and engaging these difficult issues of racism and colonialism, finding their resemblances and parallels in new contexts, and seeing the ways that these ideologies and practices are either centered, or minimized and dismissed by dominant societies, or both. In terms of the experiential and global learning, therefore, such a critical lens actually prepares students for generating a more nuanced view of the host nation, and it pushes them toward greater capacities for personal and national self-reflection.

In a pedagogical sense, training students to be bad guests means pushing them firmly toward the learning edge or "disequilibrium" goals we desire from study abroad experiences. As Che et al. (2009) explains, the most effective facilitation of student growth must structure learning as a delicate balance of progressive but scaled struggle paired with appropriate support and guided recalibration. In the case of Ethnic Studies approaches to study abroad, the struggle and sense of disequilibrium toggles back and forth between new and challenging ideas about race/racism and colonialism, and their application within both familiar and unfamiliar contexts. Tackling difficult questions of social justice generates an ideal study abroad framework, by offering a scaffolded process of interrogation, interpretation, and application of student experiences and learning. paragraph.

Acknowledgments

Gratitude to Emily Yates-Doerr for "encouraging" me to present an early draft of this paper for the "Half-Baked Workshop." My appreciation to the workshop participants: Raven Chakerian, Julianne Freeman, Mary Nolan, Cari Maes, Susan Bernardin, Argenis Moreno, and Andie Thompson. Thanks to a second round of colleague reviews by Larry Becker, Gena Carpio, Adam Schwartz, and Laurie Bridges, and (once again) Cari Maes. Cari offered the wonderful description of "being bad guests." I want to appreciate my study abroad faculty partners, who made these programs possible: Jake Hamblin and Andrea Marks in London, and Etsuko Sisley in Japan. Etsuko was also kind enough to provide the Japanese abstract translation – thank you! Thanks to Tara Williams for enthusiastically believing in the idea of taking Honors College students to Japan from the very start, and to Ron Mize for planting the idea of an Ethnic Studies study abroad trip to Japan. My regards to Kyung-Hee Ha for connecting us with Mr. Kim Boong-Ang of the Korea NGO Center, who then provided us with a powerful and

informative tour of non-Japanese Tokyo. Final appreciation for the anonymous reviewers who provided helpful comments for my initial and revised submissions to *Frontiers*.

References

American Anthropological Association. (n.d.). What is Anthropology? https://americananthro.org/learn-teach/what-is-anthropology/

Blake, D., Gasman, M., Esmieu, P. L., Castro Samayoa, A., & Cener, J. (2020). Culturally relevant study abroad for students of color: Lessons from the Frederick Douglass Global Fellowship in London. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 13*(2), 158-168. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000112

Bolumole, M., & Barone, N. (2020). What is the role of study abroad in advancing antiracism in international education? *International Higher Education, 104*(Autumn 2020), 4-6.

Bonnett, A. (2022). *Multiracism: Rethinking racism in global context*. Polity Press.

Boovy, B., & Barnd, N.B. (2019). Activating Affinities. *Seminar: A Journal of Germanic Studies 55*(4), 328-341. http://doi.org/10.3138/seminar55.4.1

Boren, C. (2019, October 10). Tennis star Naomi Osaka gives up her U.S. citizenship to play for Japan in Tokyo Olympics. *The Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/sports/2019/10/10/tennis-star-naomi-osaka-gives-up-her-us-citizenship-play-japan-tokyo-olympics/

Budgen, M. (2020, December 9). The only Ainu restaurant in Tokyo: Harukor serves foods from Japan's northernmost island that colonialism nearly eradicated. *Atlas Obscura*. https://www.atlasobscura.com/articles/ainu-restaurants

Chang, A. (2017). "Call me a little critical if you will": Counterstories of Latinas studying abroad in Guatemala. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 16*(1), 3-23. https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192715614900

Che, S. M., Spearman, M., & Manizade, A. (2009). Constructive disequilibrium: Cognitive and emotional development through dissonant experiences in less familiar destinations. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 99-116). Routledge.

Contreras, E., López-McGee, L., Wick, D., & Willis, T. (2019). Introduction: A Virtual Issue on Diversity and Inclusion in Education Abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 31*(Virtual), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v31iVirtual.451

Critical Ethnic Studies Editorial Collective. (2016). *Critical ethnic studies: A reader*. Duke University Press.

DiAngelo, R. J. (2018). *White fragility: Why it's so hard for white people to talk about racism*. Beacon Press.

Dolby, N. (2007). Reflections on nation: American undergraduates and education abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(2), 141-156. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306291944

Dong, H. (2019). Ethnic studies on its fiftieth anniversary. *Ethnic Studies Review*, *42*(2), 62-67. https://doi.org/10.1525/esr.2019.42.2.62

Ferguson, R. A. (2017). *We demand: The university and student protests*. University of California Press.

Ficarra, J. M. (2017). Curating Cartographies of Knowledge: Reading Institutional Study Abroad Portfolio as Text. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 29*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v29i1.382

Gearhart, R. (2005). Taking American race relations on the road … to Africa. *African Studies Quarterly, 8*(2), 70-83.

Glenn, E. N. (2009). Consuming lightness: Segmented markets and global capital in the skin-whitening trade. In E. N. Glenn (Ed.), *Shades of difference: Why skin color matters* (pp. 169-187). Stanford University Press.

Hartman, E., Pillard Reynolds, N., Ferrarini, C., Messmore, N., Evans, S., Al-Ebrahim, B., & Brown, J. M. (2020). Coloniality-Decoloniality and Critical Global Citizenship: Identity, Belonging, and Education Abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 32*(1), 33–59. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v32i1.433

Hoffa, W., & Forum on Education Abroad. (2007). *A history of US study abroad: Beginnings to 1965*. Forum on Education Abroad.

Institute of International Education. (2020). *Open doors 2020 report on international educational exchange*.

Iwata, M. (2020). Too dark. In N. Khanna (Ed.), *Whiter: Asian American women on skin color and colorism* (pp. 45-58). New York University Press.

Johnstone, C., Smith, T. L., & Malmgren, J. (2020). Academics as Arbiters: Promoting Equity and Cultural Responsibility in Group-based Study Abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 32*(2), 120–144. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v32i2.470

Kawai, Y. (2020). *A transnational critique of Japaneseness: Cultural nationalism, racism, and multiculturalism in Japan*. Lexington Books.

Khanmalek, T. (2019). Looking back (and inward), moving forward: A roundtable on ethnic studies. *Ethnic Studies Review, 42*(2), 99-114. https://doi.org/10.1525/esr.2019.42.2.99

Kinginger, C. (2004). Alice doesn't live here anymore: Foreign language learning and identity reconstruction. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 219-242). Multilingual Matters.

Kubota, R. (2016). The social imaginary of study abroad: Complexities and contradictions. *Language Learning Journal, 44*(3), 347-357. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1198098

Landau, J., & Moore, D. C. (2001). Towards reconciliation in the motherland: Race, class, nationality, gender, and the complexities of American student presence at the University of Ghana, Legon. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 7*(1), 25–59. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v7i1.107

Lee, J. A., & Green, Q. (2016). Unique opportunities: Influence of study abroad on Black students. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 28*(1), 61–77. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v28i1.380

McKirdy, E. (2019, January 23). Japanese sponsor accused of 'whitewashing' tennis star Naomi Osaka. *CNN*. https://edition.cnn.com/2019/01/23/tennis/nissin-naomi-osaka-skin-tone-intl/index.html

Miller-Idriss, C., Friedman, J. Z., & Auerbach, J. (2019). Jumping, horizon gazing, and arms wide: Marketing imagery and the meaning of study abroad in the USA. *Higher Education, 78*(6), 1091-1107. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00390-8

Okihiro, G. Y. (2016). *Third world studies: Theorizing liberation*. Duke University Press.

Onyenekwu, I., Angeli, J., Pinto, R., & Douglas, T. (2017). (Mis)representation among U.S. study abroad programs traveling to the African continent: A critical content analysis of a teach abroad program. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 29*(1), 68-84. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v29i1.386

Orpett Long, S., Akande, Y. S., Purdy, R. W., & Keiko. (2010). Deepening learning and inspiring rigor. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14*(1), 89-111. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315308327952

Pipitone, J. M. (2018). Place as pedagogy: Toward study abroad for social change. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 41*(1), 54-74. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053825917751509

Pulsifer, K., Feagan, R. B., & Sliwinski, A. (2020). Race and participation in international experiential learning: Case-based exemplar of a habitat-university partnership in El Salvador. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 32*(1), 60-79. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v32i1.434

Quan, T. (2018). Language learning while negotiating race and ethnicity abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 30*(2), 32-46. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v30i2.410

Reuters Staff. (2019, September 29). Osaka laughs off 'too sunburned' comment with plug for sponsor's sunscreen. *Reuters*. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-tennis-osaka-apology-response/osaka-laughs-off-too-sunburned-comment-with-plug-for-sponsors-sunscreen-idUSKBN1WF08U

Robertson, J. (2017). Blood talks: Eugenic modernity and the creation of the new Japanese. In D. R. Williams (Ed.), *Hapa Japan* (Vol. 1, pp. 45-58). Kaya Press.

Salisbury, M. H., Paulsen, M. B., & Pascarella, E. T. (2011). Why do all the study abroad students look alike? Applying an integrated student choice model to explore differences in the factors that influence white and minority students' intent to study abroad. *Research in Higher Education, 52*(2), 123-150. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-010-9191-2

Sharpe, E. K. (2015). Colonialist tendencies in education abroad. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 27*(2), 227-234.

Sweeney, K. (2013). Inclusive excellence and underrepresentation of students of color in study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 23*(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v23i1.326

Talburt, S., & Stewart, M. A. (1999). What's the subject of study abroad?: Race, gender, and 'living culture'. *The Modern Language Journal, 83*(2), 163-175. https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00013

Thomas, D. P., & Luba, Z. F. (2018). White fragility and the white student abroad: Using critical race theory to analyse international experiential learning. *Revue Canadienne D'études Du Développement, 39*(2), 182-198. https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2017.1366894

Tikly, L. (2004). Education and the new imperialism. *Comparative Education, 40*(2), 173-198. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006042000231347

Tolliver, D. E. (2000). Study abroad in Africa: Learning about race, racism, and the racial legacy of America. *African Issues, 28*(1/2), 112-116. https://doi.org/10.2307/1167071

Wagatsuma, H. (1967). The social perception of skin color in Japan. *Dædalus. Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 96*(2), 129-139.

Whalen, B., & Woolf, M. (2020). Cosmopolitanism: Rethinking the agenda of study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 32*(3), 72-98. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v32i3.580

Wick, D., Willis, T. Y., Rivera, J., Lueker, E., & Hernandez, M. (2019). Assets-based learning abroad: First-generation Latinx college students leveraging and increasing community cultural wealth in Costa Rica. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 31*(2), 63-85. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v31i2.455

Willis, T. Y. (2015). 'And still we rise…': Microaggressions and intersectionality in the study abroad experiences of Black women. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 26*(1), 209-230. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v26i1.367

Woolf, M. (2010). Another Mishegas: Global Citizenship. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad,* 19(1), 47-60. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v19i1.273

Yamashiro, J. H. (2013). The social construction of race and minorities in Japan. *Sociology Compass, 7*(2), 147-161. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12013

Author Biography

Natchee Blu Barnd, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor of History of Art and Architecture, and of Indigenous Studies, at UC Santa Barbara. Previously, he was faculty in Ethnic Studies at Oregon State University. He earned his doctorate in Ethnic Studies from UC San Diego. He is author of *Native Space: Geographic Strategies to Unsettle Settler Colonialism* (OSU Press 2017), and several writings focused on comparative Ethnic Studies, Indigenous Studies, geography, experiential learning, Indigenous public art, and pedagogy. He currently serves as editor for the *Ethnic Studies Review* journal.