Research Article

Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad

Volume 34, Issue 3, pp. 123-140
DOI: 10.36366/frontiers.v34i3.668
www.frontiersjournal.org

Leveraging Foreign Higher Education Institutional Affiliation to Support Preservation of Local Knowledge and Fight Displacement in Thailand

Lauren Collins[1]

Abstract

Study abroad host families and communities in the Global South frequently provide learning experiences to study abroad programs in search of 'intercultural experiences' and 'global competency' to students from the Global North. This paper shares findings from a multi-sited ethnographic research project exploring cultural and economic impacts on host communities in Thailand who hosted U.S. study abroad programs and students. The study found that rather than participating solely for economic gain, host families participated in the global study abroad economy to preserve local knowledge, learn about cultural others, and leverage this knowledge and affiliations in negotiations with local government over land use and the right of communities remain in place. It also found that creation of systems of distributive benefit (systems that ensured transparency and equal sharing of economic benefits received from hosting students) by local government helped to mitigate unwanted impacts from outside visitors while allowing host communities opportunities to engage with the global study abroad economy.

1 University of Colorado at Boulder, Colorado, United States of America

Corresponding author: Lauren Collins, collinlk@colorado.edu

Accepted date: 20 July 2022

Keywords:
Study abroad, global education, indigenous knowledge, displacement, power

Introduction

The boom in study-abroad programming leading up to the global Covid-19 pandemic is a manifestation of the "globalizing project", with increased cultural, political, and economic linkages between nations reflective of and visible through global educational exchanges (Tsing, 2000). In the Global South, study abroad host communities provide services to study abroad programs from the Global North seeking 'intercultural experiences' and 'global competency' for students (Doerr, 2012a, 2012b). This paper shares findings from an ethnographic research project exploring reasons for engaging with the global study abroad industry by host communities. Findings detail ways in which host communities exerted agency in relationships with study abroad programs they hosted. Host communities participated in exchanges not only to preserve and transmit local knowledge, but also actively leveraged relationships with foreign institutions, faculty, and students in negotiations with local government over land use and the right of communities remain in place in historic villages where they desired to continue living and farming.

Research that focuses on the study abroad host communities is limited but growing (Ficarra, 2019; Lloyd et al., 2015; O'Sullivan & Smaller, 2016; Reynolds, 2014). Little existing research examines expectations and experiences of hosts in depth (Collins, 2019; MacDonald, 2022). In large part this is due to the situatedness of research and literature on study abroad being published and solicited by journals based in the Global North. This special issue of Frontiers offers an opportunity to disrupt this narrative. As Balusubramaniam, Hartman, McMillan, and Paris (2018) rightly point out, knowledge should be co-generated and co-produced. Although this study is still written by a scholar-practitioner situated in the Global North, findings shared were gathered collaboratively with a study abroad partner committed to reciprocity in host community relationships. The main purpose of this paper is to disseminate critical takeaways for practitioners to learn from how host communities surveyed were affected by and exerted agency when hosting study abroad students.

This study began with a research question looking at the broad notion of how economic opportunities of host communities in Thailand were impacted by

their relationship with study abroad programs. Key findings of this research found that, first, families in each host community described programs they hosted supporting goals of retaining traditional ecological and cultural knowledge. Secondarily, community members described leveraging their affiliations with study abroad programs in ongoing conflicts with state-led efforts to get the community to either abandon their ancestral land in state forest reserves and/or adopt new forms of farming that were much more mechanized, chemically dependent, and not based on traditional farming methods. Host communities described how hosting study abroad programs from the U.S., Japan, Australia, Canada, and Europe assisted, at least in small ways, in preserving indigenous knowledge and land sovereignty. These impacts, as well as host community agency in navigating them, demonstrates the cross-directional impacts of global education relationships, presenting profound ethical implications for programs and faculty traveling to similar communities.

This study contributes to the small, but growing, literature that looks critically at how locations outside of the U.S. are impacted through study abroad representation, program design, and in-country practices (Kortegast & Kupo, 2017). A robust discourse on host community impact does exist within critical service learning, tourism, international development, and critical theory literature (Hartman et al., 2018). Adding to research on impacts of study abroad, findings of this study highlight agency of host communities and actions taken to mitigate unwanted impacted of hosting students. Shifting discourse towards host community impacts expands knowledge on study abroad, allowing for important new terrains of knowledge, critical for equitable and reciprocal program development. This also increases dialogue across fields of knowledge into new meanings and understandings of the study abroad globalizing project (Gildersleeve & Kuntz, 2013).

Methodology

Designed as an ethnographic case study, this research project was originally guided by the following central research question: In what ways are economic opportunities and behaviors of host communities altered through interactions with study abroad programs?

Case studies explore real-life bounded systems (or cases) by collecting a wide range of qualitative data (Creswell, 2013). Findings are primarily based on field work and interviews conducted during a two months of immersive field

research in three study abroad host communities over a duration of nine-months from 2018-2019. With the goal of centering host community experiences, interviews with US students were not a focus. In-depth interviews, conducted with the aid of three translators who spoke Thai, Karen, and English, happened over multiple days with four host families who the author also stayed with during the field research. In addition to interviews with these four host families, over 90 semi-structured interviews, unstructured interviews, and informal conversations took place with other community members and stakeholders, as well as primarily Thai citizen study abroad program staff, and U.S. faculty who had led study abroad programs in Thailand. Many of these supplemental interviews, particularly with program staff and U.S. faculty happened virtually from the U.S. rather than during fieldwork over the nine-month period of research. All three communities had hosted study abroad programs consistently for between 10-20 years prior to the author's visits. Research was conducted with the support of a long-standing study abroad organization based in and exclusive to Thailand, with which the author had no previous affiliation prior to this research. The partner's name has been changed to provide anonymity.

Research Partner

Thailand Abroad Experience (TAE) is twenty-five-year-old study abroad program based in Thailand. By forming a relationship with TAE for this study, the author was able to co-explore research questions with staff interested in the research who were open to sharing their own experiences and perspectives, as well as the potential for programmatic interventions because of findings. This partnership helped the research immensely by facilitating connections with key community members, providing historical context, and helping to get answers to follow-up questions. The author also chose TAE because commitment to communities that host their students was front and center in their mission with their work grounded in the notion of participatory rural development (Chambers, 1992).

> The way we are set up now is that all our programs are community based; all our courses are designed to incorporate a community. We go there and ask "What is your story? What is the story of this? What are issues that you are struggling with that you want to communicate?" I tell students "Give up your savior mentality. I tell them your role is to listen". I had a profound experience 10 years ago. Northeast Thailand is very

poor. This place called the moon river was dammed. It was ecological disaster. Every indicator you could look at was a disaster. What happened was that a very rich ecological fishery was decimated. I was there with students in this village. They were asking "Where is everyone?" Well, no was there because there are no jobs, everyone had left. The main fish market had closed. Students were asking, "What can we do?", and one of the local NGOs had this conversation with them. "Don't Do. Americans do enough; you need to listen to stories. This helps give them voice, that's what matters." That itself is an act of service. How do you teach students this? They want to take steps. So, the whole thing we talk about with our students is, "You are here to listen to people's stories". That's what we build the whole program around" – Interview with TAE Director.

Communities

Community	Population of the town where host homes and speakers were located	Participated in the tourism economy	Location	Race/ ethnicity	Length of time hosting study abroad programs
Community 1	Approximately 300	Yes, via a community approved community-based tourism (CBT) Model	Within land now designated as a national park	Predomina-ntly Christian Karen	~20 years. First groups were TAE programs.
Community 2	Approximately 5,000	No	In a lowland farming area	Predomina-ntly Thai	~20 years. First groups were TAE programs.
Community 3	Approximately 100	No	Within national forest land on the border of a National Park	Predomina-ntly Buddhist Karen	~10 years. Hosting groups began with a Japanese professor and now host based on relationships with individuals, not programs.

TABLE (1): HOST COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHIC SUMMARY

Findings

Participating in the Study Abroad Economy to Teach and Preserve Knowledge

All three communities in which the author spent time were predominantly agrarian. Although agriculture is critical to human flourishing, work as a farmer is not profitable in Thailand. Making a decent living is precariously dependent on weather and international markets. In response to this precariousness and low wages, young people in all three host communities were moving to urban areas to find jobs as factory labor or in the service sector rather than as farmers. Elders in each of the communities interviewed by the author spoke about how they saw this shift of labor and the departure of their young people as intimately tied to cultural disappearance and erasure. For this reason, as community members who were interviewed described, teaching students and scholars from the Global North about farming practices, their communities, and their culture presented itself as one small way of retaining and validating traditional wisdom and knowledge.

A theme that emerged from all host community interviewees, but especially from the two ethnic minority communities, was the value that people placed on serving as educators for study abroad students. This was described repeatedly as being important because the elder generation were worried knowledge they held was disappearing. The absence of working age children who had departed for urban areas for better job opportunities made this disappearance more acute. Without a younger generation living in the community to learn this knowledge, community elders saw it disappearing. The steady arrival of study abroad students to the community was seen as validating the value of this knowledge, even if younger generations didn't see finding a job and staying in the community as economically viable. The teaching of this knowledge, even if it was for cultural and community outsiders, meant the knowledge had a greater chance of lasting into the future.

People interviewed in each community described a sense of pride in traditional livelihoods and how they missed children who had moved away. Many also described how young people struggled to succeed economically in the city despite higher wages and greater availability of jobs, and how their kids who had left for the city described as sense of loss and dislocation in the urban communities they were joining. Most expressed hope that eventually their

children and younger generations would move back, and their communities could be maintained.

As one host father described, he didn't resent that life was different now than when he was growing up, but he did not want his community to lose their traditions and culture. He said: "It's normal for the world to develop. The world is changing, but we want to keep our knowledge". This small comment profoundly reflects the very real struggle that communities like his face. In this way, teaching U.S. study abroad students about indigenous knowledge and traditional ways were a way of ensuring that this knowledge did not disappear. Interaction with academic faculty from the U.S. was described as a kind of validation of the importance of community cultural and environmental knowledge discounted by Thai government officials who wanted communities to leave the land where they were living.

The interest of non-Thai faculty in community knowledge seemed to flip the paradigm of who got to perform expertise, placing that in the purview of local residents As one local field instructor noted, "we have had villagers talk to us about how they are used to having experts come in and tell them what to do, so having Westerners come in a position of learning from the community rather than being told what to do is huge". This positioning of community members as experts was especially important as each had spent years engaged with international NGOs and developmental organizations. Instead of being in a position of receivership in the study abroad program relationship, communities were seen and treated as those who had wisdom and knowledge to impart.

On a broader level, one of author's host sisters talked about her own work teaching U.S. study abroad students as part of her larger mission to change the agricultural system writ large. As she said, "I am really happy to share with students because then they return and the share what they learned, and they change their own community." She shared multiple examples of students she had hosted who returned home to make their own impacts on their local and global food systems. She described feeling personally connected to these changes and how her work had helped play a role in inspiring them. Other hosts also spoke about how teaching students helped their goal to show that human beings and nature can co-exist. In the words of one older of what he most wanted to convey to students, "No forests, no life".

Leveraging Social and Political Capital to Support Land Rights

Each homestay host, as well as other community members, talked about how they learned new terminology and ways of describing the value of traditional knowledge and practices through interaction with study abroad programs. These terms and concepts were then leveraged when talking people from outside of their community, both foreign and Thai, about the value of their lives and their communities. Specific examples shared included things like describing specifically how traditional rotational farming practices were sustainable and did not harm the environment, how they helped maintain biodiversity, and facilitate economic self-sufficiency.

Each community shared examples of how the connection to a foreign higher education institution allowed them to push back against government actors who were trying to influence them. Examples of how this had happened in other communities were shared by program staff from TAE as well.

> What is the buy in from communities to host or participate? If the community doesn't buy in, we don't do it. We do ask them why you do this and what we have consistently had people tell us over the years is that they learn about themselves by teaching our students, they learn how to articulate their key issues by teaching our students; sometimes its dramatic. We used to have a course on human rights and rivers. The Tom River is a river that the government keeps trying to put a dam on and the dam will destroy this beautiful vibrant ecosystem. So, one time the village head said, "Can I take photos of your students being taught on the river by the village elders about our indigenous traditions and our community? Can I use these when I go talk to parliament about why this river needs to be conserved"? I said yes, and they did, and they were successful. They may have been successful anyway without us, but he certainly felt that having government legislators see that this a place of international interest, that students are flying from across the world to learn from this community, was valuable. – Anecdote shared by TAE staff

This anecdote shows how host communities recognized the prestige currency that hosting U.S. students held and saw that they could deploy it to fight for the preservation of their environment. The use by community members of highlighting relationships with foreign higher education institutions (not just U.S., European, or Australian institutions, but also Japanese)

as leverage against the state was an unexpected finding that emphasizes the enormous social and political capital higher education institutions the Global North hold. The use of the perceived prestige of foreign higher education to fight government actions has been documented by others (Chapa-Cortés, 2019). Heron (2011) also discusses the reputational benefits and credibility that other host communities have experienced through having foreigners present. Through these small communities demonstrating to government actors that they possessed knowledge that U.S. students and academic faculty wanted to learn from they were able to resist some changes their communities. The author of this paper speculates that this was a benefit that communities saw from hosting study abroad programs.

One host father talked about how he deployed academic and technical jargon he had learned about the specific type of agriculture that he practiced in his own battles with government officials. Although he had grown up knowing that the way his community farmed and practiced farming was sustainable, he had never been asked to articulate it, or interacted with people who had studied long term impacts of his techniques before academic programs came to stay with and learn from him.

> Every year it seems like our issues with the National Park are resolved and then it comes back to the government trying to declare the area a national park and push the villagers out. They rotate government officials, and a new person comes in and wants us out. Now we can explain to them ecologically why what we are doing is sustainable. Students ask us all these questions that we had never realized people don't know to the answer to, like that everybody knows that a 5-year fallow cycle is more sustainable, but of course the students don't know that. The government officials don't know it either. We can teach them too. – Host Father

Other community members described how they attributed their successful fight to stay on their land in part to relationships that they had with foreign scholars and student visitors. According to the host father quoted above, visits by study abroad students appeared to demonstrate to government officials that community members had a legitimate claim on land rights and should be allowed to stay in their village. For another host family, this perceived power translated into attitudes toward higher education attainment. Parents described

how they were encouraging their children to attend college, and to obtain advanced degrees if they were able to do. Through encounters they had witnessed first-hand the power that academic credentialing could provide, and parents wanted their children to wield this power as well. Another host father emphasized how local families were actively working to build local capacity to promote full and effective participation in a wide range of domestic and international policy processes relevant to them through higher education obtainment by their children. This valuing of higher education also appeared to play a role in the desire to engage with study abroad programs.

This raises the crucial question of the kind of responsibility a study abroad program has when it moves into communities with this kind of power. Within Thailand, higher education attainment is still very much an opportunity limited to members of the elite. Opportunities to study overseas are even more limited, and students who do have the opportunity to study on foreign campuses typically return to Thailand and succeed economically with easier social mobility than others who have not studied overseas (Porntip & Chotima, 2018). The reverence for higher education institutions in the Global North reifies an unequal privileging of foreign knowledge over local and indigenous knowledge. By partnering with study abroad programs from the Global North, the communities in this study leveraged these relationships in ways that subverted a model where only elites could access social and political capital through education.

Ethnic minority communities especially needed to fight against marginalization by linking into larger discourses. Connecting with U.S. higher education institutions via hosting study abroad students allowed them to do so. Through these impacts, are U.S. study abroad programs providing leverage and power to marginalized communities, or are they reproducing uneven global power relations? In this case this power was productive, not only repressive, but this does not mean that this is always the case. This power needs to be acknowledged and carefully attended to by study abroad programs.

Strategic Cultivation of Knowledge of Cultural "Others"

The benefits of being familiar with American culture, as well as the culture of other Global North countries like Japan and France, came up repeatedly when speaking with community members about why they enjoyed hosting. By becoming familiar with global culture, community members could

make connections with people that they hosted from all over the world using this knowledge. Those who had the strongest English language skills became the default point person for facilitating study abroad programs visits. These skills and knowledge gave them a potentially powerful gatekeeper role and appeared to result in better employment opportunities. While the author did not see these benefits being deployed in depth, she saw the potential for communities to utilize these skills. The benefits of cultural familiarity were talked about by all host community members who were interviewed. Each of the host families talked about the value they placed on intercultural learning. The ability to engage comfortably with foreigners and gain English language skills were the two main cultural capital benefits that community members spoke about and that the author observed them utilizing in her six weeks in the field doing participant observation.

As one host sister described, with enough contact with foreigners, community members lost their shyness. Comfort with foreigners was not limited to U.S. students, and included Japanese, French, and Canadian visitors that hosts told anecdotes about. Being able to speak and converse in English meant people were more able to communicate with visitors from multiple nations, became more employable (as evidenced by the higher paying jobs that English speakers in the community held), and (as community members self-reported) ultimately more prepared to face the economic, social, and political pressures that their communities were undergoing.

The author saw this accumulation of knowledge occurring through hosts becoming familiar with diversity between and within nations, particularly the culture of nations that wielded significant economic power. Cosmopolitanism is a concept that many institutions, including the author's, hope that study abroad returnees attain, and it is often associated with corporeal mobility (Petzold, 2017), but this is not the only way it can be attained. Villagers saw their interactions with students as interactions with the larger global community. Through becoming connected to the wider world through hosting study abroad programs and other visitors, community member themselves were also becoming globally mobile. Three of the four host families stayed with had travelled to countries outside of Thailand. The idea that these places were somehow cut off from transnational mobility due to their remote location and low socioeconomic status, as the author had mistakenly assumed, was a false binary. Through their connection with the global development industry

community leaders in each place had opportunities to leave Thailand to visit neighboring Southeast Asian nations, Japan, and occasionally the U.S. and Europe. Connections with study abroad programs appeared to strengthen these opportunities and willingness to engage in them as they provided globally mobile community members more connections to leverage in other places.

Another benefit people talked about was challenging notions of Western superiority. In interviews, this theme intertwined with community members' opportunities to travel to the U.S. The author heard her host brother repeatedly recount how deeply his time in the U.S. impacted him, notably how he was exposed to the reality of significant U.S. poverty, and observed the lack of basic, life-skills knowledge among Americans he had taken for granted before leaving his home. This host brother had left his hometown to go to college in Chiangmai. After college he had stayed in the city working for a construction company. During this time, he applied for an exchange program to work for a year in the U.S. Although he had grown up poor, his family had never struggled for food or shelter, and they took pride in their work. At the farm in the U.S., many of his co-workers his age did not know how to cook, a kind of basic knowledge whose absence shocked him.

He also saw visible manifestations of poverty and marginalization and forms of desperation bleaker than anything he, or anyone he knew, had experienced. Such a contrast afforded him the realization of how rich he was simply through basic competencies he had already gained. He would never go hungry, and he would never have to beg or be victim to the poverty and disaffection he witnessed in America. When hosting U.S. student groups, these anecdotes appeared to provide perspectives from which he could draw when explaining lessons to students.

Inter-professional mobility proved added-value benefits for other community members including a host sister who had recently started a farming related business in the community, having spent six months in another country as part of a European grants program. She shared additional ways that broader global perspectives gave her pride.

> When I was young, we had foreigners, and no one could speak with them. If we can speak, we can send the true message about our community because we know what we are doing here. We should do something, and we have more experience than we know. Also, we can make people

> understand that we can do more than just farm. We can go places outside of Thailand. I wanted to prove this to my friends and the younger generation. We are more than your image of what a rural farmer is. We can go anywhere – Host Sister

This quote represents both the host sister's experience growing up among foreign strangers with whom she lacked the ability speak and how she herself eventually learned English in places far from home. She was deeply proud of this ability to travel to a place outside of her hometown and the opportunities she could access. She talked extensively about her pride in her community and in her profession as a youth who had returned to be a farmer.

Systems of Distributive Benefit

Finally, this study also found that each community had systems of distributed benefit that helped facilitate equity within the community and between the community and the study abroad program. These systems created a forum for community members to discuss concerns about hosting groups from the Global North, particularly around concerns engaging with tourism. Most people interviewed articulated frustration and concern over how to accommodate wide-spread tourist desires and behaviors that ran counter to their cultural value systems. For this reason, two of three communities the author spent time in had explicitly agreed to not engage with the normative tourism economy of Thailand and were engaging explicitly with students instead.

Tourism is a key driver of the economy in Thailand. Leaders and host families in all three communities described how they were repelled by having tourists come to consume their culture as though it were something to be performed. However, they were interested in cross-cultural exchange and placed great value on it. Families who hosted also had access to economic benefits from hosting, albeit small. To navigate the possibility of resulting tensions, communities arrived at the solution of systems of distributive benefit that facilitated transparency around the economic impact of visitors through a few key interventions.

First, by having set public prices and the opportunity for anyone in the community who wanted to host or engage with visitors being able to do so, economic benefits were clear, although they were ultimately minimal for families as compared to the work that was performed (Collins, 2021).

Community 1, the one community open to both tourists and students, utilized a community-based tourism (CBT) framework. In this model everyone in the village was expected to host students and tourists. The CBT governing board managed the list of families who wanted to participate, how often they had hosted, and handled the financial payments to minimize corruption or under the table payments. The CBT board set a standard price for housing and food and collected 20% of earnings for the overhead costs of managing the program and as an emergency fund community members could borrow from for health, housing, or other needs. This helped ensure that the supplemental income gained through hosting was generally dispersed evenly between families, as well ensuring no family felt too much of a burden by being asked to constantly host. All families hosted tourists under the same guidelines, although tourists typically only spent one night in the village as compared to 1 – 2 weeks for students. Community members described tourists as being primarily interested in trekking the surrounding hillsides and seeing wildlife.

Community 2 did not have a formal CBT board but was working on a system to implement something similar without having tourism be a component. They did not foresee wanting to host tourists at any point. Based on recommendations from trusted Thai academics, as well as community sentiment, they decided to explicitly ban the creation of tourism infrastructure. To find hosts, the local organic co-op and the homestay coordinator solicited families to see if they would be interested in hosting students. There were a few families who hosted consistently, but the coordinator had a difficult time expanding the hosting pool. Hesitations to host students described to the author included both the added work hosting required as well as stress created by having a foreigner as a houseguest.

The model of Community 2 was particularly interesting because while they sometimes struggled to find hosts, everyone in the co-op received a stipend from the hosting of groups by other families. There were a few core hosts in the community who hosted frequently. While hosts received most of the payment, about 5% of the payment was still reserved for the larger collective. Community 2 was the only predominantly ethnically Thai community of the three host communities, was located within a bigger town that had a more diverse economy with more economic opportunities. In this context, people were less interested in hosting, but still benefited from having visitors.

Community 3 also did not host tourists, only students and people interested in local culture and sustainable agricultural practices. They did not have a formalized system for tracking visitors, but opportunities to host were open to all members of the community. This was the smallest community the author visited, with only around 100 residents. The local youth group managed the assignment of guests. Since the community was small typically all homes who wanted to host during a study abroad program visit could do so. Families received 100% of the payment for hosting guests and additional fees for teaching and experiential activities went to the youth group fund.

Overall, systems of distributive benefit helped to mediate negative impacts from programs by creating transparency and the opportunity for all interested families to participate. They facilitated increased resident control in managing the economic and social impacts of hosting students. This contributed to community member agency. The existence of these systems often reflected strong local government with minimal existing corruption.

As a study abroad program instructor described:

> It feels very special in the places we go. There is a level of organization that is unique. Community varies a lot place to place, so we try and build across existing networks. Every village we go to has formalized CBT networks in one sense or another. Communities that have those institutions in place can long term handle issues much better. It helps minimize inadvertently making problems and eliminates or minimizes issues that can arise otherwise around money and power.

Conclusion

The ongoing dialogue between study abroad providers from the Global North and host communities located in the Global South needs to continue and deepen in scope. The rise of study abroad as a desired and sought-after experience by U.S. students combined with the desire of U.S. institutions to provide students with global competence fuels demand for host community sites for students to learn from, within, and about. Typically, conversations on increasing the impact of study abroad center on increasing and diversifying the numbers of students who participate. While these are important goals, we should focus too on host community perspectives, needs, and impacts. Focus on host community impacts are just as important as other research and scholarly

topics related to study abroad. As described in this paper, communities are truly the center of the abroad experience. Study abroad is an interactive dialectic, not a unidirectional process with U.S. students as the main stakeholder impacted by these programs – rather programs are impacting and being impacted by the host communities who choose to engage with them.

Study abroad program providers, higher education institutions in the Global North, and students should embed in their approach to the abroad experience designs that reject the idea that the community is the classroom (an extraction of knowledge-based model) and instead pursue one that treats the abroad experience as a dialogic process where people in the host community are actively in pursuit of understanding and benefits. Programs should be conceived and designed to work toward the goal of maximum benefit for communities. Addressing inequity in all forms should be central to study abroad goals and discourse (Balasubramaniam et al., 2018; Giroux, 2011). Host communities should not be seen as sites whose primary purpose is facilitating learning for the benefit of study abroad students. Instead, they should be treated and seen as partners and mission critical stakeholders.

References

Balasubramaniam, R.; Hartman, E.; McMillan, J.; Morris Paris, J. (2018). "Ethical Global Partnerships: Leadership from the Global South" in *The Wiley International Handbook of Service-Learning for Social Justice* (Darren E. Lund, ed.). Wiley.

Chapa-Cortés, C. (2019). What the community learns: International service-learning in Yucatán, México. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, *7*(1), Article 12.

Collins, L. (2021). Offering space at the table: the work of hosting U.S. study abroad students in Northern Thailand. *Third World Quarterly*, 42(8), 1849-1865. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2021.1937097

Collins, L. (2019) Letting the village be the teacher: a look at community-based learning in Northern Thailand. *Journal of Teaching in Higher Education*, 24(5), 694-708.

Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Doerr, N. (2012a): Do 'global citizens' need the parochial cultural other? Discourse of immersion in study abroad and learning-by-doing, *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *43*(2), 224-243. DOI:10.1080/03057925.2012.701852

Doerr, N. (2012b). Study abroad as 'adventure': Globalist construction of host–home

hierarchy and governed adventurer subjects. *Critical Discourse Studies* 9(3), 257–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2012.688211

Ficarra, J. (2019). Producing the Global Classroom: Exploring the Impact of US Study Abroad on Host Communities in San Jose, Costa Rica and Florence, Italy. (Doctoral dissertation). Syracuse University.

Gildersleeve, R. and Kuntz, A.M. (2013). Dialogue as a requiem for analysis. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies*, *13*(4), 263-266. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708613487871

Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Hartman, E., R. C. Kiely, C. Boettcher, J. Friedrichs, and R. Zakaria. (2018). *Community-based global learning: The theory and practice of ethical engagement at home and abroad.* 1st ed. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Heron, B. A. (2011). Challenging indifference to extreme poverty: Considering Southern perspectives on global citizenship and change. *Revue Éthique et Économique / Ethics and Economics*, *8*(1), 109–119. http://hdl.handle.net/1866/4584

Kortegast, C., & Kupo, V. L. (2017). Deconstructing underlying practices of short-term study abroad: Exploring issues of consumerism, postcolonialism, cultural tourism, and commodification of experience. *The International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, *8*(1), 149-172.

Lloyd, K., Clark, L., Hammersley, L., Baker, M., Rawlings-Sanaei, F., & D'ath, E. (2015). Unintended outcomes of university-community partnerships: Building organizational capacity with PACE International partners. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 16*(3), 163- 173.

MacDonald K. (2022). Transnational Solidarity Histories in International Service Learning: A Nicaraguan Case Study. *Journal of Experiential Education*. DOI: 10.1177/10538259221086666

O'Sullivan, M. & Smaller, H. (2016). Solidarity or neo-colonialism? The challenges of understanding the impact of ISL on Nicaraguan host communities. In M. Larsen (Ed.), International service learning engaging host communities (pp. 49-64). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315732305

Reynolds, N. (2014). What counts as outcomes? Community perspectives of an engineering partnership. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 20*(1), 79–90

Porntip, K., & Chotima, C. (2018). The internationalization of Thai higher education over the decades: Formidable challenges remain. In G. W. Fry (Ed.), *Education in Thailand: An old elephant in search of a new mahout* (pp. 271–321). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-7857-6_11

Tsing, A. (2000). The global situation. *Cultural Anthropology, 15*(3), 327-360. DOI:10.1525/can.2000.15.3.327

Author Biography

Lauren Collins explores the relationship between the United States' global power status and the practice of global education, especially economic and socio-cultural impacts of global education programs on local communities. Her research looks U.S. student presence in host communities in the Global South, specifically Southeast and East Asia. She is particularly interested in how

communities build global education program infrastructure in response to desires of U.S. study abroad programs to place students in “non-traditional” experiences.