WHAT IS A GLOBAL EXPERIENCE?

William Gaudelli and Megan J. Laverty

INTRODUCTION

The perceived importance of a global experience in higher education is hard to underestimate. University presidents are known to boast of their “percentage,” or the proportion of undergraduates who study abroad. At least part of the rationale is a cosmopolitan one: an essential part of being acknowledged as educated derives in part from an appreciation of different cultures and development of worldliness. The expectation is that a global experience will stand out as an enduring memorial of an encounter with others. These experiences are edified in resumes and narrated with veneration, further illuminating their cultural importance as coming-of-age rituals, particularly among a striding upper middle class.

The percentage of postsecondary students in the U.S. who study abroad is growing, yet the number is remarkably small as a proportion of all who attend university. In 2008, nearly 240,000 students from over 1,000 U.S. universities earned college credit through study abroad programs (“Meeting America’s Global Education Challenge”).¹ The percentage of U.S. postsecondary students who study abroad, however, is only ~1% of all those who enroll in higher education institutions (HEI) (8). Universities generally seek to increase student participation in study abroad options. A recent study shows that 83% of administrators surveyed from 290 HEIs have this priority, but those surveyed also indicate a lack of resources to support these efforts and thereby envision a negligible increase in the number of those studying abroad in the future (9). A bright note in this study, however, suggests that there is substantial interest in studying abroad among university students and staff, which they might (or would) pursue if more resources were available.

Study abroad programs, including long-term programs that extend over an academic year to short-term programs of only a few weeks, take substantial resources for planning and execution. Curriculum design, or the development of a formal course of study coupled with informal opportunities for learning about the place visited, requires significant planning and logistical support. Typically, students are exposed to what is most distinctive about the study location: important landmarks, historic monuments, museums, ceremonies, and artistic performances, all suggesting an essential character of the other. Efforts to immerse students in the culture are increasingly common such that visitors might take classes with local students, participate in homestays, or partake in festivals and holidays.

The homogeneity, however, of those who go abroad and where they go reveals about the orientation of these experiences, as nearly 83% identify as white, 66% are women, and 60% of traveling students go to European countries (Obst, Bhandari,

and Witherell 2007, *Current Trends in U.S. Study Abroad*).² One way of reading this data suggests that college students in the U.S. are seeking an experience of otherness that is not altogether different from their current lives. This intention, coupled with the fact that these are expensive learning opportunities, puts study abroad coordinators in a difficult position. They are compelled to balance providing a customer-oriented program with concomitantly seeking to disrupt normative ways of thinking. The customer service dynamic coupled with the changing demographic profile of study abroad presents an even greater challenge. Following the global economic downturn of 2009, scholarships for study abroad became even scarcer, exacerbating the desire to serve the client in providing certain global experiences as compared to others (Goulah 2010, “Resisting Abstraction in the Dialogic Space Abroad”).³

Universities enthusiastically embrace activities associated with global learning, typically without introducing a new order of conceptions to support them. Too often, the conceptions of what is *global* and what is an *experience* are not sufficiently sorted out. This results in a confused and incoherent global experience that prohibits meaningful experiences with cultural difference and may deteriorate into a shopping-abroad fling. Placed within a particular culture, students observe it from afar, putting their own lives on hold while engaging an artifice presumably curated for them. This can have the undesired effect of reifying separation and difference rather than ameliorating them. Furthermore, as study abroad increases among U.S. universities, popularization can ironically lead to isolation within study abroad efforts. The creation of “U.S. ghettos” or “one hundred-legged Americans” traveling in a flock to other destinations, but without leaving home in a metaphysical sense, is an offshoot of dissemination (Ogden 2006, “Ethnographic Inquiry”).⁴

Advocates of study abroad have recognized the challenges of expanding these efforts and have addressed its growth by promulgating design standards. The Forum on Education Abroad developed standards for what constitutes quality programming in HEI study abroad, for example. Advocates have offered a common set of practices and values for HEI study abroad. These standards include having a *mission* for the work that is *assessed* over time, a focus on *student learning*, an *academic program* to orient the experience, a *preparation/debriefing* program to bookend the experience, attention to *student selection*, a consideration of ethics, like *respecting difference* along with attention to *risk management* and *health/safety concerns* (Forum on Education Abroad 2011, *Standards on Good Practice for Education Abroad*).⁵ The standards are silent, however, with respect to the nature of experiences in study abroad, focusing on logistics and programming. This omission is understandable given a pervasive, implicit belief that any study abroad is likely to have certain, if unstipulated, benefits. But we hold that specifications about the structure of programming alone do not broach the critical matter of how experiences can be fundamentally educative.

We contend that without due attention to the nature of experiences and an implied reflective spirit to accompany study abroad, the full potential of these efforts may not be realized. Our purpose in what follows is to allow John Dewey's thinking about the nature of experience to inform this significant discussion. For this we turn to Dewey's last statement on teaching and learning, *Experience and Education*. In the first section, we highlight the developmental similarities between global experience in higher education and progressive education in the early twentieth century. Both have behaved associatively rather than reflectively, resulting in the fetishization of a pedagogical innovation. In the second section, we apply Dewey's criticisms of progressive education to global experience in higher education. We argue that neither what is global nor what is an experience has been adequately conceived. We conclude with some reflections on what could emerge as universities rethink this critical area.

THE "NEW" EDUCATION: GLOBAL EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

An emphasis on global experience in education, taken as a good in and of itself, risks making a fetish of what is new. When devoid of genuinely reflective practices, these experiences can amount to little more than trips that attract attention for how they symbolize an institution's status rather than how they enact learning. Study abroad is widely believed to increase awareness and cross-cultural competence, though such beliefs are not yet empirically supported (Twombly, Salisbur, Tumanut, and Klut 2012, *Study Abroad in a New Global Century*, 67).⁶ Patterson (2013), along these lines, recently studied a group of teachers traveling throughout China for three weeks and returned relatively little of what they learned to their classrooms.⁷

The circularity of reform, one well documented by educational historians, also plagued Dewey's career. Dewey (1897/2008, *My Pedagogic Creed*) outlined principles of education that grounded learning in a process of inquiry, through felt problems and toward social ends.⁸ Astute readers recognized, as did Dewey, that his theorizing was not truly new. He was synthesizing older notions of learning in such a way as to transform them into a relevant alternative to teaching and learning that was widely characterized, even by contemporaries, as being dominated by recitation, teacher-centeredness, and didactic instruction.⁹

Dewey's school of thought quickly became known as progressive education. The confusion around what progressive education meant, generated to some degree by Dewey and his adherents themselves, compelled Dewey to rearticulate his intentions, as many projects departed from what he had intended.¹⁰ Dewey solidified his responses in a significant work published in the 1930s, *Experience and Education*, wherein he calls for education worthy of its name as "education pure and simple" (1938, 90).¹¹ Dewey was ironically trying to shed the "innovative" label his pedagogical theory had been assigned since the break of continuity, or the fetish of the new, had become the focus, rather than the work itself.

The history of study abroad correlates, to some extent, with the arc of progressive education—from scant origins to enthusiastic adoption followed by recalibrated efforts. Study abroad began among elite, eastern universities (Georgetown and Indiana significant among them) in the late nineteenth century. Often study tours were led by professors eager to acquaint young people with language and culture and facilitate connections by visiting museums and historic sites in Europe (Twombly et al. 2012, 15).¹² The Junior Year Abroad program was a lengthier cousin to these excursions as it involved extended, academic study in European universities and the reciprocation of academic credit for courses taken (16). But like Dewey's progressive education, study abroad was not a widespread phenomenon.

In the aftermath of World War II and with the dawning of the Cold War, the development of study abroad expanded while moving to align more closely with national priorities. The U.S. Department of State, through its Fulbright Programs and a variety of affiliated federal agencies, began postwar funding that was partly aimed at developing language capacity and an appreciation of the wider world, while also serving as a means of strategically positioning of U.S. interests in a bipolar era (Haber Kern 2009).¹³ The national imprimatur on study abroad was unmistakable in the period from 1945 to 1970: "Faculty exchange programs [were] sponsored by the U.S. Agency for International Development, World Bank, Fulbright, IIE, Ford Foundation, and CIEE involving grant money targeted to specific countries and with specific objectives (Twombly et al. 2012, 18)."¹⁴

The third phase of the arc, from roughly 1970 to the present, is characterized by expanded participation among HEIs, academic legitimization of these efforts, and dominance of an economic/individualistic rationale. The most recent survey of HEI indicates that over 90% offer study abroad options (Twombly et al. 2012, 26). Study abroad is now less likely to be framed as a hopeful opportunity for promoting world peace, segue into a diplomatic career, or to enhance one's ability to engage cross-culturally. The rationale now is economic: study abroad creates employees whom corporations value because they can work across borders (25). While there remains a wide array of study abroad programs oriented toward specific goals—from ecological sensitivity to cultural competence to peace development—these are outliers. In a way similar to progressive education, the expansion and reinterpretation of study abroad occurred simultaneously. Where their histories diverge, however, is that progressive education mostly waned after untrammelled growth, yet study abroad continues to expand, though now focused on an economic purpose.

Our aim is not to historicize study abroad nor progressive education, though we touch on both here to illustrate changes at work in these spaces. Contemporary study abroad ought to reflect a postcolonial sensitivity characteristic of the current global moment. Study excursions that reflect postcolonial sensitivity ought to occur between the global North and South, and reciprocally, rather than exclusively North to North. These trips should highlight and examine how the wealth of empire was part

of a historical transfer, or taking, from societies of the South to those of the North. The great museums in Western Europe, for example, become sites of learning about not only their contents but also the historical and physical presence of such museums in the first place. This not-so-subtle challenge to the historical inertia of study abroad as a space of privilege aims more explicitly to avoid reinscribing an era of privilege through an edification of what it means to be worldly. It aims to expand the reach of what constitutes a truly global experience, or to recognize the way the world was made in those earlier times as part of what it means to know about the world today.

JOHN DEWEY ON (GLOBAL) EXPERIENCE

Dewey was a globe-trotter to be sure, with extended visits to China, Soviet Russia, Turkey, South Africa, and Mexico, among other places, in a time when such travel was uncommon and arduous by today's standards. He used these opportunities to lecture, teach, and explore varieties of education scarcely known in the U.S. at the time. We think it is safe to assume that Dewey, who expended a great deal of energy and resources engaging these trips, had an implicit theory about the nature of global experience, though one that, to the best of our knowledge, he does not articulate in his published corpus. We also think it is safe to assume that his theory about the nature of global experience drew heavily from his philosophy of experience.

The most comprehensive statement of Dewey's philosophy of experience is provided by his later work, *Experience and Nature*. In revising the book's introduction—something he did many times—Dewey remarked that if he were to rewrite the book he would entitle it *Culture and Nature* (1925/2008, *Experience and Nature*, 361).¹⁵ The term "experience" had, in his view, "become effectively identified with experiencing in the psychological, and the psychological had become established as that which is intrinsically psychical, mental, private (363)." He came to think that the word "culture" was a more expansive term and better reflected the "psychological and collective" scope of his inquiry (364). Culture comprised all of the materials and processes of human experience: artifacts, social organizations, technologies, rituals, customs, habits, ideals, and values. It is contingent, continuous, historical, and evolutionary. If culture provides the external conditions of experience, then the individual provides its internal conditions. Culture, and the individuals that populate a culture, are continuously changing and being changed by the other. Given the current focus of global education on the external or cultural conditions of experience, our focus is on the neglected internal or individual conditions of global experience.

According to Dewey, experience is always "the actual life-experience of some individual" (1938, *Experience and Education*, 89).¹⁶ No experience, including a global one, is intrinsically or abstractly good. Although experience has a positive connotation among educators, often used as a descriptor of an authentic moment of learning, these segmented fragments of time are not in themselves educative. Rather, their pedagogical value derives from their contribution to future learning

and enhanced experience. A global experience, therefore, has pedagogical value if it extends beyond the momentary to the continuous. This outward movement of experience is necessarily in the direction of the unknown.

The potentially continuous nature of experience suggests that we should be open to the myriad and diverse ways in which an individual can come to appreciate culturally different others. David T. Hansen (2011) is particularly insightful on this matter. In his book, *The Teacher and the World: A Study of Cosmopolitanism as Education*,¹⁷ he argues that it is possible for teachers to enact a commitment to cosmopolitanism by inviting their students to: (1) study diverse curriculum and seek out new cultural knowledge (95, 98); (2) engage in in-depth and systematic comparative study of different cultures with a view to understanding how people give shape, substance and meaning to their lives (115); and (3) articulate and discuss their own responses to the “ever-changing cultural kaleidoscope” that they experience when walking around their town or city (99). Implied in all of these activities is an awareness of how experiences can awaken us to wider insights, and even move us in the directions of explanatory theories about social patterns.

A problem with global excursions in higher education is that they are frequently demarcated using only objective conditions: students visit a circumscribed geographical location ostensibly integrated by a unifying culture and history. The assumption is that these objective conditions are unfamiliar to the students and, for this reason alone, will invite careful observation. While it is likely true that most students notice the differences in objective conditions—changes in architecture, cuisine, noises, smells, facial features, and modes of address—Dewey argues that “[i]t is a mistake to suppose” that these necessarily constitute a new experience (1938, *Experience and Education*, 75). Such an assumption neglects the internal conditions necessary for experience. It is the objective and internal conditions that “[t]aken together, or in their interaction . . . form what we call a *situation* (42).”¹⁸ Participants ought to synthesize a sense of experience from these situations, a reflective awareness of what these various objective conditions constitute, if study abroad is to be truly educative.

Situations are contingently and historically generated. They are also qualitative. An individual can sense “how the tense grace of the ball-player infects the onlooking crowd . . . the delight of the housewife in tending her plants . . . and the zest of spectator in poking the wood burning on the hearth and in watching the darting flames and crumbling coals” (Dewey 1934/2008, *Art as Experience*, 11.)¹⁹ The qualities of grace, delight, and zest pervade and unify each of the situations. A quality is not a property in the way that heat is a property of the weather and viscosity is a property of olive oil. A quality “runs through” all the properties, giving meaning to each and binding them together (Dewey 1930/2008, *Qualitative Thought*, 245).²⁰ Although qualities are apprehended in an unreflective manner, their directedness is enough to stimulate thought. If the situation is familiar, then

the thinking is naturally effortless because the distinctions are already available. When the situation is unfamiliar, the quality “persists and forms a haunting and engrossing problem” (249).

Dewey’s analysis of qualities explains why some situations are more memorable than others. When individuals travel, they rarely describe in detail places or objects. Instead, they seek to convey their lasting impressions: what it felt like to stroll along the banks of the Seine in the early evening; the occasion of sitting in the back of a rickshaw racing through the crowded streets of Mumbai; or the air of excitement felt as one witnesses a national holiday and its attendant rituals. Such situations are memorable because their discernible quality demands greater explication, particularly when translating them back into a local vernacular of experience wherein this other moment is not easily understood. These moments inspire reflective thinking within or immediately adjacent to the impetus of reflection, a critical aspect of what global experiences potentially invite. Such suggestions carry over into future experiences, creating a pulsating chain of continuous thought that springs from experience.

CONTINUITY OF THOUGHT AND DEWEY’S “EXPERIENCE”

Progressive and global educators, in their unique ways, miss the fact that students need to participate in situations that invite heightened and deepened qualitative apprehension and that educators need to provide opportunities for the occasional and episodic reflection on those apprehensions. Now and then the distance of time permits even greater thinking and perhaps more trenchant analysis that allows one to understand something even more essential in an event through a reflective and rearward grasp. There is evidence to suggest that a notion of “best practice” is emerging in study abroad wherein the anticipatory and reflective preparation of global experience is becoming regularized.²¹ Yet these reflective spaces, pre- and post-, are often situated at the end of a laborious day of touring, for example, wherein the reflection is likely to be surface rather than meaningful.

The fetish of experience may also point to a reason for the relative absence of sustained reflection in global experience. The cultural urge to forever be in pursuit of the next, great experience often treats reflective opportunities with disdain, as they are a “waste of time.” As Thommason (2012, 31) modestly reminds us, regarding the obsession with hyper-experience in the current mood, “A carnival that never ends stops being fun.”²² And as Dewey would surely add, the activity-to-exhaustion mode of learning quickly becomes activity for its own sake, lacking the thread of contiguous thought vital to meaningful learning. Reflection as an experience in and of itself is needed within study abroad, a culminating and critical point at which insights are drawn and future activities are figured and launched.

Dewey views thinking as an existential process that is an organically social and continuous activity. He writes that “it occurs, goes on; in short, it is in continual change as long as a person thinks” (Dewey 1910/1933/2008, *How We Think*, 172).²³ Prompted by

an unsettled situation, a disturbance in routine, thinking takes place through association. Events—separated by time and space—are associated based on qualitative similarities. Dewey (1930/2008, *Qualitative Thought*, 254) writes that “[t]he only way that form or pattern can operate as an immediate link is by the mode of a directly experienced quality, something present and prior to and independent of all reflective analysis.”²⁴ It allows us to recognize hardship in circumstances very different from our own and the dignified manner in which a Mayan woman sells her shells from the side the road. Clearly, we can be mistaken. We entertain suggestions, test them in observation and action, only to find them in need of correction. Dewey gives the familiar example of mistakenly identifying a piece of music or painting based on suggestion rather than analysis, where a trained observer or listener might have gotten it right.

RETHINKING GLOBAL EXPERIENCES BY DEWEY’S LIGHTS

If Dewey is right about the memorable quality of certain experiences, the phases of qualitative apprehension, and the dynamic nature of reflective thought, then there are a number of implications for global experiences in higher education. First, more thought needs to be directed towards advanced planning of global experiences. Educators must consider not only what is distinctive about the unfamiliar objective conditions but how these objective conditions are going to interact with the internal conditions of their students. This requires opportunities for inquiry not just about the destination and one’s home, culture, and history. Educators must create situations that inspire reflective thought by heightening and deepening the students’ qualitative apprehensions while inviting reflective consideration pointing towards future experiences. The more opportunities that students are given to discern, articulate, and revise their qualitative apprehensions the more cultivated their sensitivity and thinking will become.

Global experiences should be planned with a view to allowing for spontaneous activities, events, and encounters. They must, in the language of Dewey (1938, *Experience and Education*, 48), provide “room for the free play of individual thinking or for contributions due to distinctive individual experience.”²⁵ Freedom from the obligations and commitments imposed by a closely organized and tightly controlled itinerary offers the individual “new materials upon which his intelligence may exercise itself” (63). An individual’s freedom of movement is a necessary but insufficient condition for intellectual freedom. Consideration must be given to how the situation of being abroad will live on in future experiences. It is not enough that students simply be exposed to culturally diverse others. Provision must be made for moments of doing when learning about others is not the explicit focus. Most people have experienced that feeling of being swept up into an activity, to being fully immersed such that time slips away unnoticed. There is active thought in trying to determine the moment at hand in a more complex level that drives to a certain end. This type of thought has a thrown quality, or a feeling of being immersed in an activity. While not a reflective state, these moments are crucial as they become grist for vital reflection.

The activities can be as simple as shopping, cooking a meal, and traveling to an unfamiliar part of the city, but they can potentially open up students' vistas to new lifeworlds. Jan Masschelein annually takes graduate students for a two-week visit to a post-conflict European city or a non-tourist city in China.²⁶ Together, they walk along lines randomly drawn on city maps that cross neighborhoods, buildings, and areas. While they walk, they discuss their reflections on what they have seen and heard. The relevance of Masschelein's work is that he assumes that his students are aware that their perspective of the world is culturally informed and one among many. The problem, as he sees it, is one of *really* looking. How to attend to the world in such a way as to make it present and to be present for witnessing, or in the language of Dewey, experienced. Masschelein follows Jean-Luc Nancy in distinguishing between globalization and remaking the world, with the latter suggesting deep conceptual changes.

We question whether a global experience adequately transforms foreign surroundings into an environment that engages students' selective interests, or can adequately guide them to "focus here" when the totality of their experience suggests novelty, uncertainty and often anxiety. One of the authors worked on an international exchange program in teacher education wherein students were placed in schools internationally to work with historically marginalized students in those locales. When the faculty visited the students and talked with them about their placements, they reported that they were learning very little about the schools themselves but were gaining most of their insights about the wider community and the life of college students in these European societies. The project was funded because of the particularity of its focus, but it was clear to us that the laser focus was overdetermined, which discounted the meaningful experience of everyday life that students were having in those communities. They were able to construct responses that appeared to be genuine in recounting what they learned about working with marginalized populations of school students, but it was apparent that this was itself a marginal element of what they learned.

CONCLUSION

Dewey criticized the "new" or progressive education for defining itself in opposition to the old or traditional education. He thought that this was regrettable for a number of reasons. First, because traditional education rested on a contempt for "living present experience," it was assumed that since progressive education was based on living experience, it should be contemptuous of the intellectual organization of subject matter (Dewey 1938, *Experience and Education*, 82).²⁷ Second, progressive educators assumed that their new method solved problems inherent in traditional education and, third, because they assumed this, they had not sought to adequately conceive experience and the experimental method (90). They had failed to consider the fundamental question of what qualifies as education.

We have identified a similar trajectory with global education and the edu-tourism that it has launched and contained. Global education has frequently defined itself in opposition to the status quo by exposing students to the rich and diverse world that lies beyond their backyard. Institutions and organizations have, over the years, developed travel tours, homestays, work programs, and joint programs with locals, just to provide a few examples. Dewey's criticism of progressive education applies equally well to study abroad or global experiences. Because we associate more traditional forms of education with remaining within the context of what is familiar, we associate global education with travel to geographically distant locations and encounters with exotically different others. Because we have assumed the intrinsic goodness of these experiences, we have not been motivated to thoughtfully conceive global and experience.

We contend, borrowing from Dewey (1938, *Experience and Education*, 91), that there is not yet a sound philosophy of global experience. Why might a philosophy of global experience be important? Michel de Montaigne offers some insight.²⁸ He thinks that the issue is one of perspective. We find it hard to "reckon things at their real size" (Montaigne 1991, "On Educating Children," 177).²⁹ The way to do this, according to Montaigne, is to use the world as our "looking-glass" and to share in the "variety of humors, schools of thought, opinion, laws and customs" (1991, 177). The effect of such sharing is to "teach us to realize that our own fortune is not a great miracle" (177). It tempers our worldly pride and encourages us to fight for our convictions. According to Montaigne, it also allows us to discern the difference between "slavery and due subordination; license and liberty; what are the signs of true and sold happiness; how far we should fear death, pain and shame" (178).

Montaigne's insights are important for our reading of Dewey and our use of him to criticize global education. As with all of these things, global education has the potential to expand and enrich our students' experience. For this to occur, we need to take seriously the principles of continuity, interaction and reflection that points beyond. We must consider how the experience will live on in the student's future experience and recognize that how it lives on is partly a function of his or her past experience. One of the ways to handle this is to get students not just to observe the objective conditions—customs, places, and people—but to think about how the experience alters their sense of what it means for a human to flourish, what justice can possibly mean and how human life is webbed within a biosphere. For this to occur, students must be given the opportunity to reflect individually on these concepts and discuss them together and in solidarity with others. The principle of interaction alerts us to the fact that objective and internal conditions must be taken into account.³⁰

NOTES

1. "Meeting America's Global Education Challenge," *Institute for International Education*, <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Research-Projects/Study-Abroad-Capacity-Research-Initiative>.
2. Daniel Obst, Rajika Bhandari, and Sharon Witherell, "Current Trends in U.S. Study Abroad and the Impact of Strategic Diversity Initiatives," *Meeting America's Global Education Challenge White Paper #1* (Chicago, IL: Institute for International Education, 2007), <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Publications-and-Reports/IIE-Bookstore/Current-Trends-in-US-Study-Abroad-and-The-Impact-of-Strategic-Diversity-Initiatives>.
3. Jason Goulah, "Proposing Compulsory Study Abroad and Language Learning in Elementary through University Education: Resisting Abstraction in the Dialogic Space Abroad," in *Readings in Language Studies, Vol. 2: Language and Power*, edited by John L. Watzke, Miguel Mantero, and Paul C. Miller (Lakewood Ranch, FL: International Society for Language Studies, 2010).
4. Anthony C. Ogden, "Ethnographic Inquiry: Reframing the Learning Core of Education Abroad," *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* 13 (2006): 87–112.
5. Forum on Education Abroad. *Standards on Good Practice for Education Abroad*, 4th ed. (Carlisle, PA: The Forum on Education Abroad, 2011), <http://www.forumea.org/documents/ForumEA-StandardsGoodPractice2011-4thEdition.pdf>.
6. Susan B. Twombly, Mark H. Salisbury, Shannon D. Tumanut, and Paul Klute, *Study Abroad in a New Global Century: Renewing the Promise, Refining the Purpose*, Association for the Study of Higher Education Report 38, no. 4 (2012): 67.
7. Timothy Patterson, "Meeting 'the Other': The Influence of International Professional Development on Four In-Service Social Studies Teachers" (Ph.D. diss., Teachers College, Columbia University, 2013).
8. John Dewey, *My Pedagogic Creed*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. *John Dewey: The Early Works, Volume 5: 1882–1898* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1897/2008).
9. See Larry Cuban, *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890–1990* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1993), 55–60.
10. See Petra Munro Hendry, *Engendering Curriculum History* (New York: Routledge, 2011).
11. John Dewey, *Experience and Education* (New York: Simon & Shuster, 1938), 90.
12. Twombly, Salisbury, Tumanut, and Klute, *Study Abroad in a New Global Century*, Association for the Study of Higher Education Report 38, no. 4 (2012): 15.
13. Ann E. Haberkern, "The Culture of Study Abroad in the 21st Century" (Ph.D. diss., University of California-Santa Barbara, 2009).
14. Twombly, Salisbury, Tumanut, and Klute, *Study Abroad in a New Global Century*, Association for the Study of Higher Education Report 38, no. 4 (2012): 18.
15. John Dewey, *Experience and Nature*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953, Volume 1: 1925* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1925/2008), 361.
16. John Dewey, *Experience and Education*, 89.
17. David T. Hansen, *The Teacher and the World: A Study of Cosmopolitanism as Education* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 95, 98.
18. *Ibid.*, 42.
19. John Dewey, *Art as Experience*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953 Volume 10: 1934* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1934/2008), 11.

20. John Dewey, *Qualitative Thought*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953 Volume 5: 1929–1930* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1930/2008), 245.
21. See Forum on Education Abroad, *Standards on Good Practice for Education Abroad*, <http://www.forumea.org/documents/ForumEA-StandardsGoodPractice2011-4thEdition.pdf>.
22. Bjorn Thommason, “Revisiting Liminality: The Danger of Empty Spaces,” in *Liminal Landscapes: Travel, Experience and Places in between*, edited by Hazel Andrews and Les Roberts, 21–35 (New York: Routledge, 2012), 31.
23. John Dewey, *How We Think*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953 Volume 8: 1933* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1910/1933/2008), 172.
24. John Dewey, *Qualitative Thought*, 254.
25. John Dewey, *Experience and Education*, 48.
26. Jan Masschelein, “E-ducating the Gaze: The Idea of a Poor Pedagogy,” *Ethics and Education* 5, no. 1 (2011): 43–53. See also Jan Masschelein, “The World ‘Once More’: Walking Lines,” *Teachers College Record*, (2009), ID Number: 15647, <http://www.tcrecord.org>.
27. John Dewey, *Experience and Education*, 82.
28. We reference Michel De Montaigne in this context because his thinking represents the philosophical origins of progressive educational thought. Montaigne introduced many of the pedagogical ideas that define progressive education, including that the child should: be well-formed rather than well-filled; develop resilience, flexibility and sound judgment; be educated indirectly by way of his or her interactions with engaging social, cultural and physical environments; and be closely observed by his or educators so that they might alter the environment based on what has been learned and what ought to be learned next. For more information on the historical development of progressive educational thought, see Megan J. Laverty, “Progressive Education and its Critics,” *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy*, ed. Dennis Phillips (London: Sage Press, 2014), 661–66.
29. Michel de Montaigne, “On Educating Children,” translated by M. A. Screech, in *The Complete Essays* (London, UK: Penguin, 1991), 177.
30. An earlier version of this paper was presented as part of the Past President’s Panel: Revisiting *Experience and Education*, John Dewey Society, American Educational Research Association (AERA). We are grateful for comments from Larry Hickman, Lenard Waks, and two anonymous reviewers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cuban, Larry. *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890–1990*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1993.
- Dewey, John. *Lectures in China, 1919–1920*. Edited and translated by Robert W. Clopton and Tsuin-chen Ou. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1973.
- . *Art as Experience*. Edited by Jo Ann Boydston. *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953 Volume 10: 1934*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1934/2008.
- . *Qualitative Thought*. Edited by Jo Ann Boydston. *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953 Volume 5: 1929–1930*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1930/2008.

- . *How We Think*. Edited by Jo Ann Boydston. *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953 Volume 8: 1933*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1933/2008.
- . *Nature and Experience*. Edited by Jo Ann Boydston. *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953, Volume 1: 1925*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1925/2008.
- . *Experience and Education*. New York: Simon & Shuster, 1938.
- . *My Pedagogic Creed*. Edited by Jo Ann Boydston. *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953, Volume 3: 1882–1898*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1897/2008.
- Durodoye, Beth A., Coryell, Joellen E., Wright, Robin R., and Pate, P. Elizabeth. “Assessing Global Perspectives at a Hispanic and Minority Serving Institution: A University-Wide Effort.” *Journal of College & Character* 12, no. 3 (2011): 1–6.
- Forum on Education Abroad. *Standards of Good Practice for Education Abroad*. 4th ed. Carlisle, PA: The Forum on Education Abroad, 2011. <http://apps.forumea.org/documents/ForumEA-StandardsGoodPractice2011-4thEdition.pdf>.
- Goulah, Jason. “Proposing Compulsory Study Abroad and Language Learning in Elementary through University Education: Resisting Abstraction in the Dialogic Space Abroad.” In *Readings in Language Studies, Vol. 2: Language and Power*, edited by John L. Watzke, Miguel Mantero, and Paul C. Miller, 335–49. Lakewood Ranch, FL: International Society for Language Studies, 2010.
- Haberkern, Ann E. “The Culture of Study Abroad in the 21st Century.” PhD diss., University of California-Santa Barbara, 2009.
- Hansen, David T. *The Teacher and the World: A Study of Cosmopolitanism as Education*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Hendry, Petra Munro. *Engendering Curriculum History*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Laverty, Megan J. “Progressive Education and its Critics.” In *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy*, edited by Dennis Phillip, 661–66. London, UK: Sage, 2014.
- Masschelein, Jan. “E-ducatng the Gaze: The Idea of a Poor Pedagogy.” *Ethics and Education* 5, no. 1 (2011): 43–53.
- . “The World ‘Once More’: Walking Lines.” *Teachers College Record* (2009). ID Number: 15647. <http://www.tcrecord.org>.
- “Meeting America’s Global Education Challenge: An IIE Study Abroad Capacity Research Initiative.” *Institute for International Education*. <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Research-Projects/Study-Abroad-Capacity-Research-Initiative>.
- Montaigne, Michel de. “On Educating Children.” In *The Complete Essays*, translated by M. A. Screech, 163–99. London, UK: Penguin, 1993.
- Obst, Daniel, Rajika Bhandari, and Sharon Witherell. “Current Trends in U.S. Study Abroad and the Impact of Strategic Diversity Initiatives.” *Meeting America’s Global Education Challenge White Paper #1*. Chicago, IL: Institute for International Education, 2007. <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications>

/Publications-and-Reports/IIE-Bookstore/Current-Trends-in-US-Study-Abroad-and-The-Impact-of-Strategic-Diversity-Initiatives.

Ogden, Anthony C. "Ethnographic Inquiry: Reframing the Learning Core of Education Abroad." *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* 13 (2006): 87–112.

Patterson, Timothy. "Meeting 'the Other': The Influence of International Professional Development on Four In-Service Social Studies Teachers." PhD diss., Teachers College, Columbia University, 2013.

Thommason, Bjorn. "Revisiting Liminality: The Danger of Empty Spaces." In *Liminal Landscapes: Travel, Experience and Places in between*, edited by Hazel Andrews and Les Roberts, 21–35. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Twombly, Susan B., Salisbury, Mark H., Tumanut, Shannon D., and Klute, Paul. *Study Abroad in a New Global Century: Renewing the Promise, Refining the Purpose*. Association for the Study of Higher Education Report 38, no. 4 (2012). <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-1118511379,subjectCd-ED20.html>.

Wang, Jessica Ching-Sze. *John Dewey in China: To Teach and to Learn*. New York: SUNY Press, 2007.

William Gaudelli is an associate professor of social studies and education at Teachers College Columbia University. Email: gaudelli@tc.columbia.edu

Megan J. Laverty is an associate professor of philosophy and education at Teachers College Columbia University. Email: laverty@tc.columbia.edu