

ATJ-SPONSORED ROUNDTABLE 2003 ASSOCIATION FOR ASIAN STUDIES (AAS) CONFERENCE

“Asian *in Situ*: Acquiring Language and Culture through Study Abroad”
March 27, 2003. 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Presenters: **Dan P. Dewey** (Assistant Professor of Foreign Language Education, University of Pittsburgh); **Phyllis H. Larson** (Associate Professor of Asian Studies, St. Olaf College); **Stephen P. Nussbaum** (Professor of Anthropology and administrator of the Japan Study Program, Earlham College; Visiting Professor, Center for International Education, Waseda University, Tokyo)

Chair: **Patricia J. Wetzel** (Professor of Japanese and International Studies and Director of the Institute for Asian Studies, Portland State University)

*Summary prepared by Keiko Ikeda
Ph.D. candidate, University of Hawaii*

Patricia Wetzel provided a general context for the discussion of study abroad. She offered facts on American college study abroad students in the year 2002 which show that still a very small portion of the population (6%, or 9,247 out of 154,168 students) chose an Asian country as their destination. This fact was contrasted with the number of students the U.S. hosted during the same year. In higher education, 582,996 foreign students were hosted, and over half (56%) of them were Asian. Wetzel also introduced the findings of the 2002 *Open Doors* report from the Institute of International Education (IIE) on study abroad, including a list of 24 U.S. institutions which send a large number of students to study abroad. The handout provided at the roundtable is reproduced as Appendix 1.

Wetzel raised several questions for discussion with the other participants as well as the audience:

- ❖ How do students abroad acquire cultural knowledge and language experience?
- ❖ What factors characterize the experience of being “*in situ*” and make it different from intensive study at home (i.e., in the U.S.)?
- ❖ What type of study program yields the best language and culture learning?
- ❖ How can students and their teachers maximize the study abroad experience?
- ❖ Does Asia require a larger intellectual commitment in the sense that, in order to make significant gains, its study abroad students require longer time periods in the target destination than do students of the commonly taught European languages?

These questions were addressed by the subsequent presenters from a variety of perspectives—teaching, research, and program development. **Phyllis Larson**’s presentation was entitled “Self-Managed Japanese: A Strategy for Learning Japanese *in Situ*.” By “self-managed Japanese” Larson and her collaborator John Knapp mean that if study abroad students see themselves as *active participants* in their learning—as managers of their own learning—they will fare better in immersion settings and achieve their goals more satisfactorily. A sample of the materials used in their approach is reproduced in Appendix 2. Larson emphasized that students need to realize that success in study abroad does not simply happen to them, but is an outcome that is largely in their own control. Following Knapp & Larson (1993), she suggested some strategies which study abroad students should develop and integrate into their on-going learning experience during their stay:

- a) anticipate the situation (such as the vocabulary and polite expressions you will need to carry out a task);
- b) put yourself on the “edge” of the situation (e.g., eavesdrop on other people carrying out the same task);
- c) do the task;
- d) reflect on how things went (where did you get stuck? what additional vocabulary did you need?);
- e) write down what you have learned in a notebook for future reference;
- f) rehearse the implementation of the task once more, with corrections;
- g) put yourself in the same situation again.

Larson emphasized that the above strategies are task-based and should be applied to each specific situation accordingly. The learner’s development of meta-level awareness during the study abroad experience was emphasized, suggesting that students be equipped to process and reflect on their language learning and cross-cultural experiences. Developing a “more reliable internal monitor” is the key for fruitful results.

Dan Dewey provided an overview of research on language learning in the study abroad experience. He reviewed study abroad research in other languages, as well as specifically in Japanese, and then offered his view on the limitations and future directions of this line of research. He suggested that the areas of greatest potential interest and utility are: 1) general indicators of “gain” (such as [oral] proficiency, fluency, accuracy), as well as self-assessment; and 2) defining predictors of “gain” (e.g., language aptitude, pre-departure skill in reading and grammar, gender, age, previous time spent abroad, and initial language proficiency). He reviewed studies which compare study abroad students and at-home students in their target language profile as well as literature on the nature of the study abroad experience. Factors that come into play include the use of L1 (English) during the stay as well as social factors (e.g., intensity of the study abroad program, homestay family size) and their impact on language learning. More specifically, Dewey introduced previous findings with respect to learner development that indicate, for instance, 1) that study abroad learners are more motivated to learn *kana* than at-home students, 2) that the students during their stay may struggle with polite and honorific terms, performing socio-pragmatically appropriate behaviors in Japan, but they show additional development in such areas after completion of the program, and 3) that students’ interaction with the host family benefits them not only in linguistic improvement but also in understanding of the target culture.

In the last part of his talk, Dewey noted that research in other languages may or may not necessarily apply to Asian languages, and pointed out that there are as yet very few studies that compare language learning abroad with learning at home, which is an avenue for future study.

Stephen Nussbaum was not able to attend the Roundtable; his paper was read by Susan Schmidt, Executive Director of ATJ’s Bridging Project for Study Abroad in Japan. The paper is also reproduced below as Appendix 3. Nussbaum addressed three key issues for the development of study abroad in Japan and elsewhere in Asia. The first is to examine how studying on-site in Asia differs from studying at home. Although “study abroad,” as such, is still in its infancy, the impact of the experience is clearly significant almost universally for the participants. The students’ responses to their experience abroad also suggest that study on-site is qualitatively distinct from study at home. The students stress in their reports that they find beneficial gain in what might be thought of as performative skills—that is, skills that are practical and situational and that provide a “window of reflection for them to see themselves in a new light.” As the students study on-site in a new setting using a second language, particularly as “distant” as Japanese language and culture are to Americans, they can expand their cross-cultural competencies.

Nussbaum considered what the appropriate tools are that ought to be provided to students as they enter Asia through a study abroad program. His answer to this question fell into two areas. First, he suggested that the program should assure rich opportunities for socialization with local people in the target community. The students can engage in “*participant-observation*” and learn by doing through such opportunities. Second, the need for rich opportunities for *reflection* on their experience abroad was emphasized. He also pointed out that the second area is currently the weakest in most study abroad programs. For implementation of these suggestions, the role of local faculty on-site was seen as one crucial factor. The way local faculty view their role vis-à-vis in-coming foreign students from the U.S. is sometimes at odds with the view of the home faculty. Another problem is that institutions in Asia and elsewhere rarely recognize the challenges their faculty may face in working with second culture students. There is a strong need for *professional discourse* among institutions and faculty on both ends specific to the goals and methods of study abroad.

A third area of concern is the institutional growth of study abroad in Asia. Teamwork linking on-site study with study at home is something we want to see emerge. At a more interpersonal level, we also find growth of a “social unit” which stems from the relations between students, host families, and others through study abroad programs. Taking advantage of the growing network, Nussbaum presented a possible extension of study abroad into larger institutional efforts to build on the *diversity* of living languages—not limited to East Asian languages but including all languages found in the Asia-Pacific area.

After Nussbaum’s presentation, the session was opened up to all the participants. The issue of communication between the on-site institutions in Japan and the home institution in the U.S. was re-visited in the discussion. Participants shared anecdotes from their experience in managing study abroad programs. For example, local agendas (e.g., frequent change in personnel) on the part of on-site institutions sometimes become a hurdle for successful alignment at both ends of the students’ experience. Incentives for study abroad on the part of students was also a topic of discussion. Credits (transfer of credits to the home institution) and scholarship availability were the major incentives discussed. There was an exchange of information regarding available scholarships that are applicable to students in the U.S. On the pedagogical front, the difficulty of transition—the bridging required between what students learn in study abroad and what they already learned or returned having learned after the study abroad experience—also came up. These areas need further consideration; however, the sharing and communication that took place among different institutions on the theme was a fruitful experience for all the participants.

Appendix 1 Data on Study Abroad

2002	
American students going abroad	154,168
American students going to Asia (6%, up 5% over 15 years)	9,247
American students going to China	2,942
American students going to Japan	2,618
American students going to Korea	522
American students going to Thailand	496
American students going to Hong Kong	470
American students going to Vietnam	188

91% of American study abroad participants go for a semester or less. ATJ's Bridging Project data, however, indicate that students going to Asia study abroad for at least a semester. Two-thirds of applicants for the Bridging Scholarships study in Japan for a full academic year. Compare:

Foreign students in the U.S.	582,996
Asian students in the U.S. (56%)	326,478
Indian students in the U.S. (12%)	66,836
Chinese students in the U.S. (6%)	63,211
Korean students in the U.S.	49,046
Japanese students in the U.S.	46,810
Taiwanese students in the U.S.	28,930
Indonesian students in the U.S.	11,614
Thai students in the U.S.	11,606

U.S. campuses that awarded academic credit for study abroad in 2000-2001 to more than 1,000 of their students: Michigan State University (1,835), University of Texas at Austin (1,633), New York University (1,471), Florida State University (1,464), University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (1,369), Miami University (Oxford, OH) (1,348), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (1,286), Indiana University at Bloomington (1,268), University of Wisconsin-Madison (1,253), Arizona State University Main Campus (1,248), and Brigham Young University (1,235).

Fifteen smaller colleges report that over 80% of their four-year students go abroad: Antioch College, Austin College, Carleton College, Centre College, College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's, DePauw University, Dickinson College, Earlham College, Elon College, Goshen College, Kalamazoo College, Lafayette College, Principia College, Saint Olaf College and Wofford College.

Appendix 2

Self-managed Language Learning in Study Abroad

HOW TO PROCEED

Your general approach to each exercise should be the following:

1. *Anticipate the situation.*
 - a. Talk to your mentor or other Japanese friends about the situation you are about to explore, asking about their own experiences in such situations.
 - b. Ask your mentor and friends for cultural information that might help you understand what is going on in the situation more fully, i.e., how a Japanese person would be most likely to handle the situation.
 - c. Anticipate what kinds of things would probably be said to each other by people in the situation.
 - d. Ask your mentor to confirm the appropriateness of what you think might be said, tell you about alternatives, and rehearse various conversational “routines” you will use in the situation itself.
2. *Put yourself “on the edge” of the situation.*
The first time, simply observe what Japanese in the situation say and do. Eavesdrop discreetly. Make notes about the things you don’t understand, including transcriptions (as carefully as you can) of what you hear. Also copy down any written language forms that might have played a part in the exchange you observed, e.g., a sign in a grocery store or instructions on a public telephone, whether you understand all of the characters or not.
3. *Reflect on how things went.*
Be objective and critical of yourself! How much did you understand? What flew right by you? How much did you not quite understand but nevertheless recognized as having heard before, e.g., a word, a phrase, a verb ending?
4. *Look up* as many of the things that puzzled you as you can in your dictionary, grammar book, *kanji* dictionary, etc.
5. *Ask your mentor to help you with parts of the exchange you didn’t understand*—words, verb forms, *kanji*, expressions, etc. Note that some grammatical explanation is appropriate at this point, but keep it short and sweet—only to the extent that it helps you get a better grasp of the structure of the sentences you are trying to produce. Some practice of *kanji* for new words is also appropriate. In all cases, ask your mentor to help you understand the specific cultural context of what puzzles you.
6. *Ask your mentor to help you rehearse* some key expressions again, then practice the expressions on your own until you can say them fluently.
7. *Put yourself in the situation again* (and again, and again, repeating the above steps), until you can negotiate the situation smoothly.
8. *Talk to your instructors*, friends, native speaker, etc. about the things you observed in the situation and any difficulties you continue to have.
9. Take some time to *reflect on your progress* in each situation. How are you doing? Can you measure your progress? Write down some of your successes in your journal.

* * *

CONVENIENCE STORE

Overview

In this exercise, you will visit a convenience store. Your tasks will include:

- finding out what kinds of convenience stores there are and which are best for different purposes (varieties of goods, prices, convenience, customer services etc.)
- finding out what kinds of things you can buy in a typical convenience store and how they are packaged
- observing how Japanese customers talk to clerks in a convenient store
- talking to a clerk yourself about particular goods you may wish to buy

Preparation

- Find out what kinds of convenience stores there are, where they are, and how to get to them.
- Interview at least five of your Japanese acquaintances and find out:
 - if they ever stop at convenience stores
 - if not, why not?
 - if so, are some better than others? why?
 [...]
- Imagine what you would need to say to ask a convenience store clerk politely if he or she would help you with an exercise for your language class by answering some questions about convenience stores in Japan.

Activity

- Pick one of the convenience stores that sound the most interesting to you and go there.
- Ask a clerk where you can find a particular kind of item, e.g., cough drops. In your notebook, record the following:
 - what did you say?
 - what did the person you spoke to say in response?
 - did you understand the person's complete utterance?
 - if not, what confused you? What parts of the utterance did you understand?
- In your notebook, write down the names of at least ten different, unrelated products available in the convenience store. Try to find examples of each of the following:
 - items identical to something you could find in the U.S.
 [...]
 Copy the names down, even if you can't read all of the characters.
- For each of the above items, include notes on how it is packaged, units of measurement, and price. If it is a food item, what does the package say about how it tastes? about how to store it and prepare it? about its ingredients? about preservatives?
 [...]
- Ask your mentor to go over any parts of the exchange you didn't understand when you listened to Japanese customers talking to clerks. Practice the expressions you might envision yourself using if you were the customer.
 [...]

Follow up

Write a one- or two-page summary of what you learned from this experience. Include both cultural observations and linguistic insights: new words, expressions, *kanji*, grammatical forms, uses of verb endings, or extensions of things you previously learned (e.g., words used in new ways). Save your summary to hand in for course credit when you return to the U.S.

Appendix 3

Student Learning on Study Abroad: Challenges, Opportunities

Stephen P. Nussbaum¹

Introduction

I would like to begin with a short illustration of the virtues and complexities of study abroad, and, in my case, of working abroad. I am currently Visiting Professor and Advisor to the Dean of Academic Affairs at Waseda University. As military action began in Iraq, the Executive Committee of the University met and issued a statement that included the following expressions:

- イラクに対する軍事行動の開始に伴う海外出張等の禁止について²
- 本日開催の理事会において海外出張などに関する取り扱いについて審議した結果、本日から28日までの間の出国の出張を全て承認取り消しとすることを決定しました。³

The key words are *shutchō*, *kinshi*, *shōnin*, *torikeshi*, and *rijikai*.

The first statement is the title of an announcement circulated among staff and faculty:

- “In reference to the ban on trips abroad accompanying the beginning of military action against Iraq”

The second is its key sentence:

- “As a result of deliberations at today’s executive committee meeting regarding the handling of trips abroad, it was decided to treat all permissions for travel abroad from today until March 28 as cancelled.”

Many things could be said about these statements, but the key one, from the perspective of an American academic, is that the “ban” on travel abroad is simply a “revoking” of permission already given. All trips abroad need formal approval. Even travel within Japan to institutions a few moments away can require formal approval. I once was a commentator at a conference held at a national research institute. For me to be able to do this I had to seek the approval of the President of Waseda and his seal had to be formally placed on documents I was requested to submit to the research institute. Understanding customs such as these in depth requires understanding the layers of meaning and institutional structures implicit within them and this, jumping ahead, strikes me as perhaps the core challenge of study abroad. To fully unpack these simple statements we would need a lengthy discussion of the nature of faculty employment in Japan, including how faculty leaves are arranged, financed, and insured, as well as an exploration of the vocabulary of “responsibility” and its uses within university settings. In short, we would need to know what expectations faculty and institutions share in Japan and how these play out in their daily lives. I will return to this theme in a moment; the key thing to stress is that as we try to get into a second culture the challenge is to move from a surface translation to a substantive one—in the often-quoted phrase of Clifford Geertz and Gilbert Ryle, to move from a “thin” description to a “thick” one.⁴

Let me return to my theme and present a brief outline of key issues for the development of study abroad in Japan and, more broadly, in Asia. In the interest of time I will try to present things in a schematic fashion. I will stress three areas:

¹ I would appreciate comments on this paper as it is part of a larger project. Please direct comments to me at nussbaum@waseda.jp.

² “*iraku ni taisuru gunji kōdō no kaishi ni tomonao kaigai shutchō nado no kinshi ni tsuite.*”

³ “*honjitsu kaisai no rijikai ni oite kaigai shutchō nado ni kansuru toriatsukai ni tsuite shingi shita kekka, honjitu kara 28 nichi made no aida no shukkoku no shutchō o subete shōnin torikeshi to suru koto o kettei shimashita.*”

⁴ See C. Geertz, “Thick Description: Toward and Interpretive Theory of Culture,” *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973).

- First, I think we must situate study or education abroad within the context of study at home. How does it differ from what we try to do in the education of students at their home institutions? What does it contribute to that education?
- Second, what methods are appropriate to this field? How should we go about structuring study abroad programs, especially if they have goals distinct from study at home?
- Third, institutionally, how should we go about building this field? Are there preferred methods in institutional development—especially within the historical moment in which we live? In elaborating on this point I will try to go beyond the needs of students to discuss briefly how student needs in study abroad complement the needs of the modern university, its social mission, and the rapidly evolving tools available to it. In doing this I will stress the university and study abroad as a means of bringing together the diverse peoples of the Asia-Pacific area.

Part One

Let me return to the first of these points: How is studying on-site in Asia different from studying within one's home institution? Compared to study at home, study abroad has several characteristics, each of which could be unpacked at length.

1. It is still in its infancy. American colleges and universities only began sending students abroad in the 1960s and, still today, only a small percentage participate in study abroad. The great majority of these students continue to travel to nearby cultures. Within Japanese universities sporadic program development began in the 1980s, and study abroad still is not realistic option for the vast majority of students.
2. At least anecdotally, most participants in study abroad, when reflecting on their college career, are quick to state that it was their most powerful educational experience as a college student. If we are to take learning seriously—and I think we should—then we must heed the voices of our students when they state that study abroad, I think especially in Asia, was simply a more powerful, often a much more powerful educational experience than any they engaged in on their home campuses. What does this mean? Why do they say this? I hasten to add that Japanese students say the same thing about their sojourns as students outside of Japan.
3. Following on this, and assuming the students are right, a third characteristic is that study on-site is qualitatively distinct from study at home. I think the key to this, at least from my conversations with students, is that they see themselves as “growing” abroad in ways more profound than their growth at home.

Just last week I discussed this with some recent college graduates who had studied in France. What they said is very similar to what college graduates say who have studied in Asia or Japan. They were quick to stress the new competencies they had acquired. They had learned to travel in new cities and to visit nearby countries on their own. They had learned how to stay out all night and yet also, somehow, how to live with host families. They had learned the daily rhythms of these families and the personalities of their members. They had learned new tastes, eaten new foods, and asserted their mastery over their daily lives in an unfamiliar world.

In stating all of this, it is notable they never mentioned classes and, indeed, later when I asked about classes, were quick to critique the classes they had taken as “OK” although fundamentally unchallenging and not particularly interesting. But they stressed repeatedly what we might think of as performative skills, skills they had acquired on their own. Competencies that were practical and situational and that provided a window of reflection for them to see themselves in a new light. In this sense *the key characteristic of study abroad*, from the perspective of student learning, *is the performative mastery of an unfamiliar terrain*. Later I will suggest we need to graft onto this the more standard goals of the academy, and that to do this we need to rethink those goals to present them in a manner appropriate to what we might term second culture students. We need to encourage students to reflect deeply on their daily lives and to learn, as I suggested above, that the “trips” taken by the “faculty” of universities in one part of the world may be very different from the “*shutchō*” of their counterparts in another.

A side comment: In trying to understand student learning it seems essential that we situate that learning within the life context of our students. And in doing this, several observations strike me as important:

1. The great majority of our students have never been on their own in a truly unfamiliar setting.

2. The great majority of our students have never, or at best rarely, spoken with anyone across a gulf of unknown expectations. All of their prior communication has been with mothers, fathers, uncles, aunts, teachers, classmates, baseball coaches, salespersons, and the like. In all of these cases their role and that of the other person have been defined in powerful ways for them by the situation. Rarely have our students ever spoken in a truly “open context” to an unknown other. In our normal lives language rarely moves in such directions.
3. They have rarely been encouraged to attempt to understand, in their totality, any of the social institutions surrounding them.
4. They have rarely been encouraged to think about the totality of social and cultural meanings shaping their social interactions.

All of these things are relatively hidden from them. In all of these ways we must recognize that while our students are massively competent, their competencies are set within the narrow constraints of their birth and nurturance. As they study on-site, as they engage in *the tutelage of everyday life* in a new setting and a second language, they discover they can expand these competencies, and while this can often be a frustrating experience, it *becomes the driving force behind their on-site learning*—one that, should be of central concern in the design of any study abroad program.

Let me go on to present a fourth characteristic of on-site study in Asia for second culture students from the United States. If on-site study is new, valuable, and performative, then Asia, and especially East Asia, is, arguably, the best of all places for developing this new field.

According to *Ethnologue*, the five most common non-Indo-European languages in the world are: Mandarin Chinese (885m), Japanese (125m), Wu Chinese (77m), Javanese (75.5m) and Korean (75m).⁵ Two of these are classified as linguistic isolates (Japanese and Korean), and in both of these societies, especially in comparison with South and Southeast Asia, bilingualism is largely non-existent. Taken together, this suggests that Chinese, Japanese and Korean are among both the most important and the most challenging languages an American student can encounter. Compared to the study of European languages and cultures, very little of a student’s background knowledge “transfers” to the study of these “distant” languages and cultures. Far from being a disadvantage, this suggests that, in the study of these languages, we have to look at “what’s there” rather than reading our assumptions into them. This is, of course, hugely difficult—and, indeed, requires us to create new approaches to the study of language and culture, often distinct from our colleagues studying European languages.

Part Two

I’d like to move to my second area: If study abroad in Asia is a new, powerful, and distinct field, then what are the appropriate tools we need to provide our students as they enter it? The answer falls into two areas:

1. Rich opportunities for socialization—for entering into the lives and worlds of local people. Or, to borrow a phrase from anthropology, rich opportunities for “participant-observation.” Socialization and performance are two aspects of a single process. Both change one’s status and worldview from that of an outsider to that of an insider or, more realistically, a quasi-insider.
2. Rich opportunities for reflection on this experience. This is perhaps the most complex and, perhaps because of this, the weakest area in most study abroad programs.

In the interest of time I will only touch on these areas.

One implication is that as we design on-site programs, whenever possible, we need to provide our students *sustained access* to local people. Preferred methods include homestays, local roommates, internships, and ethnographic assignments or projects requiring students to talk with and work with local people. It is worth stressing that the key word here is “*sustained*.” Visits to museums or famous places and opportunities for students to watch local craftsmen or to make products with them have a place in study abroad. But these are not sustained opportunities to create a personal relationship with local people and by doing this to learn, however partially, to see the world through their eyes.

I should stress that assignments or projects that engage students with local people emphasize the strengths of local faculty. Local faculty always have a native’s familiarity with the local world. They

⁵ See *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*—<http://sirio.deusto.es/abaitua/konzeptu/nlp/top100.htm>.

understand it in greater depth and breadth than outside faculty or the area specialists of the students' home universities. But those outside area specialists, because they are native speakers of the students' first languages, and because they have worked hard to understand the second culture, will typically be better at presenting information about the local culture, at lecturing, or at providing convincing explanations concerning it than local faculty. This suggests that much of the pedagogical focus of local institutions handling study abroad students is often misplaced. Instead of facilitating student experiences, local faculty often see themselves as playing the same role for second culture students as for first culture students: that of lecturing.

As possible, local faculty should explore *inductive pedagogies*. Rather than lecturing about "distant" truths they should strive to root their classes in the immediate world surrounding students.⁶ And they should encourage students to explore that world, to make inquiries of friends or host families, to read articles from the newspaper or watch TV news. Faculty will then find themselves in the position of unpacking rich sources of "data" presented, in part, by students. As they do this they will discover they have little difficulty in demonstrating the merit of their disciplinary approaches to issues confronting normal people in their everyday worlds. This turns the everyday life of students, and the world unfolding around students, into a text for them to study. Students who can be "turned on" in this fashion quickly develop tremendous respect for those local faculty who are able to guide them through this world.

It should be stressed that institutions in Asia and elsewhere rarely recognize the challenges their faculty face in working with second culture students. Typically the assumption is that the only real challenge is one of language. If faculty spoke better English, or students spoke better Japanese or Chinese, then teaching them would be easy—after all, students know very little, anyone could teach them. This is a bias familiar to language teachers everywhere. In this sense, both study abroad and language teaching continue to be in need of professional discourses internal to these fields regarding goals and methods—discourses that can both structure these fields and shape how they are recognized within university settings.

While arguing that study abroad faculty should present their disciplines as methods for enhancing students' understanding of the immediate worlds around them, it is important to recognize that faculty will always have a limited reach: their encounters with students are shaped by their disciplinary or thematic interests and constrained by limited class periods. In contrast to such constraints, students ideally spend significant amounts of time daily learning to move in densely structured local worlds where almost everything is new to them. Members of host families and friends ideally become key guides to these worlds. While it is essential to have such guides, I do not think they are sufficient. These local guides are often learning with the students about cultural and linguistic differences.

Ideally, we need to augment the role of such local informants by providing our students with professional guides to these worlds. Such professionals should be seen as *facilitators of daily engagement and learning*. They would be study abroad specialists intimately familiar with the world students are trying to enter and equally familiar with the points of least resistance within that world for students to enter it. They should be readily available to students, much like counselors or therapists, to aid students in talking through their experiences so they might recognize how this new world is structured and distinguish between its resilient features and the momentary quirkiness of social interaction. While providing emotional support for students in the very personal challenges they face as they try to use a new language in an unfamiliar setting, such a person would also be a combination language teacher, anthropologist, and cultural coach.

This person would facilitate both access to the local world and reflection on it. Other targeted methods for facilitating reflection and engagement should characterize all facets of the local curriculum. All would encourage students to reflect on the world surrounding them as they enter it. These include ethnographic tutorials, projects with local students, self-paced learning exercises, journals, and video reports, among many other methods. The internet presents many possibilities for linking such on-site learning with at-home instructors and fellow students.

Finally, we need new meta-conversations to aid all of us in understanding the dynamics of this emerging field. I would suggest we need to develop the following vocabulary and share it actively with our students:

⁶ I am not suggesting faculty should refrain from lecturing or that introducing students to local academic discourses is not valuable. One of the great benefits of study abroad is the recognition that on-site faculty often engage in conversations and pursue issues not well represented in foreign discourses about the field site.

- Engagement
- Socialization
- Performance
- Performative landscapes and genres
- Situated meaning
- Social deixis
- The density of everyday life
- Differences between experience-near vs. experience-distant perspectives
- Inductive pedagogies and methodologies for linking personal experience and the broader thematic and disciplinary discourses of the academy.
- Professional facilitators of learning abroad (cultural counselors, program associates, etc.)

Each of these terms shapes reflection and encourages growth.

Part Three

I'd like to touch briefly on the institutional growth of study abroad in Asia.

First, I think it is crucially important to recognize the special character of the second culture student. He or she is caught in a liminal world, neither fully “on-site” nor fully “at home” throughout most programs. This hybridity presents tremendous opportunities for collaborative approaches linking local universities in Asia with their counterparts around the world. The university itself is changing quickly, and study abroad is a harbinger of things to come. The best programs are likely to be based on teamwork linking on-site study with study at home. This teamwork also presents the possibility of fully recognizing and responding to student learning. We need actively to develop linkages between institutions throughout the Asia-Pacific area as well as with mediating organizations and consortia to aid us in shaping this potential.

Second, enduring social relations between students, host families, and others emerge as a result of study abroad. Students and their hosts acquire sympathy and understanding for each other. This has multiple long-term benefits for everyone. It transforms two sets of local people into citizens of some larger social unit. We do not have the proper vocabulary for discussing such “larger social units” and the mingling of identity occurring within them, but our world is desperately in need of them. Earlier I suggested that among Asian languages, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean had a special role to play *vis-à-vis* the American student and study abroad. Here I would like to go a step further and mention again that these are only *three* of the *three thousand* or so *languages found in the Asia-Pacific area*. It is embarrassing to contemplate how little the modern university, its students, and its faculty know about the diversity of living languages. It is also embarrassing to contemplate how little interest there is in using the university as a means of creating social relations between its students and the speakers of these languages.

I would like to suggest that study abroad is an excellent means for doing this. Funds generated by revenues from student tuitions can be used to hire language teachers for these neglected languages. They can be brought to places like the United States or Japan to teach our students. After a year of more of language study at their home institution, students could go to study on-site. I am thinking of small yearly programs for ten to twenty students, but programs that would be created among languages not currently studied by university students. After graduation every year, some students are likely to return to these places to seek employment, to become teachers, and to build families.

Any college creating such a program would immediately become famous among the speakers of that language. And since there are well over one hundred languages with five million or more speakers—a hundred such languages currently not being taught in U.S. or Japanese universities—this means that any college tapping into this resource would have a tremendous base of talented people to draw upon in the future. I would like to see the major foundations fund such a program. It would be relatively inexpensive and would have massive results. To give just one example: Iraq is reported to have 23 living languages. Four languages are reported to have roughly a million or more speakers and three of these have more than five million. I suspect we would live in a different world if the colleges of the United States and Japan each supported the study of one such language. This would be a modest extension of their social mission but one with rich benefits.