PART I

Introduction

Affect and Romance in Study and Volunteer Abroad

Introducing our Project

Neriko Musha Doerr and Hannah Davis Taïeb

Romance is at the heart of our travel fever. We romanticize landscapes, people, languages, and the very fact of moving across borders, of encountering and learning something new, of transforming ourselves as well as others. Study abroad and volunteering abroad are fueled by these passions, by this romance. And along with this romantic passion comes other emotions: fear of the unknown mixed with thrilling attraction to its temptations; longing for liberation; yearning to make a difference; guilt about one's privilege; moral righteousness; and hope for growth, transformation, and enlightenment.

What kind of affect helps students form deep, long-lasting relationships with people during their travels? What kind of affect thwarts or dehumanizes encounters? What kind of affect drives study abroad students to understand their sociocultural surroundings and participate in wider social activities? What kind of affect leads them to withdraw into transient observer or consumer positions? How do study and volunteering abroad programs generate, shape, or transform such affect? What drives the romanticization of border-crossing and the construction of the border itself? And how does affect tie in to larger social and economic structures around us, to neoliberal and globalist and other world transformations, to the subjectivities of our time? These are the questions that inspired us to put together this volume.

As a collaboration between researchers and study abroad practitioners with diverse expertise—cultural anthropology, geography, education, foreign language education, and psychoanalysis—this edited

volume seeks to explore the romantic passions and related affect of border crossing in the context of study abroad and volunteering abroad by students from American colleges and universities.

The framework that we bring to this multidisciplinary volume is that of *affect*. As we will discuss below, we use the notion of affect to focus not only on bodily response that cannot be signified (Buda 2015; d'Hauteserre 2015), but on how affect is mobilized and managed and how it shapes subjectivities—and how these processes are embedded in broader economic and political processes, in relations of power.

Why examine study abroad and volunteering abroad in this way? First of all, because of the intensity of the affective load that surrounds study and volunteer abroad. Before travelling the destination is often surrounded in the mind by a romantic aura, driving and heightening the desire for change, for discovery. Once the student or volunteer arrives at the destination, other, equally strong emotions may come into play: love, or shame, or guilt, anger or fear, exhilaration, deep disappointment. The strength and importance of these emotions is evident, and is reflected in their use in marketing study abroad and volunteering abroad programs, as well as in the many practices of predeparture and on-site professionals intended to handle these emotions to enhance outcomes defined as optimal, and in the writings of students and volunteers about their experience. Furthermore, in the literature written by and for study abroad and volunteering abroad professionals, there is growing interest in looking at emotions and affect and bringing this aspect of student experience squarely into discussions in the field. Our approach to affect, primarily anthropological but also emerging from other fields, can contribute to these discussions, and is thus of interest for international education and community service professionals.

This book is also geared for anthropologists, geographers, and cultural studies scholars who study affect in globalist/globalizing processes, encounters with cultural Others, travel and tourism, education, and humanitarian work. Our turning of the lens onto study and volunteer abroad contributes a new field of affect analysis that focuses on the construction and sustenance of difference in globalist processes, border crossings involving less apparent relations of power, a field of experiential learning in which what constitutes "learning" is not clear, volunteer and service work, and on intersections of affect and wider political economy.

We consider the field of study and volunteering abroad to be a rich, understudied domain for understanding the emergence of the subjectivities of twenty-first-century selves. Study and volunteer abroad are

growing dramatically, but little serious attention has been paid to the analysis of these phenomena, to what they suggest about what young Americans in particular are becoming and are being encouraged to become. Thus this volume, at once geared to the scholar and to the professional.

Our professional motivation leads us to ask questions with proactive intervention and practical suggestions in mind. What kind of affect connects people instead of creating boundaries? How can we make sure our romantic desire and curiosity for the exotic do not make our relationship with the cultural other into voyeurism? How can we harness and redirect emotions in order to humanize the encounter? What kinds of mobilization and management of affect reduce relations of power and domination and instead reinforce egalitarian relations?

In what follows, we will first present a broader theoretical framework and an overview of our approach to affect. We will then go on to situate this volume's contributions in four fields whose interests touch upon the issue of affect and border crossing: affect in the national belonging and the global, affect in the encounter with the cultural Other in relations of power, affect in learning, and affect in helping others. After introducing the chapters in this volume, the chapter ends with a postscript that explains how this project began.

Affect: Theoretical Frameworks

There is no single theory of affect (Seigworth and Gregg 2010). For Brian Massumi, one of the influential scholars of affect writing today (cf. Massumi 1995, 2010), the distinction between emotion and affect is central, as they follow "different logics and pertain to different orders" (1995: 88). Massumi uses the word "emotion" to mean the quality of experience from that point on defined as personal; it is a "qualified intensity" to be inserted into the system of meaning. Affect, in contrast, is irreducibly bodily and autonomic: passion. Eric Shouse further clarifies Massumi's distinctions, writing that "[f]eelings are personal and biographical, emotions are social, and affects are prepersonal"; affect here is "a nonconscious experience of intensity" (Shouse 2005: 5). Julia Kristeva, as discussed by Karen Rodriguez in this volume, distinguishes the emotions, shared with other vertebrates, from the passions, which are human and involve reflexive consciousness (Kristeva 2011: 80, quoted in chapter 3).

Some (e.g., Besnier 1990) are wary of such distinctions, however, because they impose West-centered taxonomies of psychological process. They also warn about the assumption that affect can exist independent of and prior to ideology and to shared meanings (see Leys 2011 for discussions). For our part, though we do see Massumi's, Shouse's and Kristeva's distinctions as key for some purposes, in this work we do not focus on the distinction between feeling, emotion, passion, and affect. Thus, we avoid imposing researchers' interpretation of these processes. Instead, we use these terms synonymously, using the term *affect* interchangeably with feelings, or emotion, or sentiments, and focusing on the relationship of affect to broader social, economic, and political processes. In so doing, we follow the approach of Richard and Rudnyckyj (2009: 57) who use affect as a way to conceptualize "the relationship between structures and sentiments."

This also contrasts with earlier anthropological approaches to emotion as culturally mediated (Geertz 1973; Rosaldo 1984) that relied on a static and bounded notion of culture. Instead, we pay attention to wider political, economic, and social forces that shape "culture" as well as affect—passion, desire, romantic feelings, discomfort, fear, anxiety, etc. This approach allows us to link subjectivity and action, to explore in meaningful ways the connection between lived experience (including its visceral manifestations) and broader processes, "the shifting relationships between the state, market and society" (Richard and Rudnyckyj 2009: 57).

In particular, our volume examines the mobilization and management of affect, which then shapes actions and fosters particular subjectivities. For individuals choosing to study or volunteer abroad, the main affect connected to these activities is positive, at least initially: the emotions that drew them to participate. Therefore, our main focus is on romance and the other alluring feelings that draw people to study or volunteer abroad. However, other types of affect are also discussed.

What does it mean to talk about how affect is mobilized? A flight attendant may mobilize her empathy for passengers and her good humor to live up to her employers' promises of providing "sincere smiles" to customers (Hochschild 2003); a care-giver from the Philippines or Sri Lanka, separated from her own loved ones, may divert her affections and transform them into love for those she has been hired to nurture (Hochschild 2004). Letter writers in the Nukulaelae Atoll in the Pacific mobilize love or *alofa* to control the flow of gifts with their relatives living abroad (Besnier 1990); leaders of Mexican NGOs "build bridges of love" between local people and foreign volunteers, fostering soli-

darity that will lead to ongoing donations and structural assistance, all the while trying to avoid "emotional blackmail" (Richard and Rudnyckyj 2009: 67). Not only love and affection but fear can be analyzed in this way; for example, in the post-9/11 United States fear was mobilized to bind subjects together (Ahmed 2004; Massumi 2010).

In this volume, we ask: How is affect mobilized, through what discourses, by whom and to what ends? How is the affective experience of students and volunteers aroused by marketing materials, by orientation sessions, by on-site interventions (Rink, Taïeb et al.)? How is our romantic search to be helpful to others and make a difference shaped through media images and news reports in ways that move us across the globe (Jakubiak) and how does it intersect with other types of discourses such as modernism and anticolonialism (Li)? Are there paradoxes involved in study and volunteering abroad—practices that must emphasize difference to evoke romantic passion in potential "customers," but must overcome difference to some extent to be successful? How do these processes fit in with the larger economic and social context—what kind of desire, fear, guilt, and aspirations do current neoliberalist, globalist, and other world transformations inspire, and how do these direct our movements and actions?

Another way we look at affect is in terms of how it is managed. This management of affect can be part of a "technology" for governing individuals (Good 2004), as modes of governmentality shift from welfare states that sought to govern "through society" to advanced liberalism that seeks "to govern through the regulated and accountable choices of autonomous agents ... and ... through intensifying and acting upon their allegiance to particular 'communities'" (Rose 1996: 61). The shift toward neoliberalism has been shown to involve the production of subjectivities through the management of affect. For example, affect-laden spiritual development sessions known as ESQ, Emotional and Spiritual Quotient, were instituted in Indonesian corporations, mixing management techniques with Koranic verses, with employees and high-level managers, leaders, and participants sharing in tears that showed "an open heart" and that led to a renewal that would improve business practices (Richard and Rudnyckyj 2009). Those who established these practices shared in the affect and were moved themselves to new kinds of subjectivities. A second example can be seen in the work of Ana Ramos-Zayas, who shows how emotions like belonging or pride in one's desirability or commercial viability can be managed to enhance an individual's "Blackness" and overall worth in terms of race, sexuality, and gender in

the current wider race politics (2009). In the example mentioned above concerning Mexican NGOs, the affect elicited for volunteers by hard work with local people and shared food is purposefully molded by local leaders into warmth that will lead to ongoing partnerships. The NGO local leaders conceive of this as a kind of therapy, working against the alienated emotions and "coldness" that they see as characteristic of human relations for their foreign volunteers, and fostering warmth, creating solidary subjectivities (Richard and Rudnyckyj 2009: 67).

It should be clear from these examples that the management of affect can occur in very different sites and with very different goals. In the field of study and volunteering abroad, we can ask: How is affect managed, by whom (students and volunteers themselves, local partners onsite, education abroad professionals, researchers)? To what ends? What discourses and political, economic, and social environments move students and volunteers to overcome certain affect, such as fear of the unknown, anxiety about novel experiences, and a sense of guilt about privilege in the face of social injustice? What neoliberalist and globalist restructuring of higher education and employment pushes us to think about what affect and what affect-management skills a successful employee should have? What kind of interpretative strategies are used to "read" students' affect in order to manage it?

In this volume, we see how curiosity about and desire for the romantic "dark continent" (Africa) or the "City of Love" (Paris) can be reframed and problematized by study abroad professionals and students, in contexts involving laughter, urban exploration, and study (Rink, Taïeb et al.). Other authors consider how students' themselves manage their affect—various degrees and contours of fascination about the destination—in ways that may highlight the sometimes contradictory goals of studying abroad (Doerr, Kumagai); or how the affect evoked by volunteering abroad—ranging from a sense of being useful and loved to guilt and doubt—are managed by participants as they evaluate their experience (Jakubiak, Li).

Affect also shapes our subjectivities and our own and others' actions. The notion of affect has a double aspect—it is a noun and also a transitive verb. This fits well with the idea that affect simultaneously is what one has and acts on others: a particular form of affect, such as the feeling of shame for example, shapes others' actions, while shaping oneself as a subject (Richard and Rudnyckyu 2009).

In this volume, our authors explore how passion for the language of the destination transforms subjectivities and shapes the borders of the

self as well as the surrounding social terrain (Rodriguez). Romantic attachment to destinations makes the study abroad students observant as they hope to become like local people by copying their behavior and attire but also become critical and reflexive when romanticism turns into disappointment (Taïeb et al., Doerr). The desire to serve others generates for volunteers a sense of themselves as good and caring (Jakubiak) but also guilt as they come to view themselves as colonialist imposers of "Western values," depending on the type of project and context (Li).

While our main theoretical frames are thus analyses of affect as it is mobilized, is managed, and produces subjectivities and actions, our discussions intersect with four fields of research, to which we turn below.

The Global, the National, and Affect

Current study and volunteering abroad are often framed within the notion of the global. Researchers and administrators, as well as guidebooks and brochures, highlight the merit of these experiences as ways of gaining "global/intercultural competence" (Savicki 2008) and becoming "global citizens" (Lewin and Van Kirk 2009, see Chapter 2 of this volume for extensive discussion of these issues). The notion of the global is often uncritically viewed as positive (for exceptions to this see Doerr 2012, 2014; Grünzweig and Rinehart 2002; Johnson 2009; Woolf 2007, 2010; Zemach-Bersin 2009, 2011). The notion's reliance on pre-existing differences among people (see Doerr 2012, 2013) and how this relates to students' affect are rarely discussed. In this subsection, we review the notion of the global and discuss its relation to affect, starting with the research on nationalism/nationhood that serves as the unit of "difference" to be noticed, learned, and bridged.

The sense of belonging to a nation—patriotism, *Volkgeist*, etc.—has been a major topic of investigation in studies of nationalism. How does one come to feel attachment and belonging to fellow nationals in the bounded territory of the nation-state—people that one may never meet in one's lifetime? This question was at the heart of the now classic work on nationalism, *Imagined Communities* by Benedict Anderson (1991), as well as other studies of nationalism (Balibar 1988; Borneman 1992; Briggs 1996; Comaroff 1987; Sommer 1991). Also, anthropologists in recent years have analyzed affective aspects of the state, its "modern bureaucracy" that is infused with affect—desire, apathy, irony, cynicism (Navaro-Yashin 2006). Michael Taussig (1993) and Michael Herzfeld

(1997) illustrate aspects of the state and its officials, respectively, that relate individuals affectively to the state.

This understanding of nation as a unit of belonging with a clear boundary that draws individuals together affectively is an important basis of the notion of the global because the notion relies on crossing such boundaries (Doerr 2012). Researchers of globalization focus on disjunctive flows of people, media images, technology, finances, and ideologies *across* national borders (Appadurai 1990) as well as the channeling (Broad and Orlove 2007), interrupting, and resisting of such flows (Tsing 2005). Examination of changing perceptions (Robertson 1992; Wilk 1995) and practices (Appadurai 1986; Howes 1996) does not escape the assumption that the unit of focus—whether crossing it or overcoming it—is that of nation-state.

Because the notion of culture has been linked to the nation-states (though it came to be used to challenge the ideology by "ethnic groups")—in its ideologies, one nation, one people, one culture—some discussions of the notion warrant some space here. Culture is a "take" on human variations that needs to be situated in the context of changing anthropological theorizations: "race" (the nineteenth century), "culture" (the twentieth century), and "ethnicity" with a revised notion of "culture" (late twentieth century). While the earlier approach viewed culture as a given without consideration of power politics, an approach emerged in the 1960s that viewed culture as a new way to stake out claims to precedence and power—the way of life as rooted in the particular place—as cultural particularity has become a major ideological weapon in political struggles (Wolf 1994).

Here, culture came to be viewed as a strategy for groups to mobilize, shape, and reshape self-images and elicit participation. Culture became objectified—aspects of a social world get interpreted as typifying that world and represented as detached, object-like "traits" that are believed to be possessed by the bearer of the culture (Handler 1985)—and analyzed as such (see theme issues in *Mankind,* 1982; *Oceania,* 1992; and *Anthropological Forum,* 1993). Once culture is objectified and named, people take a variety of stances towards it, including using it as a strategy to challenge the one-nation, one-people ideology of the nation-state (Kearney 2004), or to claim authority (Oakdale 2004) and authentic existence as an indigenous group (Clifford 1988; Povinelli 1998), or to gain self-determination (Henze and Davis 1999; Warner 1999), or to intermittently express a sense of belonging when convenient (Gans 1999), or to

understand themselves and guide their subsequent behavior (Holland et al. 1998).

Research on study and volunteering abroad often uses the objectified notion of culture without critical analyses about such objectification. The notion of culture is also used to measure the interpersonal skills of individuals who "cross cultural borders"—study and volunteering abroad participants—and is a basis for establishing the desired skills to be taught through these activities, evoked in the notion of "intercultural competence."

In this volume, we do not focus on the notion of culture as an object of study nor as an analytical tool because of its political nature as described above. We are interested instead in maintaining critical distance from the notion of culture and also the notion of intercultural competence, all the while remaining aware of their importance in the field of international education, in order to reflect on how these notions play a role in the evocation of desired affective states for students and volunteers abroad.

Research about the process of globalization is critiqued as itself being part of the ideologies that portray global connections as always positive, progressive, and universally accessible (Friedman 2003; Tsing 2000). What is rarely discussed is its affirmation and perpetuation of the national as the most relevant unit of difference through its analytical privileging of the crossing of the national borders—methodological nationalism (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002)—over other kinds of borders. This is also the case for research on study abroad: it relies on a valorization of global connection and the existence of difference based on which the experiential learning of another culture becomes meaningful (Doerr 2012, 2013, 2015a).

We then seek to analyze how students' romantic images of the destination draw on and perpetuate (Doerr, Kumagai), ignore (Rink), or subvert (Taïeb et al.) the imagining of the nation as having unique and homogeneous culture. How does urban-rural difference frame differently the power relations between volunteers and those they serve, complicating the notion of crossing borders (Li)? Chapters in this volume further examine kinds of sameness and difference, commonality and separation, that students/volunteers feel and how this is interpreted in light of national borders and the notion of the global (Taïeb et al., Doerr). That is, we show that globalist ideologies mobilize affect around the crossing of national borders and that affect nurtured by various

nationalist ideologies is managed through study abroad practitioners' wish for encouraging critical thinking in students (Taïeb et al.), students' wish to succeed in schooling (Kumagai), and volunteers' own anticolonial critiques (Li), creating various types of subjectivities.

Through these analyses, we open up new fields of inquiry, asking: How does the discourse of culture and interculturality interpret, mobilize, and manage affect, and to what end? What kinds of belongings are being created? Does the notion of the interculturally competent global citizen suggest a new kind of belonging, to a world imagined community? If so, how is affect mobilized and managed to create this new kind of community? What light is shed through this process, and what shadows are cast?

Encounter with Cultural Difference: Power and Affect

Encounters with difference have been analyzed extensively in colonial contexts. Edward Said (1978) argues that Orientalism, a style of thought based upon a distinction made between the "Orient" and the "West," shows a prevalent way of knowing the cultural Other in the context of relations of power. With an assumption that the Orient cannot represent itself, the West gained authority over the Orient by making observations about it, making statements about it, authorizing views of it, and teaching about it. At the same time, the West defined itself in contrast to the Orient. Said argues that this is how cultural domination operates.

In these colonial relations of power, people of the non-West were displayed in zoos, freak shows, circuses, and museums as spectacles (Fusco 1995). These exoticized people embody the audience's anxieties about the cultural Other while also affirming the spectators' mastery over them (Koritz 1997). Such exhibitions helped forge a special place for nonwhite peoples and their cultures in the Euro-American affective imagination, as also discussed by Rink with the case of Hottentot Venus (this volume). The legacy of this colonial exoticism remains in the present day, especially in the form of various "cultural performances" by ethnic minorities (Fusco 1995) but with added implications (Doerr 2008, 2009).

Analyzing imperial travel writing, Mary Louise Pratt (1992/2008) argues that discourses in eighteenth-century Europeans' travel writing on non-European places "produced 'the rest of the world' for European readerships" (4, emphasis in original) and constructed "the imperial

order" for these readers, nurturing in them a sense of ownership, entitlement, curiosity, adventure, and moral fervor about their colonies. Debbie Lisle (2006) argues that today's travel writing carries this legacy in two intertwining visions: colonial visions that resuscitate the hierarchy by which the dominant Western writer judges the "less civilized," and cosmopolitan visions that distance themselves from the legacy of empire by celebrating cultural difference yet impose a universal standard by which to judge others, as well as creating an illusion that "globalization" has produced a world where everyone can move freely. Both visions presume aforementioned natural differences between cultures marked by stable boundaries, ignoring the relations of power that structure, mobilize, and mark such differences. Lisle argues that the reemergence of travel writing hinges on its ability to let readers reimagine clear-cut, contained, stable differences, thus alleviating the anxieties of globalization.

These works on colonial relations analyze affect toward the cultural Other—desire and fear, longing and disdain, and surrender and control—as emerging in and perpetuating power relations. In this volume, we will look at some cases in which affect is mobilized and managed in relations of power when students and volunteers encounter the cultural Other. Rink's chapter discusses students' exoticization of the African continent. Jakubiak's chapter portrays contours of affect that simultaneously distance and connect volunteers to those receiving their service. Li's chapter compares different ways volunteers working in the rural areas and urban areas frame themselves to the locals in the context of (neo) colonial relations between the United States and the Marshall Islands. We also look at cases where there is no clear-cut status differential, such as when American study abroad students visit European countries with varying degrees of romanticization of the destination (Taïeb et al., Doerr), or when historically hierarchical relations become more complex, when American study abroad students visit Japan (Kumagai). We then examine how affect is mobilized and managed and new subjectivities get constituted as they intersect with study abroad practitioners' intent, more specific relations between countries, and discourses of schooling.

Analyzing cases where relations of power are explicit and apparent and cases where such relations of power are more ambiguous, we extend the question of affect and the constitution of otherness to a wider frame of cultural Others, to the question of border crossing more generally. Especially, border crossing in general and between those in less-visible relations of power have not been approached yet in the field

of the anthropology of affect; this volume can offer new insight in that area.

This volume further asks what happens when the encounter with the Other is interpreted in terms of "intercultural education" or experiential learning through "immersion," as we discuss in the next section.

Learning and Affect

Affect has been examined in the field of education from various angles. Some focus on the classroom, for example, discussing how peer dynamics can produce emotions like alienation, embarrassment, or belonging (Doerr and Lee 2012, 2013; Frekko 2009; Krashen 1998; Yamasaki 2011). Others examine the role of affect in out-of-class learning, such as how culturally specific categories of affect are passed on in linguistic socialization of young children (Schieffelin and Ochs 1987) and how interactions with the "native speakers" of the language outside the classroom, the cultural capital of the target language, and the language-learners' investment in the social position they wish to occupy—such as mother-figure or immigrant—play a crucial role in the language-learners' desire to learn and speak the language (Heller 2003; McEwan-Fujita 2010; Pierce 1995; Whiteside 2009).

Another line of research focuses on the management of affect in education, particularly in advanced capitalism. Lynn Fendler (1998) argues that the rhetoric in current US education suggests the need for reflective teachers with understandings of critical and culturally relevant pedagogy and character education. These emphases point to new types of things that are teachable. Besides intellect and disciplined behavior, motivation and attitudes—desire for education—have become something that teachers aim to teach. Love, pleasure, feelings, wishes, fears, and anxieties—in other words, "soul"—all became teachable and things that educated subjects should have. The educated subject that critical pedagogies aim to create is a subject with a desire for social justice and moral commitment to democracy (Fendler 1998).

Similarly, the idea that study abroad can create global citizens with "intercultural competence" involves believing that it is possible through education to bring into being particular attitudes, such as openness and willingness to interact with cultural Others. This process involves work on the self, and reinterpretation of one's own affect and that of others through new kinds of educative processes. As will be detailed in Chap-

ter 2 of this volume (Taïeb and Doerr), affect and learning have been discussed for many years in the literature on study abroad in terms of the practical issues involved in making "intercultural learning" smooth and helping students adjust to the destination. The focus of discussion moved from handling "culture shock" and its discomforts to include how these can be turned into learning experiences, how to improve students' openness to and understanding of others, and how to increase students' confidence and ability to navigate new environments. More recently, the field has developed new ways of thinking about emotions, with the emergence of the idea of fostering "emotional resilience" in students, and an increasing fine-tuning and development of the process of transforming affect from discomfort and fear into "intercultural competence" and "cultural self-awareness." Study abroad research takes these approaches for granted and thus has not approached them as objects of examination and analyses.

Chapters in this volume contribute to a broadening of how affect and learning can be viewed in these fields. As mentioned above, first we do so by problematizing and analyzing the ideology of globalism prevalent in higher education generally and in study abroad in particular. The ideology is linked to the desire to be "interculturally competent" (though the two are not identical). The search for "intercultural competence" also intersects with other, differently inflected notions of learning, such as moving away from the "mother tongue" to the new social order of the new language (Rodriguez), critical understandings of social issues (Taïeb et al.), learning through immersion (Doerr), learning through academic work (Kumagai)—with varying effects.

We also consider in detail particular emotions, including those of romance, and discuss their mobilizing and transformative effects. Rodriguez's chapter takes a fresh look at the passions associated with language learning for study abroad students, considering how they are "sublimated" (i.e., modified in order to fit into the social order while modifying the social order creatively also) and thus linked in a creative way to the specificities of the host society. Rink's chapter discusses some of the affective reactions to the idea of "Africa"—nostalgia for a lost, pristine nature; fear; desire; and also desire to correct perceived wrongs. He brings in the idea of affective learning to propose how professionals can bring about an "entanglement" between the student and the specific site (not the reified, imagined continent), and shows how affect can become mutual, an engagement. Taïeb et al.'s chapter suggests that on-site professors can join with students in observing, analyzing, and

rethinking the very processes of study abroad with which they are involved—rethinking romantic journeys underway, and working towards dialogic and critical learning. Doerr's chapter compares different affective investment in the destinations reflecting the relationships between the students' host and home countries and examines how they shape the students' learning and other experiences during studying abroad. Kumagai's chapter contrasts the kinds of learning—through class work and through extracurricular immersion—that emerge from and further reinforce different student affective experience.

We thus hope to bring the question of study abroad into the discussion of learning and affect, and bring a critical and analytic approach to the discourses of international education, thus contributing to both these domains. We also seek to bring the discussion of affect into the field of volunteering abroad as we discuss in the next section.

Helping and Affect

Volunteer/service work has become increasingly popular in the 1990s (Sherraden et al. 2006). A shift away from the Cold War to "life politics" that focuses on individual morality and sense of self, from the politics of production and social class to consumption and individual identity, and from public politics to a form of therapy for individuals, volunteer/service work came to provide a sense of morality to participating individuals (Butcher and Smith 2010). Neoliberal transformations normalized the privatization of social services by the state, encouraging the development of NGO-run volunteer/service opportunities to fill that gap (Conran 2011). Also, the current tightening of the job market due to the economic crash in the late 2000s in the United States made students increasingly anxious to create a distinguishing edge in their CVs, and volunteer work became a popular choice (Hickel 2013).

Current volunteer/service abroad can be divided into three types. The first emphasizes technical skills to help developing societies to modernize that are (1) altruistic to fight poverty and disease, (2) political to promote a positive image of the West, and (3) manned by skilled people (Butcher and Smith 2010), as in the Peace Corps and the WorldTeach program that Li describes in this volume. The second type, sometimes called International Service Learning (ISL), connects the volunteer work or service with learning, and intends mutual benefit to local partners and to student volunteers who seek engagement in the host society

(Bringle and Hatcher 2011; Plater 2011). The third type is volunteer tourism developed as an alternative to mass-packaged holidays aiming at both enhancing the well-being of the host community and nurturing the volunteer tourists' self-development and academic credit, or "ego-enhancement" (Callanan and Thomas 2005: 196; also see Mowforth and Munt 2009), as Jakubiak discusses in this volume.

Volunteering abroad involves various romanticized notions: the world of cultural Others as an arena of problems to be solved, occluding the problems that exist in students' home country; the notion of "the local community" as a primordial and authentic entity, occluding the fact that local communities are usually heterogeneous with diverse interests; "sharing of knowledge" as the automatic result of volunteering, occluding the fact that volunteers do not always have significant levels of technical knowledge; equal partnership between volunteers and the community they work in, occluding the fact that their relationships are hierarchical at various levels; a romanticized conception of what it takes to "change the world," occluding the difficulty involved in liberal art students without training achieving significant results as volunteers; and a vision of the universality of humanitarianism, occluding the US-specific view of individuals as equal units entitled to pursue their interests as civic participation, and occluding the ways in which this may involve an evasion of political responsibility (Cororation and Handler 2013).

Despite their humanitarian goals, these volunteer abroad programs are critiqued for perpetuating the hierarchical relationship between the volunteers and their recipients by suggesting "privileged" volunteers have power to change situations by "giving" to the "less-privileged" hosts viewed as needy, passive, and incapable of helping themselves (Conran 2011; Manzo 2008; Sin 2009); evading transforming structural inequality by its focus on seeking to improve basic needs—food and shelter—of impoverished communities (Butcher and Smith 2010; Kahne and Westheimer 2003); imposing the idea of what constitutes an ideal state of being onto the community being helped (Gray and Campbell 2007; Munt 1994; Sinervo 2011); and serving primarily volunteers' need to gain "soft skills"—communication, organization, and team working skills—to give an edge in the competitive educational market (Heath, 2007; also see Gray and Campbell 2007; Munt 1994; Stewart 2013).

Those working towards critical and egalitarian projects abroad have sought to respond to these critiques in several ways. There is a growing literature working to develop ethical standards for practice (e.g. Hartman et al. 2014, Strait and Lima 2009), proposing community

direction with multiple stakeholders, long-term interdependent partnerships between volunteer organizations and NGOs (see also Nenga 2011), funding transparency, sustainability, deliberate diversity, and "dual purpose" with a refusal to prioritize student goals or to view students as consumers of experience. Framing classes are increasingly seen as necessary tools, problematizing power relations, raising awareness of privilege, and fostering dialogue between volunteers and local partners (Hartman et al 2014); they can also be used to link notions of service to local conceptions such as solidarity (Taïeb et al 2015). Jacoby (2009) emphasizes the importance of linking practice to reflection not only for students, but also for service-learning professionals, who should foreground social justice concerns and resist the rush to set up programs without considering their duration, sustainability, accessibility, and long-term consequences including the possible obscuring of the root causes of problems (Jacoby 2009: 99-103). Innovative program design can include credit-bearing learning opportunities, teaching, traveling, and "soft skills" for local partners as well as volunteers; questions of affect can also be raised with local partners as well as volunteers (Taïeb et al. 2015).

Affect in volunteering abroad is discussed in various ways. "Caring" is discussed as (re)producing unequal structural arrangements of paternalism (Sin 2009) as in the notion of charity, "a superior class achieving merit by doing things gratuitously for an inferior class" (Dewey 1908/ 1996: 166). The sense of duty as responsible citizens is seen to be cultivated through service work, drawing on John Dewey's vision that it is a matter of justice rather than altruism (Barber 1994; Saltmarsh, 1996; Taylor, 2002). Empathy with the less unfortunate through crossing socioeconomic borders and interacting with them is increasingly viewed as a goal of volunteer/service work (Chesler et al. 2006; Rhoads and Neururer 1998). Intimate attachment is seen as part of volunteering's moral economy, "a tangled circulation of money, people, labor, and emotions that creates complex webs of possibility and connection, but which also contains points of friction and disillusionment" (Sinervo 2011: 6), as intimate connections developed between volunteers and volunteered is commodified for the former as "authentic" experience (Conran 2011) and regarded as opportunities for further economic interactions for the latter (Sinervo 2011). Confidence, altruism, and sensitivity that volunteers develop through their volunteering experience is discussed by some as positive (McGehee and Santos 2005) and by others as negative for benefiting mainly the privileged volunteers (Gray and Campbell

2007; Heath 2007; Munt 1994) and, as it came to be purchased through signing up for volunteer projects, depoliticizing the political urge for social justice into consumerism for self-transformation (Hickel 2013). The emotional difficulties students experience through volunteering are discussed as a starting point towards self-transformation, learning, and the fostering of successful reciprocal projects (Nickols et al. 2013; Pagano and Roselle 2009).

Some point out the dangers of focusing on intimate emotions while volunteering abroad as it overshadows and obscures—or normalizes—larger structural inequalities, depoliticizing power relations and reframing structural inequality as a question of individual morality (Conran 2011). Our intention in this volume is to investigate the links between affect—which drives individuals to connect with those in communities they work in and gives meaning to their acts—and wider economic and structural inequities at the societal level. In Jakubiak's and Li's chapters here, we see an approach that views the volunteer's romantic motivations and on-site affective responses in this way. How does affect reflect the various motivations for volunteering abroad, and their contradictions? How do volunteers manage the emotions that arise during their activity, including emotions like guilt, disappointment, and doubt? How are these affective responses linked to the construction of subject positions via volunteering? What kinds of affect arise for local partners who are the intended recipients of volunteer activities, and how is this managed and interpreted? What does this suggest about the interconnections between affect and wider relations of power, and about how to develop new kinds of critical reflection on these activities?

The Structure of This Volume

This volume is divided into three parts. Part I consists of this chapter and Chapter 2 and sets out theoretical backgrounds in which the volume can be situated. Entitled "Study Abroad and Its Reasons" and written by Hannah Davis Taïeb and Neriko Musha Doerr, Chapter 2 introduces the overview and history of study abroad and how affect has been treated in the field. We offer a new way to look at study abroad itself, focusing on its genealogies and legitimating discourses as they shift throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, bringing out some of the inherent tensions in the field. We then consider how affect has been brought to bear on the field, considering the processes of orientation

and reflection on "cultural shock," "getting out of the comfort zone," and the reinterpretation of the critical incident and the search for "intercultural competence" and "personal leadership."

Part II has five chapters that discuss various cases of affect as it plays out in diverse study abroad contexts. Karen Rodriguez's Chapter 3, entitled "Passionate Displacements into Other Tongues and Towns: A Psychoanalytic Perspective on Shifting into a Second Language," explores the psychic dimension of the second-language learning process, focusing on study abroad students' passion for the Spanish language in Mexico. Based on student reflections, the chapter examines the psychic shifts involved in the transition to the symbolic in one's second language that parallels an infant learning their first language. Drawing on the work of psychoanalyst Julia Kristeva, Rodriguez explores the contradictory affective processes—passionate separations and connections; conflicting feelings of love, desire, and hatred; and narcissism and masochism—of connecting to the destination by taking up a subject position in the local language. Rodriguez illustrates the transformation of study abroad students' subjectivity and its implications for social change through their passionate involvement in another language.

Bradley Rink's Chapter 4, entitled "Sojourn to the Dark Continent: Landscape and Affect in an African Mobility Experience," analyzes the study abroad students' affective responses to the marginalized, patronized, and sexualized Africa—romance, desire, hope/hopelessness, and fear—and considers how such affect influences and is influenced by their institutionalized study abroad experiences. Based on an analysis of the discourses embedded in study abroad literature students are exposed before their travel as well as a series of questionnaires with students during their study abroad experience, this chapter analyzes the complex affective responses that the African city evokes, and suggests pedagogical strategies for affective learning that can be used with students.

Hannah Davis Taïeb's Chapter 5, entitled "Thinking through the Romance" and written with Emily Bihl, Mai-Linh Bui, Hyojung Kim, and Kaitlin Rosenblum, draws on the input of two groups of students in Paris to discuss the enlistment of students in a critical reevaluation of the romantic images that launched them on their study abroad journeys. The discourses students are brought to question include not only the romantic discourse of Paris, but also the somewhat contradictory romantic notions of study abroad adventure, personal transformation, and linguistic immersion. The chapter brings in the particular position of students "studying abroad while studying abroad"—that is, non-US

students who come to America for college, and during their college years, study once again "abroad."

Neriko Musha Doerr's Chapter 6, entitled "Falling In/Out of Love with the Place: Affective Investment, Perceptions of Difference, and Learning in Study Abroad," compares two American summer study abroad students' learning experiences in terms of their affective investment (or lack thereof) in the destination, France and Spain, asking how the different degrees of affective investment shaped students' learning experiences and perceptions of difference among people. Doerr argues that the student with an invested, romantic view of the destination highlighted differences between French people and Americans and, when she came to be disillusioned, reflected on her experience critically, whereas the student with fewer romantic preconceptions noticed not only differences between the host and home societies but also differences within each society and similarities between host and home societies; however, she absorbed whatever she encountered though with little critical reflection.

Yuri Kumagai's Chapter 7, entitled "Learning Japanese/Japan in a Year Abroad in Kyoto: Discourse of Study Abroad, Emotions, and Construction of Self," analyzes the interplay between the students' sense of the "success" of their study abroad experience (itself influenced by the discourse of immersion), and their romanticized and exoticized views of Japan. The two students both expressed a romantic fascination with Japan (geisha, Shinto, tea ceremony, etc.), but during their year in Kyoto the student who focused on academic work and experienced more mundane parts of Japanese life viewed her study abroad as wanting, while the other who plunged into many "traditional" cultural activities viewed hers as successful while retaining an exoticized view of Japan.

Part III of this volume consists of two chapters that discuss volunteer abroad experiences. Cori Jakubiak's Chapter 8, entitled "One Smile, One Hug: Romanticizing 'Making a Difference' to Oneself and Others through English Language Voluntourism," illustrates the contradictory link between the discourses of love and caring in teaching, and the encounter with the "exotic" other. Using data collected from the ethnography of English-language voluntourism, where people from the Global North teach English in the Global South as humanitarian aid, this chapter discusses the ways in which voluntourists describe their experience affectively as being helpful and having an important impact, as transformative of self and others, and as an authentic experience of the cultural Other. Her analyses of these affective languages in turn illuminate the

ideological underpinning of the voluntourist projects and situate them in terms of North-South power relations.

Richard Li's Chapter 9, entitled "People with Pants: Self-Perceptions of WorldTeach Volunteers in the Marshall Islands," illustrates how the romantic view of Americans as modernizers held by the volunteers as well as Marshall islanders intersect with anticolonialist views, and how this varies geographically between the urban and rural Marshall Islands. The chapter depicts WorldTeach volunteers in the Marshall Islands negotiating a tension between their romantic self-image as modernizers and a desire to avoid imposing their values and beliefs, which evolves faced with the Marshall Islanders own idealized and romantic notions of Americans.

The conclusion written by Hannah Davis Taïeb and Neriko Musha Doerr pulls together arguments and suggestions from all the chapters and discusses how we can use this knowledge for reflecting on study abroad and volunteer abroad practice and discourse, and for thinking about ways to "intervene" in student experience. We also consider what unanswered questions this work has brought up and fruitful directions for future research.

Together, these chapters explore the role of affect in studying and volunteering abroad. While the chapters introduce the reader to individual students and the details of their day-to-day lives while studying and volunteering abroad in particular settings, these quotidian and experiential details are put into the context of the diverse theoretical questions we discussed in this chapter.

Collectively, these chapters contribute to the discussions on globalization and analyses of affect in (re)constituting and crossing borders on which the discourses of globalization rely; to the discussions of power relations in the encounters with the cultural Other cases in which such power relations are not apparent; and to the literature on affect in learning a new examination of the fields of study and volunteer abroad that involve mobilizing and managing affect in specific ways. To the fields of study abroad and volunteering/serving abroad, this volume adds analyses of how affect and wider sociocultural and economic structures relate with each other, as affect is not only mobilized and managed while situated in these wider contexts but also shapes subjectivities and the actions of those involved.

Romantic passions drive us to gaze at maps, pack our bags, and step out of our daily lives to travel. Pushed by strong feelings, we hope for

freedom, for new emotions to spring up as we travel into new worlds. However, Althusser (1971) tells us that we are never free: we are always subject in a double sense—subject as author of our own actions but also subjected to ideologies or systems of representation (i.e., categories). Passions rise up inside us, we feel, but we feel as part of wider political, economic, and sociocultural structures. Analyzing such dynamics helps us further examine our experience, perceptions, and feelings, not only in terms of what they can teach us about ourselves personally, but also as they and we are part of our time. Passions for travel thus help us journey into other domains intellectually and affectively.

Postscript: Reflecting on the Genesis of This Project

This project was born out of a conversation that took place in July 2011 in Paris. Neriko Musha Doerr was carrying out fieldwork on study abroad, following a student attending Hannah Davis Taïeb's study abroad program. As we talked about the program and our understandings of study abroad in general, we found our mutual interest in the question of romance—the romance of travel, the romantic attraction of certain destinations and cities, the romance of service. Being ourselves an anthropologist specializing in education (Doerr) and a study abroad director and international educator trained as an anthropologist (Taïeb), we come at the subject from different but related points of view. Though our starting point was the question of romance, as we worked and solicited ideas from colleagues, we expanded our scope to other kinds of passions about travel, learning, and service. We decided to investigate questions of affect in the very specific context of study abroad and volunteering abroad, looking not only at romance, desire, and objectification, but at other passions and emotions such as shame, embarrassment, yearning, and the desire to be of service. We hoped to analyze these themes in an open-ended, context-specific manner, looking at particular places and projects and some of the expressions of affect they elicit. This is a beginning in which our two divergent visions, as detailed below, converged.

> **Neriko Musha Doerr:** I came to do research on study abroad because a friend, Drew Maywar, who was designing a study abroad program for engineering students asked me to work with him as a consultant to understand and support the adjustment of students to their desti-

nation, Japan. Prior to that, my research had been on issues of education, language politics, race relations, and technologies of power in the context of the revitalization of indigenous Maori language in Aotearoa/New Zealand (2009), English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) education in the United States (2012), and the education of Japanese-as-a-heritage-language (JHL) in the United States (Doerr and Lee 2012; 2013). The friend felt my expertise would be an asset for the team. Although the program did not materialize due to lack of funding, I was inspired by what is involved in study abroad processes, and I decided to carry out research on study abroad.

For me, the issue of romance was one of the things that made study abroad special. Compared to the areas of education I had studied, in which the students tended to be driven to learn by their ethnic affiliation, the sense of responsibility, and parental and peer pressure (indigenous language revitalization); by the necessity to adjust and increase career opportunities (ESL education); or by the need for communication with extended family, their ethnic affiliation, and future career opportunities (JHL education), study abroad appeared to be driven more by personal romantic views of things the students seek to learn about—the people and culture of a destination. This made me focus on the role of affect, especially romantic sentiment, of the students.

I value collaboration with people I meet in the field. To work together is a way to give back something—documents collected through fieldwork and their analyses from anthropological viewpoints—to the field site. It is also a way to include viewpoints and draw on the expertise of the people in the field site in the research, and to share authorship of knowledge production during research, which has often been claimed solely by the ethnographer (Clifford 1988). Moreover, because many of the people I meet in the field are professionals, working with them often means interdisciplinary collaboration. For example, I have worked with a school administrator, who is also a linguist, of a JHL program where I was doing fieldwork (Doerr and Lee 2012; 2013; 2016; Lee and Doerr 2015). This project is also an interdisciplinary collaboration with a study abroad director I met in the field, who is also an international educator and anthropologist.

I found it fruitful to approach the issue of romance in study abroad from two different viewpoints—that of the cultural anthropologist, and that of the study abroad practitioner/international educator. I feel that anthropology's current focus on affect and the ethnographic method can offer critical tools for study abroad, and the focus on study abroad can offer anthropology the opportunity to analyze affect in new ways.

Hannah Davis Taïeb: I have been working in study abroad since the year 2000, most of that time as resident director of CIEE's Contem-

porary French Studies program in Paris. My studies, however, were not in the field of international education, but in anthropology, and I did anthropological fieldwork in Morocco in 1988–89, focusing on conceptions of self for unmarried women in a middle-sized town. My interests at that time involved the relationship between conceptions of self and political economy (looking for the links between changing conceptions of the self and of self-control and the fact that women were remaining single longer and entering the labor market). I was also preoccupied by the question of boundaries, of transnational cultural forms and the creating and blurring of boundaries by social actors (Davis 1989), and the projection onto others of our fantasies and desires (Davis 1990, 1993, 1998).

As I learned the profession of international educator, the anthropological approaches that had shaped me were always in the back of my mind. It seemed natural to me to set up classes based on participant-observation, and I launched classes comparing the French and US educational systems. Questions of culture, in constant discussion within the field of study abroad, I saw in terms of long-standing anthropological debates, and I could never feel comfortable when definitions of cultural difference came across as essentialist. Critical anthropological approaches and my own sociopolitical slant also led me towards educational forms that were dialogues or partnerships. I set up seminars that brought French and American scholars and professionals together,[1] co-taught bilingual classes and workshops with mixed student bodies,[2] and set up classes integrating volunteering with a critical shared questioning of notions such as solidarity, service, and diversity.[3]

When I met Neriko Musha Doerr, I saw that we shared common analyses of how study abroad works, and that an explicit return to the anthropological approach could enrich my own professional life. What "culture work" are we doing, are we part of, as practitioners in our fields? How is the movement of American and other students around the world contributing to changing discourses of culture and diversity? What is being achieved when global discourses combine with international organizations that talk more and more about difference, but in more and more standardized ways?

At the same time, as an international educator and program director, the pedagogical, practical, and also ethical questions are never far away. What is the next step with each particular student, professor, program, partnership? What are the paradoxical or contradictory aspects of our mandates, and how can we negotiate them? How can the anthropological perspective inform our own views of our field, inform our decisions, give depth to our practice?

Five years have passed since our first meeting in Paris where this project emerged. This volume is a result of our numerous email exchanges, skype sessions, and in-person meetings whenever either of us crossed the Atlantic, in which our knowledge, theoretical orientations, analytical perspectives, practical concerns, aspirations for the future of study abroad, and personal affective investments diverged, bounced off of each other, converged, and generated something new. This project is a milestone of our own continuing journeys for both of us.

Neriko Musha Doerr received a Ph.D. in cultural anthropology from Cornell University. Her research interests include politics of difference, language and power, and study abroad and alternative break experiences. Her publications include *Meaningful Inconsistencies: Bicultural Nationhood, Free Market, and Schooling in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (Berghahn Books), *The Native Speaker Concept* (Mouton de Gruyter), and *Constructing the Heritage Language Learner* (Mouton de Gruyter), and articles in *Anthropological Forum, Compare, Critical Discourse Studies, Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power,* and *Journal of Cultural Geography.* She currently teaches at Ramapo College in New Jersey, US.

Dr. **Hannah Davis Taïeb** is an international educator, teacher, and writer who was the director of CIEE's Contemporary French Studies Program in Paris from 2003 to 2015. She has a Ph.D. in anthropology from New York University; her thesis, concerning unmarried women and changing conceptions of the self, was based on fieldwork in a middle-sized city in Morocco. After working with a research team in Lyon, Hannah settled permanently in France in 1992, where she first was the co-editor of a multilingual, multidisciplinary review, *Mediterraneans,* then taught intercultural and interpersonal communication at the American University of Paris before entering the field of study abroad in the year 2000. While at CIEE, she ran Franco-American seminars, joint classes and study trips on subjects like disability, religious diversity and secularism, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, chaplaincy and religion in prison, and special education. Independently, Hannah continues to teach about popular culture and *métissage,* disabilities, and religious diversity, co-teaches a Franco-American intercultural communication class, and runs volunteer and exchange activities with a Paris youth club.

Notes

1. Hannah Davis Taïeb has led Franco-American seminars on themes such as Islamophobia and anti-Semitism, religion in everyday life through a reflection on the role of chaplains in prisons and hospitals, and disabilities.
2. Hannah Davis Taïeb has co-taught classes with Verena Aebischer of the University of Paris Nanterre (Paris X), with a joint student body including Intercultural Communication students and Social Psychology students; co-led workshops with Ita Hermouet of the Institut Catholique d'Enseignement Supérieur in La Roche sur Yon, with a joint student body of CIEE study abroad students and French students bound for study abroad in the United States; and co-taught classes with Jérémy Arki at the University of Paris Diderot (Paris VII) with a class that was open to CIEE study abroad students and also to Paris-Diderot students.
3. Hannah Davis Taïeb is co-teaching a class entitled Community Service Learning: Social Justice/Solidarité, Diversity/Diversité, in which American students engage in tutoring French youth from a youth club in a low-income, diverse neighborhood. The class also involves joint discussions of topics such as race and "service", and an independently funded voyage by four French high-school students from the club to US universities.

References

Ahmed, Sara. 2004. "Affective Economies." *Social Text* 22: 121–39.

Althusser, Louis. 1971. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities.* London: Verso.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. "Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value." In Arjun Appardurai (ed.), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–63.

———. 1990. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Public Culture* 2(2): 1–24.

Balibar, Etienne. 1988. "The Nation Form: History and Ideology." In Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (eds), *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities.* London: Verso, pp. 86–106.

Barber, Benjamin R. 1994. "A Proposal for Mandatory Citizen Education and Community Service." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 1(1): 86–93.

Besnier, Niko. 1990. "Language and Affect." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 419–451.

Borneman, John. 1992. *Belonging in the Two Berlins: Kin, State, Nation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Briggs, Charles L. 1996. "The Politics of Discursive Authority in Research on the 'Invention of Tradition.'" *Cultural Anthropology* 11(4): 435–69.

Bringle, Robert G., and Julie A. Hatcher. 2011. "International Service Learning." In Robert G. Bringle, Julie A. Hatcher, and Steven G. Jones (eds), *International Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Research.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, pp. 3–28.

Broad, Kenneth, and Ben Orlove. 2007. "Channeling Globality: The 1997–1998 El Nino Climate Event in Peru." *American Ethnologist* 34(2): 285–302.

Buda, Dorina Maria. 2015. *Affective Tourism: Dark Routes in Conflict.* New York: Routledge.

Butcher, Jim, and Peter Smith. 2010. "Making a Difference: Volunteer Tourism and Development." *Tourism Recreation Research*, 35(1): 27–36.

Callanan, Michelle, and Sarah Thomas. 2005. "Volunteer Tourism: Deconstructing Volunteer Activities within a Dynamic Environment." In Marina Novelli (ed.), *Niche Tourism: Contemporary Issues, Trends and Cases.* Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 183–200.

Chesler Mark A, Joseph A. Galura, Kristie A. Ford, and Jessica M. Charbeneau. 2006. "Peer Facilitators as Border Crossers in Community Service-Learning." *Teaching Sociology* 34(4): 341–56.

Clifford, James. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Comaroff, John. 1987. "Of Totemism and Ethnicity: Consciousness, Practice and the Signs of Inequality." *Ethnos* 52(3–4): 301–23.

Conran, Mary. 2011. "They Really Love Me! Intimacy in Volunteer Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research* 38(4): 1454–73.

Cororation, Claire, and Richard Handler. 2013. "Dreaming in Green: Service-Learning, Global Engagement and the Liberal Arts at a North American University." *Learning and Teaching* 6(2): 72–93.

Davis, Hannah. 1989. "American Magic in a Moroccan Town," *Middle East Report,* July-August 1989.

———. 1998. «'La où vont les femmes': notes sur les femmes, les cafés, et les Fast Food au Maroc,» in *Miroirs Maghrebins : Itinéraires de soi et paysages de rencontre,* S. Ossman, ed. Paris : CNRS.

———. 1993. «Dreams of Another Kind of Woman,» in *Who's Afraid of Femininity? Questions of Identity,* M. Brügmann et al, eds., Amsterdam, Atlanta; Rodopi.

———. 1990. «Des femmes marocains et 'La chaleur de St. Tropez',» in *Cahiers de l'Orient* (20), pp. 191–199.

Dewey, John. 1996/1908. *Theory of the Moral Life.* New York: Irvington.

d'Hauteserre, Anne-Marie. 2015. "Affect Theory and the Attractivity of Destinations." *Annals of Tourism Research* 55: 77–89.

Doerr, Neriko Musha. 2008. "Global Structures of Common Difference, Cultural Objectification, and Their Subversions: Cultural Politics in an Aotearoa/New Zealand School." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 15(4): 413–36.

———. 2009. *Meaningful Inconsistencies: Bicultural Nationhood, Free Market, and Schooling in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* London: Berghahn Books.

———. 2012. "Study Abroad as 'Adventure': Construction of Imaginings of Social Space and Subjectivities." *Critical Discourse Studies* 9(3): 257–68.

———. 2013. "Do 'Global Citizens' Need the Parochial Cultural Other? Discourses of Study Abroad and Learning by Doing." *Compare* 43(2): 224–43.

———. 2014. "Desired Learning, Disavowed Learning: Scale-Making Practices and Subverting the Hierarchy of Study Abroad Experiences." *Geoforum* 54(July): 70–79.

———. 2015. "Volunteering as Othering: Understanding A Paradox of Social Distance, Obligation, and Reciprocity." *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement* 6(2): 36–57.

Doerr, Neriko Musha, and Kiri Lee. 2012. "'Drop-Outs' or 'Heritage Learners'? Competing Mentalities of Governmentality and Invested Meanings at a Japanese Language School in the United States." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 33(4): 561–73.

———. 2013. *Constructing the Heritage Language Learner: Knowledge, Power, and New Subjectivities.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

———. 2016, "Heritage Language Education without Inheriting Hegemonic Ideologies: Shifting Perspectives on 'Korea' in a Weekend Japanese Language School in the United States." *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Migrant Education* 10(2): 112–126.

Fendler, Lynn. 1998. "What Is It Impossible to Think? A Genealogy of the Educated Subject." In Thomas S. Popkewitz and Marie Brennan (eds), *Foucault's Challenge: Discourse, Knowledge, and Power in Education.* New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 39–63.

Frekko, Susan. 2009. "Social Class, Linguistic Normativity and the Authority of the 'Native Catalan Speaker' in Barcelona." In Neriko Musha Doerr (ed.), *The Native Speaker Concept: Ethnographic Investigations of "Native Speaker Effects".* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 161–84.

Friedman, Jonathan. 2003. "Globalizing Languages: Ideologies and Realities of the Contemporary Global System." *American Anthropologist* 105(4): 744–52.

Fusco, Coco. 1995. *English Is Broken Here: Notes on the Cultural Fusion in the Americas.* New York: New Press.

Gans, Herbert J. 1999. *Making Sense of America: Sociological Analyses and Essays.* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Geertz, Clifford. 1963. *The Interpretation of Cultures.* London: Fontana Press.

Good, Byron. 2004. "Rethinking 'Emotions' in Southeast Asia." *Ethnos* 69(4): 529–33.

Gray, Noella J., and Lisa M. Campbell. 2007. "A Decommodified Experience? Exploring Aesthetic, Economic and Ethical Values for Volunteer Ecotourism in Costa Rica." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 15(5): 463–82.

Grünzweig, Walter, and Nana Rinehart, eds. 2002. *Rockin' in Red Square: Critical Approaches to International Education in the Age of Cyberculture.* Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Handler, Richard. 1985. "On Having a Culture: Nationalism and the Preservation of Quebec's Patrimoine." In George W. Stocking, Jr. (ed.), *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 192–217.

Hartman, Eric, Cody Morris Paris, and Brandon Blache-Cohen. 2014. "Fair Trade Learning: Ethical Standards for Community-Engaged International Volunteer Tourism." *Tourism & Hospitality Research* 14(1–2): 108–16.

Heath, Sue. 2007. "Widening the Gap: Pre-University Gap Years and the 'Economy of Experience'." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 28(1): 89–103.

Heller, Monica. 2003. *Crosswords: Language, Education and Ethnicity in French Ontario.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Henze, Rosemary, and Kathryn A. Davis. 1999. "Authenticity and Identity: Lessons from Indigenous Language Education." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 30(1): 3–21.

Herzfeld, Michael. 1997. *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State.* New York: Routledge.

Hickel, Jason. 2013. "The 'Real Experience' Industry: Student Development Projects and the Depoliticisation of Poverty." *Learning and Teaching* 6(2): 11–32.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 2003. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feelings.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. First publication 1983.

———. 2004. "Love and Gold." In Barbara Ehrenreich and Arlie Russell Hochschild (eds), *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy.* New York: Henry Holt, pp. 15–30.

Holland, Dorothy, Debra Skinner, William Lachicotte Jr., and Carole Cain. 1998. *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Howes, David. 1996. "Introduction: Commodities and Cultural Borders." In David Howes (ed.), *Cross-Cultural Consumption: Global Markets Local Realities.* New York: Routledge, pp. 1–16.

Jacoby, Barbara. 2009. "Facing the Unsettled Questions about Service-Learning." In Jean R. Strait and Marybeth Lima (eds.), *The Future of Service-Learning: New Solutions for Sustaining and Improving Practice,* Sterling, VA: Stylus, pp. 99–105.

Johnson, Martha. 2009. "Post-reciprocity: In Defense of the 'Post' Perspective." *Frontiers* 28(Fall): 181–86.

Kahne, Joseph, and Joel Westheimer. 2003. "Teaching Democracy: What Schools Need to Do." *The Phi Delta Kappan* 85: 34–40, 57–61, 63–66.

Kearney, Michael. 2004. *Changing Fields of Anthropology: From Local to Global.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Koritz, Amy. 1997. "Dancing the Orient for England: Maud Allan's 'The Vision of Salome'." In Jane Desmond (ed.), *Meaning in Motion: New Cultural Studies of Dance.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Krashen, Stephen. 1998. "Language Shyness and Heritage Language Development." In Stephen D. Krashen, Lucy Tse, and Jeff McQuillan (eds), *Heritage Language Development.* Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates, pp. 41–49.

Kristeva, Julia. 2011. *Hatred and Forgiveness,* trans. J. Herman. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lewin, Ross, and Greg Van Kirk. 2009. "It's Not About You: The UConn Social Entrepreneur Corps Global Commonwealth Study Abroad Model." In Ross Lewin (ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship.* New York: Routledge, pp. 543–64.

Leys, Ruth. 2011. "The Turn to Affect: A Critique." *Critical Inquiry* 37(Spring): 434–72.

Lee, Kiri, and Neriko Musha Doerr. 2015. "Heritage in the Making: Policies of Old Homeland, Discourse in New Homeland, and Heritage Language Education for 'Japanese' in the United States." In Horiguchi Sachiko, Imoto Yuki, and Greg Poole (eds.), *Foreign Language Education in Japan: Exploring Qualitative Approaches.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 19–34.

Lisle, Debbie. 2006. *Global Politics of Contemporary Travel Writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manzo, Kate. 2008. "Imaging Humanitarianism: NGO Identity and the Iconography of Childhood." *Antipode* 40(4): 632–57.

Massumi, Brian. 1995. "The Autonomy of Affect." *Cultural Critique* 31, The Politics of Systems and Environments, Part II (Autumn) : 83–109.

———. 2010. "The Future Birth of the Affective Fact: The Political Ontology of Threat." In Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth (eds), *The Affect Theory Reader.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 52–70.

McEwan-Fujita, Emily. 2010. "Ideology, Affect, and Socialization in Language Shift and Revitalization: The Experiences of Adult Learning Gaelic in the Western Isles of Schotland." *Language in Society* 39: 27–64.

McGehee, Nancy Gard, and Katheleen Andereck. 2009. "Volunteer Tourism and the 'Volunteered': The Case of Tijuana, Mexico." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 17(1): 39–51.

McGehee, Nancy Gard. and Carla Almeida Santos. 2005. "Social Change, Discourse and Volunteer Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(3): 760–779.

Mowforth, Martin, and Ian Munt. 2009. *Tourism and Sustainability: Development, Globalization and New Tourism in the Third World,* 3rd ed. London: Routledge.

Munt, Ian. 1994. "Eco-Tourism or Ego-Tourism?" *Race and Class* 36(1): 49–60.

Navaro-Yashin, Yael. 2006. "Affect in the Civil Service: A Study of a Modern State-System." *Postcolonial Studies* 9(3): 281–94.

Nenga, Sandi Kawecka. 2011. "Volunteering to Give up Privilege? How Affluent Youth Volunteers Respond to Class Privilege." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 40(3): 263–89.

Nickols, Sharon Y., Nancy J. Rothenberg, Lioba Moshi, and Meredith Tetloff. 2013. "International Service-Learning: Students' Personal Challenges and Intercultural Competence." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement,* 17(4): 97–124.

Oakdale, Suzanne. 2004. "The Culture-Conscious Brazilian Indian: Representing and Reworking Indianness in Kayabi Political Discourse." *American Ethnologist* 31(1): 60–75.

Pagano, Monica, and Laura Roselle. 2009. "Beyond Reflection Through an Academic Lens: Refraction and International Experiential Education." *Frontiers* 18(Fall): 217–29.

Pierce, Bonny Norton. 1995. "Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning." *TESOL Quarterly* 29(1): 9–31.

Plater, William M. 2011. "The Context for International Service Learning: An Invisible Revolution Is Underway." In Robert G. Bringle, Julie A. Hatcher, and Steven G. Jones (eds), *International Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Research.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, pp. 29–56.

Povinelli, Elizabeth A. 1998. "The State of Shame: Australian Multiculturalism and the Crisis of Indigenous Citizenship." *Critical Inquiry* 24(2): 575–610.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 1992/2008. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation.* London: Routledge.

Ramos-Zayas, Ana Y. 2009. "Urban Erotics and Racial Affect in a Neoliberal 'Racial Democracy': Brazilian and Puerto Rican Youth in Newark, New Jersey." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 16(5): 513–547.

Rhoads, Robert A., and Julie Neururer. 1998. "Alternative Spring Break: Learning through Community Service." *NASPA Journal* 35(2): 100–118.

Richard, Analiese, and Daromir Rudnyckyj. 2009. "Economies of Affect." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 15(2): 57–77.

Robertson, Roland. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture.* London: Sage.

Rosaldo, Michelle Z. 1984. "Toward an Anthropology of Self and Feeling." In Richard A. Sweer and Robert A. LeVine (eds), *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 137–57.

Rose, Nikolas. 1996. "Governing 'Advanced' Liberal Democracies." In Andrew Barry, Thomas Osbourne, and Nikolas Rose (eds), *Foucault and Political*

Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism, and Rationalities of Government. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 37–64.

Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books.

Saltmarsh, John. 1996. "Education for Critical Citizenship: John Dewey's Contribution to the Pedagogy of Community Service Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 3(1): 13–21.

Savicki, Victor. 2008. *Developing Intercultural Competence and Transformation: Theory, Research, and Application in International Education.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Schieffelin, Bambi, and Elinor Ochs. eds. 1987. *Language Socialization across Cultures.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seigworth, Gregory J., and Melissa Gregg. 2010. "An Inventory of Shimmers." In Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth (eds), *The Affect Theory Reader.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 1–25.

Sherraden, Margaret Sherrard, John Stringham, Simona Costanzo Sow, and Amanda Moore McBride. 2006. "The Forms and Structure of International Voluntary Service." *Voluntas* 17: 163–80.

Shouse, Eric. 2005. "Feeling, Emotion, Affect." *M/C Journal* 8(6): December 2005. Retrieved 22 November 2015 from http://journal.media-culture.org .au/0512/03-shouse.php.

Sin, Harng Luh. 2009. "Who Are We Responsible to? Locals' Tales of Volunteer Tourism." *Geoforum* 41: 983–92.

Sinervo, Aviva. 2011. "Connection and Disillusion: The Moral Economy of Volunteer Tourism in Cusco, Peru." *Childhoods Today* 5(2): 1–23.

Sommer, Doris. 1991. *Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Stewart, Kearsley A. 2013. "The Undergraduate Field-Research Experience in Global Health: Study Abroad, Service Learning, Professional Training or 'None of the Above'?" *Learning and Teaching* 6(2): 53–71.

Strait, Jean R. and Marybeth Lima. 2009. *The Future of Service-Learning: New Solutions for Sustaining and Improving Practice.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Taïeb, Hannah, Isabelle Jaffe, Rosie McDowell, Gregory Spear, and Senzeni Steingruber. 2015. "Civic Engagement in Multicultural Europe: American Students and Europeans in Dialogue." In Eliza J. Nash, Nevin C. Brown, and Lavinia Bracci (eds), *Intercultural Horizons Vol. III. Intercultural Competence: Key to the New Multicultural Societies of the Globalized World.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 207–23.

Taussig. Michael. 1993. *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses.* New York: Routledge.

Taylor, Joby. 2002. "Metaphors We Serve By: Investigating the Conceptual Metaphors Framing National and Community Service and Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 9(1): 45–57.

Tsing, Anna. 2000. "The Global Situation." *Cultural Anthropology* 15(3): 327–60.

———. 2005. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Warner, Sam L. No'eau. 1999. "Kuleana: The Right, Responsibility, and Authority of Indigenous Peoples to Speak and Make Decisions for Themselves in Language and Cultural Revitalization." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 30(1): 68–93.

Whiteside, Anne. 2009. "'We Don't Speak Maya, Spanish or English': Yucatec Maya-Speaking Transnationals in California and the Social Construction of Competence." In Neriko Musha Doerr (ed.), *The Native Speaker Concept: Ethnographic Investigations of "Native Speaker Effects."* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 215–32.

Wilk, Richard. 1995. "Learning to Be Local in Belize: Global Systems of Common Difference." In Daniel Miller (ed.), *Worlds Apart: Modernity through Prism of the Local.* London: Routledge, pp. 110–33.

Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2002. "Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences." *Global Networks* 2(4): 301–34.

Wolf, Eric R. 1994. "Perilous Ideas: Race, Culture, People." *Current Anthropology* 35(1): 1–7.

Woolf, Michael. 2007. "Come and See the Poor People: The Pursuit of Exotica." *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* 13: 135–46.

———. 2010. "Another Mishegas: Global Citizenship." *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* 19: 47–60.

Yamasaki, Yuri. 2011. "Conflicted Attitudes toward Heritage: Heritage Language Learning of Returnee Adolescents from Japan at a Nikkei School in Lima, Peru." In Neriko Musha Doerr (ed.), *Heritage, Nationhood, and Language; Migrants with Japan Connection.* New York: Routledge, pp. 25–42.

Zemach-Bersin, Talya. 2009. "Selling the World: Study Abroad Marketing and the Privatization of Global Citizenship." In Ross Lewin (ed.), *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship.* New York: Routledge, pp. 282–302.

———. 2011. "Entitled to the World: The Rhetoric of U.S. Global Citizenship Education and Study Abroad." In Vanessa Andreotti (ed.), *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education.* New York: Routledge, pp. 87–104.