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ABSTRACT

This study examined the experiences of faculty members from U.S. universities who led students on a short-term summer study abroad program that incorporated the Camino de Santiago, a medieval pilgrimage route in Spain. The study sought to understand how faculty leaders engaged in sensemaking (Weick, 1995) of these experiences in the context of their faculty roles on their home campuses. The ethnographic methods included six years of field work in Spain, participant observation as faculty program director, and in-depth interviews with faculty leaders. The findings show that participants engaged in sensemaking through three theoretical constructs. The construct of family addresses nuclear family roles, including gendered roles, as well as Camino Family expectations. The construct of appointment and role expectations deals with tenure status and issues of autonomy, agency, and teaching. The construct of inspirations identifies and analyzes both internal and external sources of inspiration for faculty engagement in these programs. These sources include personal tragedies, a focus on student-centeredness, and a desire to expose students to a “Real Spain.” The constructs, in addition to serving as catalysts for sensemaking, establish a counternarrative on faculty growth (O’Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008). This counternarrative focuses on learning across complex faculty roles, the development of agency in enacting meaningful work, and faculty capacity for commitment to their work and institutions. Overall, this study demonstrated that leading a study abroad program along the Camino is an activity that contributes to faculty leaders’ growth.
TEACHING ALONG THE WAY: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF FACULTY GROWTH AND SENSEMAKING ON THE CAMINO DE SANTIAGO
CHAPTER 1: TAKING THE FIRST STEPS

Six months earlier, while studying in Madrid, I had seen an intriguing flyer inviting me to “Walk 500 miles on the Camino de Santiago!” It was an announcement for a two-month Medieval Studies seminar focused on the history, literature, art, and architecture of the Camino which would be taught as we walked from St. Jean to Santiago de Compostela. (Talbot, 2011, p. 3)

In May 1974, the first short-term study abroad program from an American university took place on the Camino de Santiago (the Camino). David Gitlitz, a professor of Spanish and medievalist at Indiana University, led a group of seven women undergraduate and graduate students on a two-month pilgrimage hike from the Pyrenees Mountains along the French-Spanish border and across northern Spain to Santiago de Compostela (Talbot, 2011). The group relied on Spanish army maps, some dating back to 1918, to make their way across Spain, all the while learning about the medieval pilgrimage, the then-current Franco dictatorship, and the way of life for rural Spaniards (Talbot, 2011). Nearly four decades after that first U.S.-based Camino study abroad program, I travelled to Spain and walked the Camino as a program assistant for William & Mary’s program. My experiences on the Camino over the course of the intervening six years—as a program assistant, research assistant, and ultimately as a faculty member
teaching my own course as part of the study abroad program—and the relationships that I
developed along the way inspired this research project.

My dissertation has been, from its earliest conceptions, a multi-disciplinary
project. It began as a phenomenological analysis of faculty experiences through a narrow
lens of study abroad leadership. As I began to record my own experiences, conduct pilot
studies and interview participants in the field, and immerse myself in the broader
literature of higher education, the study has evolved into an ethnography that tells the
story of a particular sub-culture of U.S. faculty members within the context of their
broader work-worlds. Ultimately, this study explores how faculty members who lead
study abroad programs on the Camino make sense of that experience in the context of
their faculty roles at their home institutions. Doing this research has been a pilgrimage of
its own, culminating in this dissertation. Throughout the text, I draw connections to the
Camino through metaphor in hopes that, in addition to learning about faculty growth,
readers will also better understand nature of the Camino itself.

My Camino

I first travelled to Spain in summer 2005 as an undergraduate student studying
abroad for five weeks in Cádiz, near the southern tip of the Iberian Peninsula. My
roommate and I lived with a host family, we attended classes with other William & Mary
students taught by local faculty, and we spent our weekends on field trips with our group.
All these years later when I reflect on that experience, I come back to two streams of
thought. First, my time abroad sparked a deep desire for me to continue my studies of
Hispanic culture and the Castilian language. That was my first extensive trip abroad; in
the 13 years since that trip, I have traveled 19 times to Nicaragua—frequently with high
school and college students—and six times back to Spain. These six trips were all to Santiago de Compostela. The second stream of thought that I reflect on is how we travelled in our William & Mary bubble—living together, taking classes together, going on field trips together. As I have become more involved with study abroad along the Camino de Santiago, I realize that this type of study abroad program is different from other study abroad programs, particularly in regard to the physical nature and the religious origins of the Camino. Students from a single institution may arrive to Spain, walk the Camino, and take classes all together, but while they are on the Camino, they gain exposure to people, cultures, and ideas from all over the world. Many of the U.S.-based Camino study abroad programs emphasize the cultural exposure, physical demands, and transformational nature of the Camino as opportunities unique to this genre of study abroad. This unique combination of physical demand and potential for transformative experiences is what sparked my interest in the Camino as a subject of study in 2013 when I first found myself in Santiago.

In spring of 2013, George Greenia, a Camino celebrity in his own right and Professor Emeritus of Hispanic Studies at William & Mary, invited a group of four faculty, five undergraduate students, and me to come walk the Camino Inglés with him. That initial Camino experience for me, the two additional Caminos for which I served as a program assistant, the summer I spent as a research assistant in Santiago, and the summer I taught in and co-directed the study abroad program constitute my deep personal and academic history with the Camino. For many of these summers, I travelled with Kathleen Jenkins, Professor of Sociology and Director of the Institute for Pilgrimage Studies at William & Mary. My time shadowing her as a program assistant and as a
research assistant was invaluable as I shaped my own research questions and built up my experience as a participant-observer. In summer 2017, I travelled with James Barber as program faculty for the William & Mary summer study abroad program. Alongside Dr. Barber, an Associate Professor of Higher Education, I designed and taught my first undergraduate course, and managed the logistics of moving students along the Camino Francés. Both Dr. Barber and Dr. Jenkins served on my dissertation committee. In Chapter 3, I further discuss how the experiences I shared with them shaped this study, and the ways in which they have guided this research from its earliest conception through to this final dissertation.

This Chapter sets the stage for what I refer to as my own Camino de Investigaciones, or my Camino of Research. As they prepare for their journey, many contemporary pilgrims immerse themselves in the ever-growing body of knowledge about the Camino. This may include learning about culture, history, tips for hiking, picking up a new language, or the social context of the Camino within modern Spain. This Chapter provides the same introduction for my study. Now, I turn to the background for this study, the context of the Camino through both cultural and academic lenses, the context within higher education and faculty work in which I situated the study, and details on the study design and implementation.

**Background**

Much like the multitude of pilgrims who have walked the Camino in centuries past, so too does study abroad have a historical tradition in U.S. higher education. In 1923, Raymond Kirkbride of the University of Delaware designed a program for students at the university to spend their junior year abroad in France (University of Delaware,
The phenomenon of study abroad that began with that group of eight students nearly a century ago is now a lived experience of millions of U.S. college students. In the 2016-17 academic year alone, 332,727 students—292,467 of them undergraduates—traveled abroad to earn academic credit (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2018). Even though the original study abroad was a year-long venture for the eight University of Delaware students, 64.46% of students who studied abroad in 2016-17 participated in a short-term program that lasted eight weeks or less (IIE, 2018).

My research focuses on faculty who lead short-term programs in one specific location—Santiago de Compostela in Galicia, Spain. One of five autonomous regions in Spain, Galicia is home to the final stretch of the Camino de Santiago (“the Camino”), a medieval Catholic pilgrimage route that has seen a renaissance of activity since the 1970s and the first trip initiated by Professor Gitlitz.

Much like Kirkbride’s initial study abroad program grew in popularity, so too has the idea of incorporating the Camino into a short-term study abroad. Even though the 2017 Open Doors report indicated that England and Italy were the most popular study abroad destinations for U.S. students, this study focuses on the Camino because of the unique environment and activities associated with teaching while on a pilgrimage route. In the summer of 2018, no fewer than 20 U.S.-based institutions sponsored faculty-led study abroad programs in northern Spain that spend some amount of time on the Camino.

The Camino de Santiago

The Camino emerged as a pilgrimage route, with Santiago de Compostela the destination, in the mid-10th century (Gitlitz & Davidson, 2000). Appendix A represents a variety of the routes that exist to this day. Much like the Church in modern Europe, the
Camino peaked during the Renaissance and then waned during the Enlightenment, and while never totally ceasing its popularity surged again in the last decades of the 20th century (Gitlitz & Davidson, 2000). In the decade 2008-2018, the Camino witnessed an increase in the number of pilgrims making the trek along the route. In 2004, 179,944 pilgrims completed the Camino (Oficina de Acogida al Peregrino, 2018). The vast majority (75%) of pilgrims who registered with the Pilgrim’s Office reported that the motivation of their journey was religious and a mere 5% reported that their motivations were non-religious (Oficina de Acogida al Peregrino, 2018). Over a 13-year period, the numbers of pilgrims and their motivations shifted dramatically. In 2017, the Pilgrim’s Office welcomed 301,036 pilgrims, a 167% increase from 2004 (Oficina de Acogida al Peregrino, 2018). Of these pilgrims, only 43% reported religious motivations, and 9% reported non-religious motivations—a marked difference in how pilgrims engaged with the ancient route (Oficina de Acogida al Peregrino, 2018). The remaining percentages in each case comprised pilgrims who noted both religious and spiritual motivations.

The original Camino consisted of a winding network of routes that pilgrims would follow from various ports, countries, and regions. Today, most pilgrims use the Camino Francés and travel up to 800 kilometers (km) from the border of France to Santiago de Compostela, where they receive the official Compostela of the Catholic Church. The Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela has purview of the awarding of the official church document and sets the standards that pilgrims must meet to officially complete the Camino. Pilgrims can travel by foot, horseback, bike, or wheelchair and have minimum distances associated with each mode of transit in order to qualify for the Compostela (Oficina de Acogida al Peregrino, 2018). Walking pilgrims must complete the final
100km of whichever route they take. While on the Camino, pilgrims often stay in communal housing, dine with fellow pilgrims, and form relationships based in the common identity of being a pilgrim. Shared practices, experiences, and values emerge and constitute the development of a distinct Camino culture.

**The Camino as culture.** Ethnographers have addressed the Camino as a cultural site for study (Feinberg, 1985; Frey, 1998; Haab, 1992; Mouriño López, 1997). Sánchez y Sánchez and Hesp (2016) brought together a number of researchers who examined the Camino through interdisciplinary lenses. The overarching connection with each of these studies is the treatment of the Camino as a cultural site. Geertz (1973) defined culture as “a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life” (p. 89). The Camino is a system within which individuals interact with place and with each other as they make their journey to Santiago de Compostela. It is also a liminal space, in which boundaries and hierarchies that normally structure our experiences in the social world begin to fade (Turner, 1969). The liminal, or ritual-based, journey carries for some pilgrims connotations of the sacred and divine as related to the Catholic origins of the Camino. The sense of communitas often establishes all pilgrims and sojourners as equals along the Way, regardless of origin (Turner, 1969). Within the culture of the Camino, community can thrive and individuals have the autonomy to engage with this community at whatever levels they desire (Hesp, 2013). Community can thrive in massive shelters where hundreds of pilgrims share sleeping accommodations and dine together (Frey, 1998). Community also often thrives in the private narrations of pilgrims’ journeys (Hesp, 2013). Personal diary writing—both digital and analog—connects the
writer to the imagined community on the Camino. Diary writers achieve this connection to community through “connecting the protagonists to their fellow pilgrims,” as well as exposing the development and meaning of relationships that blossom with other pilgrims (Hesp, 2013, p. 79). As individuals make the journey to Santiago, they become members of the Camino community. As such, they may partake in the traditions and daily rituals of the community, which include washing, foot care, shoe mending, cooking, eating, sleeping, cleaning—all activities that take place far outside the bounds of the traditional faculty role in U.S. institutions of higher education.

The Camino as classroom. As part of a study abroad program, the Camino presents a laboratory of endless topics of academic inquiry. Not bound to a classroom, students and faculty hike between 100 and 780km across 12 different pathways. Faculty who lead these programs not only teach content as they would in any course; they manage logistics of walking for weeks on end, ensure their students are physically prepared, and accept and embrace the role of pilgrim alongside their students. Faculty leaders enter into a social space different from any they may encounter on their campuses when they assume this role. There are no physical classrooms along the Camino, no offices where faculty may hold appointments with students, and no calendar dictating appointments and obligations. As discussed above, the expectations associated with the role of pilgrim strive to strip away titles, dissolve hierarchies, and erode the notions of privacy and personal space (Gitlitz & Davidson, 2000). Faculty members acting as program directors face a significant challenge in embracing the communitas of pilgrimage while maintaining a relationship with students that respects the tradition and hierarchy of the professor/student dynamic. While not dissimilar for students who
inhabit similar social environments on campus, this engagement is a significant departure from the traditional faculty role.

The Study

My study examines the experiences of faculty leaders as they embrace new and different roles leading these programs while still teaching disciplinary content, and, importantly, addresses how the faculty leaders themselves make sense of these experiences in the context of the faculty roles they fill on campus.

In this chapter, I argue the need for research on how faculty make sense of their experiences leading students on the Camino. Even though the broad topic of internationalization in U.S. higher education framed this research, I adopt a narrow focus on how one aspect of internationalization—study abroad—is experienced by faculty members who engage in directing short-term programs. Even more narrowed is the focus on the type of program analyzed, those that involve hiking and learning along the Camino de Santiago.

Here I share the figurative map that I followed in designing my study prior to my fieldwork in the summer of 2018. First, I provide a brief overview of the evolution of internationalization in American higher education. This introduction leads to a review of the current state of short-term study abroad programming, with particular focus on outcomes related to student learning and development, and on academic engagement in study abroad. In a pivot toward the faculty who lead these programs, I provide an entrée into the study of faculty work—namely what faculty do and why. After an overview of the evolution of faculty work in the late 20th century, I present a discussion on the internationalization of faculty work that connects back to the earlier discussion of faculty
engagement in education abroad. Next, I outline the problem and purpose of the study, which leads to the introduction of the research questions guiding the study and its overall significance. These questions have evolved over the course of my writing, working with my committee, and ultimately were shaped by the six summers I spent in the field in Santiago de Compostela. I then introduce the theoretical and conceptual frameworks that guided my initial approach to the research and end the chapter with defining terms that I use throughout the rest of this dissertation.

This study is much like a Camino journey, having a distinct starting point but never really ending. I began thinking about the Camino as a research topic while walking the Camino Inglés six years ago. Much of my thinking has evolved as my orientation to the Camino itself evolves. The first three chapters of this dissertation start to lead down a path that I believed would address the principle issue of understanding faculty work through the lens of leading a Camino-based study abroad program. Just like on the Camino, as I ventured down this inductive path, the landscape changed. However, the argument for why this study is important remained solid. This introductory chapter remains relatively unchanged over time from my initial musings and arguments. In it, I situate my study in the broader context of study abroad, the internationalization of U.S. higher education, and current faculty work issues.

**Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education**

The internationalization of higher education in the United States has been the focus of significant research for decades. In an early treatise, Kerr (1990) referred to internationalization “as one of the laws of motion propelling institutions of higher learning” (p. 5). A decade later, Altbach (2000) framed the topic as one of the most
critical in the last half of the 20th century for higher education. Both Kerr and Altbach highlighted the importance of internationalization even before critical events such as 9/11 and the technology boom dramatically changed how scholars, let alone society writ large, engaged with the idea of internationalizing higher education in the U.S. While widely accepted as a critical issue, or even a foundational principle, de Wit (2002) asserted that a working definition of internationalization was alone insufficient. If internationalization is truly at the core of this complex web of learning in higher education, then it cannot be treated without coupling a conceptual framework to the concrete definition (de Wit, 2002). Knight (2003) offered the definition of internationalization as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 2). This broad definition provides the context for viewing the expansion of study abroad as directly connected to internationalization efforts in introducing a global dimension into the delivery of post-secondary education. Therefore, I use Knight’s definition of internationalization to frame the activities associated with study abroad programs on the Camino as part of broader internationalization efforts.

Additionally, the Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) of the American Council on Education (ACE) offers a Model for Comprehensive Internationalization and defines Comprehensive Internationalization as “a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate policies, programs, and initiatives to position colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected institutions” (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017, p. 1). This model specifically outlines policies and best practices that institutions should adopt concerning internationalization efforts.
The six areas include: (a) articulated institutional commitment; (b) administrative leadership, structure, and staffing; (c) curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes; (d) faculty policies and practices; (e) student mobility; and (f) collaboration and partnerships (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). Within these pillars, study abroad itself aligns with student mobility. My research on faculty study abroad directors instead most closely aligns with the pillar of faculty practices in the CIGE model, as the programs themselves serve as a means to analyze faculty work. In regards to the six areas of comprehensive internationalization, my research has touch points with at least four—institutional commitment to have the program take place, a curriculum that allows for students to earn credit while abroad, faculty policies and practices that extend beyond campus, and the fact that these programs allow student mobility abroad.

Both the CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization and the conceptual model for internationalization that Knight (2004) developed regarding approaches for internationalization at the institutional level emphasize the need for faculty involvement and highlight the importance for faculty development in relation to internationalization goals. The 2017 *Mapping internationalization* survey results from ACE highlight areas of improvement concerning hiring, promotion, and award structures that account for faculty internationalization efforts. However, the report raises questions about the prominence and effectiveness of faculty input into internationalization efforts (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). The report focuses on institutional reflections on internationalization, including how the institutions view the experiences of faculty writ large. What is missing within the ACE report is the inclusion of perspectives of individual faculty members. I embarked on this study to share the experiences of individual faculty members who lead
students on the Camino. In doing so, this dissertation brings to light individuals’ perceptions of this particular internationalization experience in the context of traditional faculty roles and how those perceptions align or contrast with larger-scale data trends. My study extends the research that analyzes internationalization efforts at the institutional level, and brings into focus the unexplored individual experiences faculty have in leading study abroad trips as part of their broader work roles on campus.

**Study Abroad in American Higher Education**

As briefly noted earlier, study abroad in American higher education has become an increasingly common component of undergraduate education. As a nation, the United States sends 292,467 undergraduate students to dozens of countries each year to earn academic credit either through a host institution or the student’s home institution (IIE, 2018). In total, 16% of students pursuing a Bachelor’s degree study abroad at some point during their degree program (IIE, 2018). The demographics of all students who study abroad are becoming increasingly diverse. In 2006-2007, White students constituted 83% of American students studying abroad; while still in the majority, that percentage dropped to 70.8% in 2016-17 (IIE, 2018). The increase in short-term study abroad, which accounts for 64.6% of study abroad engagements, allows students more opportunity to include an experience abroad during their college years (IIE, 2018). As more students engage in study abroad, interest in the outcomes of their experiences and the impact those experiences have on student development increases.

**Student learning outcomes in short-term study abroad.** Research has focused in the past decade on the different outcomes students experience through participating in a short-term study abroad program lasting less than eight weeks. The learning outcomes
receiving significant attention in the literature include intercultural learning (P. Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006; Czerwionka, Artamonova, & Barbosa, 2015; Gullekson, Tucker, Coombs, & Wrights, 2011; Hamad & Lee, 2013; Salisbury, An, & Pascarella, 2013; Stebleton, Soria, & Cherny, 2013), cultural understanding (Braskamp, Braskamp, & Merrill, 2009; Grey, Serafini, Coz, & Sanz, 2015; Lemmons, 2015), and academic development (Ogden, 2010; Woodside, Wong, & Wiest, 1999). Researchers also have addressed the long-term impact on student learning (Dwyer, 2004; Kilgo, Ezell Sheets, & Pascarella, 2015; Paige, Stallman, & Josic, 2008; Smith & Curry, 2011). Even though the body of extant literature on student learning outcomes is vast, there remains a gap in how researchers understand what faculty do in order to encourage these outcomes. I explore how faculty experienced the Camino-based study abroad programs as educational programs—how they engaged students, encouraged intercultural experiences, and how they facilitated student learning.

**Student development and short-term study abroad.** Aside from the intellectual development outcomes discussed above, previous research addresses in-depth the ways in which students personally change because of engaging in short-term study abroad. These changes include the emergent concept of global citizenship, which Ogden (2017) viewed “as a central concept in the language used to prioritize the internationalization of higher education” (p. 10). The research has examined how study abroad enhances global citizenship (Braskamp, 2008; Doerr, 2013; Gambino & Hashim, 2016; Morais & Ogden, 2011). Identity development linked to participation in study abroad is also a central focus of the extant literature (Angulo, 2008; Bryant & Soria, 2015; Dolby, 2007). Finally, Deardorff (2006, 2008, 2009b) has examined at length the
impact of study abroad on the development of intercultural competency. Despite the coverage in the literature on student learning during study abroad experiences, the literature fails to address whether leading study abroad impacts faculty members in a similar way, and how faculty contextualize those experiences within the scope of their roles on campus.

**Academics and short-term study abroad.** By definition, short-term study abroad incorporates coursework for which students receive academic credit. There is substantive literature on the academic programming development of short-term study abroad programs (Norris & Dwyer, 2005; Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, & Paige, 2009) and in particular how it relates to experiential learning (Chisolm, 2005; Franklin, 2010; Green, Hesel, & Bartini, 2008; Haeckl & Manwell, 2009; Orahood, Kruze, & Pearson, 2004). Of particular importance to my study is the role of the faculty leader in study abroad. Research highlights significant growth occurring for students in relation to “global knowledge, academic development, and intercultural learning” (Ogden, 2017, p. 11). The literature has yet to address faculty development in regards to these same issues even though evidence exists regarding how faculty members have been critical in the development and evolution of study abroad (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Festervand & Tillery, 2001; Gouldthorpe, Harder, Roberts, & Stedman, 2012; Highum, 2014; Moseley, 2009; Niehaus & Williams, 2015; Sandgren, Ellig, Hovde, Krejci, & Rice, 1999; Stohl, 2007). Faculty leading short-term study abroad is only one part of their faculty role. Modern faculty roles in U.S. higher education are complex. To understand specific aspects of faculty roles, one must understand the broader context of faculty work.
Faculty Work in U.S. Higher Education

Since facilitating study abroad is but one part of a modern faculty role, it is important to understand where that role fits with other expectations and realities of faculty work. Since the boom in American higher education post-World War II, the essence of faculty work has involved the trinity of teaching, research, and service (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). This broad definition provides a starting point for discussing the finer points of faculty work and the evolution of that work—and the way scholars approach studying it—over the past decade.

In the last half of the 20th century faculty work diversified and grew more complex as institutions themselves developed more multifaceted structures and missions (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). This developing organizational complexity led to rearranging of faculty roles to match the needs of specific institutions. Boyer (1990) found that as institutions developed more interest in academic prestige, faculty members began to shift their priorities to earning tenure and notoriety. As faculty members strived for tenure, they engaged in a series of activities that were driven by institution mission and value. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) described these activities as behaviors, and these faculty behaviors included “activities in the domains of teaching, research, scholarship, and service. To the extent that they have options, faculty members will allocate their efforts to those activities toward which they are most motivated” (p. 106). Ultimately, these behaviors led to concrete deliverables, or products. The definition Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) used noted how faculty work is the combination of behaviors and products as contextualized by socio-demographic variables such as age,
sex, and race. This definition, however, emerged before the boom of non-tenure eligible faculty appointments and other issues that began affecting faculty work.

More recently, Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) expanded the definition of faculty work to include “teaching, research, creative endeavors, community involvement, professional service, and academic decision making” (p. 4). This broader definition takes into account the growing work that occurs outside the traditional work role. Indeed, as the years have progressed, faculty have reported working more hours and in a wider array of duties (Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016; O’Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Another aspect of faculty work that has grown more salient in recent years is internationalization. Even though the typical definition of faculty work does not specify international work, internationalization has touched on nearly every area of U.S. higher education, including faculty work. Each of the facets of faculty work noted above (Gappa et al., 2007) could include an international context. How this international experience influences faculty work receives less attention in the literature.

**Internationalization of Faculty Work**

As discussed above, the focus on internationalization in American higher education reaches back to the latter half of the 20th century. Much of the discussion around internationalization grew out of four rationales: political, economic, social-cultural, and academic (Knight, 1997, 1999). These rationales provided the basis for de Witt’s (2002) work addressing the academic impacts of internationalization in the U.S. and Europe, which focused initially on “providing an international dimension to research and teaching, extension of the academic horizon, institution-building, profile-status,
enhancement of quality, and international standards” (p. 85). Before de Witt’s work in 2002, little research focused directly on the impact internationalization had on the work and careers of US faculty. Rather, much work focused on institutional outcomes and the effect on students—their learning, development, and level of global citizenship.

In more recent years, scholars have begun to address the lack of research examining faculty work on an international scale (Huang, Finkelstein, & Rostan, 2014). In particular, Finkelstein et al. (2016) emphasized the importance of considering internationalization efforts when evaluating the work of American faculty. These efforts yield an environment for American higher education faculty that involves “a more-global faculty employment marketplace, research and publishing that is more commonly cross-national, and contemporary faculty who are more obliged to prepare their students as global citizens” (Finkelstein et al., 2016, p. 13). Finkelstein and his colleagues described this modern era of faculty work as a Third Paradigm in which faculty roles are “more narrowly repurposed and, as a consequence, their influence significantly diminished” (Finkelstein et al., 2016, p. 10). I want to understand more fully the perceptions and experiences of faculty members working within this Third Paradigm. In this vein, I see a need to explore the ways faculty members make sense of their roles, given the global factors referred to above and the recent research on faculty careers. The experiences these faculty members have leading study abroad programs on the Camino de Santiago align with their roles in curricular internationalization and global education. As well, leading study aboard programs can inform faculty members’ perceptions of the study abroad experience.
**Faculty and internationalization.** The model for Comprehensive Internationalization developed by the CIGE holds as one of its main pillars the development and implementation of policies and practices related to faculty work. The 2017 *Mapping Internationalization* report questions the “recognition of faculty as key drivers of internationalization” on participating campuses (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017, p. 23). As a reminder, the data that support this assertion stem from a 2016 survey. The respondents to this survey were “provosts… senior international officers, institutional researchers, and presidents”—not average faculty members (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017, p. 3). These data and the subsequent interpretation indicate a disparity between the perceptions of the ACE survey participants and the data sources for a wide swath of research on the role of faculty in internationalization processes.

The literature treats faculty members as fundamental to the internationalization process on campuses (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Finkelstein et al., 2016; Finkelstein, Walker, & Chen, 2013; Huang et al., 2014; Postiglione & Altbach, 2013; Stohl, 2007). Faculty buy-in and participation in campus-wide internationalization efforts are necessary for success, and in many cases their participation can be directly linked to perceptions of the senior administration’s overall administrative competency and motivations (Postiglione & Altbach, 2013). This linkage highlights a possible cause for the discrepancy between the extant literature on faculty work in internationalization efforts and the CIGE findings based on administrators’ perceptions.

Setting aside the disagreement between the recent CIGE data and research on faculty roles and campus internationalization, my study aims to understand how faculty make sense of their participation in a study abroad program on the Camino, which is
considered part of an internationalization effort. To understand how they make sense of these experiences, it is important to understand barriers to engagement in internationalization efforts, how institutions can address these barriers, and the motivations behind faculty engagement.

In *Mapping Internationalization* (2017), institutions reported a substantive increase in professional development opportunities for faculty in relation to internationalization efforts. However, this effort falls far short of the programs and opportunities for administrative staff members. It also is not representative of the decline in these opportunities for faculty at doctoral universities (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). Niehaus and Williams (2015) emphasized that professional development training opportunities are necessary for faculty to feel competent in engaging with internationalization efforts. Another significant barrier is the lack of clarity regarding institutional reward and benefit systems (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). This lack of clarity can prevent faculty buy-in and participation (Dewey & Duff, 2009) and limit faculty in reaching their full potential across their various roles (Niehaus & Williams, 2015). As institutions more clearly articulate reward structures, faculty will be more likely to engage in internationalization efforts, which have long focused on student mobility and learning rather than incentivizing participation from the faculty members in study abroad programs (Stohl, 2007).

The extant research, however, is unclear if external factors alone will prompt faculty to engage. Finkelstein et al. (2013) found that the most significant factor predicting faculty engagement in internationalization efforts was whether an individual had an international experience prior to their academic career. This factor, along with
other individualized factors, was found to impact faculty motivation (Bedenlier & Zawacki-Richter, 2015), and may lead to more understanding about participation of faculty in these efforts. However, there is a gap in the literature regarding how faculty members perceive and make sense of these experiences, once the engagement has taken place, in the greater context of their faculty roles. My research seeks to understand faculty members’ perceptions of their lived experiences, not merely the motivations behind the experiences or any impact the experiences may have had.

**Teaching abroad.** Faculty members who engage in teaching abroad contribute not just to the faculty-based priorities of Comprehensive Internationalization, but also engage in increasing student mobility, developing curricular outcomes, and oftentimes developing collaborative partnerships abroad (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). Teaching abroad is not, however, a duplication of the skills and knowledge needed for teaching on their home campus. Three main areas of inquiry arise regarding teaching abroad that link to my study on Camino-based programs.

As introduced earlier, the Camino as a site for study abroad represents a different environment for teaching and learning than what many U.S. faculty and students are accustomed to. In addition to the physical demands, faculty and students encounter multiple points of cultural difference. These differences manifest not just through interactions between pilgrims and locals, but also in the interactions that pilgrims have with each other. National origin is an important indicator of cultural diversity on the Camino—pilgrims hail from 160 nations (Oficina de Acogida al Peregrino, 2018). This environment provides an opportunity for students to engage across variables of difference they may never encounter on their home campuses.
This may also represent a challenge for faculty members who have spent their careers engaging with students in a classroom teaching discipline-based content without a focus on preparing students to interact across these cultural differences. Faculty members should have access to training materials that help prepare them to engage students in cross-cultural environments (Deardorff, 2009a; Verbik, 2007). These materials or trainings oftentimes fall short or do not take place at all (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). When faculty do not receive the proper development opportunities to prepare themselves and their students for these cross-cultural interactions, they frequently fail in successfully engaging students or meet learning outcomes for the course (Paige & Goode, 2009). Gopal (2011) developed a framework to assist faculty in preparing for teaching abroad, and Teekens (2003) highlighted the importance of aligning teaching expectations with the expectations of the host-country. Through my interviews and observations, I raise these concerns about teaching preparation on the individual faculty level in an attempt to develop an understanding of how participating faculty prepare for the Camino program, and how faculty members make sense of their experiences within the context of their roles on the home campuses.

In addition to engaging in international teaching, faculty participants also walk a portion of the Camino with their students. This physical activity deviates significantly from normal teaching activities for the faculty who participated in my study. Because these programs require such physical activity, the type of faculty member who participates in them does so with the understanding that they will employ a broader set of skills than when they are in a classroom teaching their standard courses. When faculty engage in programs like the Camino-based programs, it is critical that they develop the
skills necessary to balance all roles associated with the study abroad program (Lutterman-Aguilar & Gingerich, 2002). In the context of the Camino and the participants in my study, this also includes developing skills aimed at helping students navigate exposure to different cultures in addition to the physical demands of the program (Citron & Kline, 2001).

Finally, faculty members who travel with students on study abroad and teach abroad assume roles beyond the traditional faculty roles on their home campuses. Goode (2008) illustrated four roles, three non-academic, which faculty directors assume in study abroad programs. These roles, or “dimensions” as Goode (2008) refers to them, are: (a) logistical dimension; (b) intercultural dimension; (c) academic dimension; and (d) Dean of Students dimension. The role most foreign to faculty members is that of “Dean of Students”—the role responsible for the health, physical and psychological wellbeing, and conduct of the student participants (Goode, 2008, p. 155). At times, faculty members may eschew the responsibilities for this role and partner with a colleague from their campus’ Student Affairs departments, which allows the faculty member to focus on the academic portion of the program (Feldman Barr, 2013). These additional roles will be important to explore within the context of faculty who take students on the Camino de Santiago.

**Impact of time abroad.** As teaching and research in a global context becomes central to the modern American faculty role, it is important to understand how faculty experience their time abroad. Even though there is little to no research that distills the essence of the experience of directing a study abroad program like the Camino de Santiago, some literature addresses the perceived influence on faculty members that they
report after engaging in international experiences. These outcomes include increased cultural awareness, academic impacts, and effects on their teaching.

Travel abroad, in particular as part of a faculty development opportunity, impacts the way faculty perceive other cultures (Gouldthorpe et al., 2012; Hamza, 2010). This shift in cultural perception may also align the discussion above on preparing faculty to engage in international teaching. This increased cultural awareness may not be limited to the professional roles of faculty and has the potential to influence a faculty member’s personal life as well (Hamza, 2010). Throughout my study, I seek to understand more fully how faculty describe these experiences in the context of their professional role, a nuance that previous work has omitted.

In addition to shaping perceptions of culture, time abroad also has an impact on the intellectual development of faculty members. Faculty who engage in international experiences oftentimes incorporate those experiences into their research in interdisciplinary ways that further their understanding of their field of inquiry (Festervand & Tillery, 2001; Gouldthorpe et al., 2012; Vincenti, 2001). This academic engagement after an international experience also serves as a vital connection to different perspectives on research and strengthens relationships and collaborations that emerge while faculty are abroad (Mossberg, 1990; Yates, 2002). Much of the existing literature focuses on how a faculty’s international experiences manifest in his or her research output, not the way that faculty make sense of the experiences and contextualize them within their faculty roles more broadly.

Finally, research also suggests when faculty spend time abroad engaged in non-teaching activities such as research or professional development, they report changes in
how they approach their teaching at their home institutions. David Sandgren and colleagues (1999) found direct relationships between participation in a faculty study abroad program and the incorporation of international topics and intercultural teaching into preexisting coursework. Additional research shows that when faculty spent time abroad, ranging from their own study abroad experiences as undergraduates to trips abroad that are part of their current research roles, they perceive influences on their current teaching roles from those international experiences. These include their approach to international students, incorporation of global examples in their courses, and understanding of different cultural teaching norms (Bodycott & Walker, 2000; Lyon, 2001; Miglietti, 2015; Yates, 2002). I believe that this focus on how time spent abroad impacts current teaching practice falls short of understanding the totality of how faculty members make sense of their time spent abroad. This gap is particularly salient when that international experience entails directing a study abroad program that has non-traditional activities associated with it such as the Camino. My research focuses on understanding the breadth and depth of faculty directors’ experiences leading programs on the Camino, and the ways in which they make sense of those experiences in the context of their faculty roles on campus.

Problem Statement

It is clear that study abroad has increased in popularity in American higher education curricula. More students are going abroad now than ever before, and research points to significant outcomes they experience from study abroad (Ogden, 2017). The recent growth in short-term study abroad programs highlights the need for more investigation into the impact of these programs (Ogden, 2017). We know that faculty
have been involved in the internationalization of the American higher education landscape (Finkelstein et al., 2016; Huang et al., 2014; Ogden, 2017), and in the development and implementation of traditional study abroad (Brockington & Wiedenhoeft, 2009; Burn, 1991; Gore, 2009). Some existing research addresses the experiences of faculty when they themselves study abroad (Gouldthorpe et al., 2012; Hamza, 2010; Sandgren et al., 1999). Little research on faculty work, however, addresses the experiences of faculty when they lead students on study abroad. As short-term study abroad increases in popularity and becomes a more significant factor influencing faculty work, it is critical to develop an understanding of how faculty experience these programs and how they contextualize their time leading study abroad within the broader scope of their faculty roles on campus.

**Research Questions**

As mentioned briefly earlier and discussed later in Chapter 3, my research questions evolved as a result of my own evolving interactions with the Camino and study abroad programs. In my pilot studies, I applied a phenomenological approach to understanding one particular lived experience of faculty members—that of leading students on study abroad on the Camino. This approach limited the scope of my study to an understanding of the three to six weeks the faculty were with students on the trail. As the project has developed, I see that this population of faculty members leading study abroad on the Camino constituted a cultural subgroup of U.S. faculty. Conversations with my committee members that spanned months, and in some cases years, have led me to understand the key questions to my study focus on learning about the experiences of faculty on the Camino and how they make sense of these activities in the context of their
broader faculty role. My research interest is more comprehensive than examining a single shared experience of a few weeks’ duration; I want to understand how members of this cultural group constructed meaning within the broader context of their professional lives. The research questions evolved from the pilot studies and my work with my committee members, and I left for six weeks of fieldwork in May 2018.

The research questions for this study are:

- How do faculty members who lead study abroad programs on the Camino make sense of that experience in the context of their faculty roles at their home institutions?
  - How do responsibilities associated with participants’ faculty roles on their home campus shape participants’ experiences teaching on the Camino?
  - How does the Camino culture and discourse shape faculty members’ experiences?

**Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of my study is to explore the faculty experience of leading short-term study abroad programs on the Camino in order to understand how they make sense of these experiences in light of their faculty roles at U.S. institutions of higher education. In particular, this study focuses on faculty members who direct programs that involve the Camino de Santiago pilgrimage route. I analyze these experiences through the lenses of sensemaking (Weick, 1995) and faculty growth (O’Meara et al., 2008) frameworks.
Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

This study approaches the analysis of faculty experiences on the Camino by engaging two distinct frameworks. These two frameworks make up the etic perspective of my research (Fetterman, 2010). They provide the “external, social scientific perspective of reality” in the context of analyzing the culture of Camino-based study abroad (Fetterman, 2010, p. 22). The theoretical framework of sensemaking (Weick, 1995) focuses the study on exploring the ways in which faculty participants describe their experiences on the Camino within the context of their own home campus environments. Sensemaking as a framework for developing the research questions and methodologies allows the participants “to talk about reality as an ongoing accomplishment that takes form when (they) make retrospective sense of the situations in which they find themselves” (Weick, 1995, p. 15). Within this theoretical framework, this study focuses on how leading students on the Camino informs the ways participants make sense of their faculty roles.

The second analytical approach central to this study is a conceptual framework O’Meara et al. (2008) developed that focuses on “an image of faculty members growing, or as having potential to grow, regardless of career stage” (p. 2). The framework for faculty growth emphasizes four thematic areas that provide the lenses for analysis in this study–learning, agency, professional relationships, and commitments (O’Meara et al., 2008). These four thematic areas offer a perspective for viewing how faculty participants’ sensemaking of the Camino experience may contribute to growth and satisfaction in their career.
The pairing of a theoretical framework, sensemaking, and a conceptual framework, faculty growth, allows for a multifaceted approach that provides flexibility in interpretation. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) lamented that in previous studies: when theory was present, the conceptual framework was most often too restrictive. It depended almost exclusively on demographic attributes of age and sex and on career experiences of where the professor had gone to graduate school and was currently working. (p. 11)

The flexibility of using two analytical perspectives for this research is critical in avoiding the narrow, restrictive analysis outcomes to which Blackburn and Lawrence referred. Sensemaking and faculty growth allow a more thorough analysis of participants’ experiences. These ideas surface in the analysis of the emergent themes I identify in Chapter 5. In Chapters 6 and 7, I discuss how the experiences my participants shared map to sensemaking and contribute to a counternarrative of faculty growth as they relate to the theoretical constructs that emerged from my analysis.

**Methods**

This study focuses on the experiences of faculty members who led students on a Camino-based short-term study abroad program in the summer of 2018. To find these pilgrims, I gathered a list of potential participants via an internet search for “summer study abroad Camino programs.” After developing a list of 10 potential participating institutions with programs offered in summer 2018, I established three criteria for faculty participants. These initial criteria were (a) the program director was a faculty member teaching an academic-credit course associated with the Camino program; (b) the Camino-based portion of the program included walking the final 100 km of any Camino route;
and (c) the program arrived in Santiago de Compostela between May 30 and July 1, 2018 when I was in the city. I then reached out to establish an initial connection with faculty members serving as program directors that met all the criteria and ensured their willingness to participate. I initially made contact with 18 potential participants from the 10 programs noted above and ultimately conducted interviews and observations with eight total participants. The original protocol for this study included an audio-recorded interview in the days immediately following the completion of the Camino, document analysis, and engaging in participant-observation in the final days of the Camino portion of the program. After a matter of days in Santiago and contact with two participants, my protocol evolved to allow for non-recorded interviews as well as interviews that could take place weeks after the programs’ completion. I elaborate on the changes that occurred in data collection in Chapter 3.

The interviews and conversations I had with participants evolved from ideas I developed in three previous pilot studies from 2015-17 in Santiago de Compostela. To complement this prior research, I conducted an initial pilot interview in March 2018 to confirm the that the interview protocol for this research was clear, was able to solicit the collection of data relevant to the research questions, and did not contain extraneous questions (see Appendix B). I spent the summer of 2018 on the ground in Santiago. During this time, I engaged in interviews with faculty, spent time observing interactions faculty had with their students, and developed a deeper understanding of the complexities of walking the Camino with students. Following my return to Williamsburg in July, I conducted one final interview with a participant with whom I could not connect while in Spain. Even though many of my interviews were not audio recorded, I produced
recordings of my reactions and thoughts immediately after the interviews and those recordings were transcribed. I also kept detailed notes of each conversation, my reactions, and any ideas for significant meaning or themes that emerged in the conversations. I then developed a set of a priori codes. In addition to my field notes and interviews with participants, I incorporated content analysis of websites and social media accounts associated with the specific programs. Through this methodological approach, I am well-positioned to describe the experience of leading a Camino study abroad program and in turn learn how participants made sense of these experiences in the context of their faculty roles.

**Significance of the Study**

A gap exists in the literature regarding how faculty members leading study abroad programs make sense of their international experiences with relation to their faculty roles on campus. As faculty members design and lead more short-term study abroad programs, particularly those with an experiential component, it is important for research to address the influence of these experiences on the faculty members themselves. This study contributes to the dialog on faculty roles and international education. Faculty leaders at the departmental and dean level will be interested in how participants cast their experiences abroad in terms of their lived experiences on campus. Administrative colleagues in study abroad offices will develop a more complete understanding of how faculty engage short-term international experiences. Finally, individual faculty will encounter stories and emergent themes that will in turn aid in their own sensemaking processes about their faculty roles.
Definition of Terms

Several terms and phrases are critical to the understanding and contextualization of my research and merit definition. These definitions not only introduce the concepts, if a concept is unknown to the reader, but also provide important boundaries and context for my study.

**Camino.** The Camino de Santiago (The Way of St. James) is a network of Catholic pilgrimage routes dating back to medieval times. The trail crosses northern Spain and ends in Santiago de Compostela, the final resting place of the bones of St. James the Apostle. Following a resurgence in the 1970s, the Camino has dramatically increased in popularity in the first decades of the 21st century and sees over 300,000 pilgrims a year (Oficina de Acogida al Peregrino, 2018).

**Ethnography.** Both a methodological approach and a final representation of data, ethnography involves a researcher identifying cultural phenomena within a group of individuals, immersing his or herself within that culture, and producing a thick description of the lived reality of those individuals in a way that is meaningful (Fetterman, 2010; Geertz, 1973; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Markham, 2018).

**Faculty growth.** Faculty growth is the “change that occurs in a person through the course of her or his academic career or personal life and that allows her or him to bring new and diverse knowledge, skills, values, and professional orientations to her or his work” (O’Meara et al., 2008, p. 24). There are four concepts linked with this definition of faculty growth.

**Learning.** Within the context of professional and scholarly growth for faculty members, “learning, as changed cognition, involves the personal and shared construction
of knowledge; it involves coming to know something familiar in different ways, or to know something altogether new, from within one’s self and often with others” (Neumann, 2005, p. 65).

**Agency.** The second concept in faculty growth is agency. “Agency speaks to a feature of the faculty person in the faculty role as she or he strives to construct the contexts of her or his own learning and development in professional and intellectual ways” (O’Meara et al., 2008, p. 28).

**Professional relationships.** These relationships are defined as “interactions that provide personal and professional support; that stimulate, facilitate, and shape learning; and that strengthen faculty capacity to bring the best of their talents to their work roles” (O’Meara et al., 2008, p. 29).

**Commitments.** The final concept in faculty growth is that of professional commitments. These are “long-term, conscious, personal, and professional investments that scholars make in certain people, programs, places, and social concerns through concrete activity that furthers the goals of higher education… we define commitment in terms of conscious choice, active nature, and content” (O’Meara et al., 2008, pp. 30-31).

**Faculty member.** In the context of my study, a faculty member refers to a person in an instructional role who provides leadership in some capacity for a short-term study abroad program that incorporates completing at least a 100km portion of the Camino. Faculty members may occupy both tenure-track and non-tenure-track appointments.

**Faculty role.** This study treats the faculty role as the professional obligations each participant has regarding their contract at their home institution. Recognizing the diversity of appointment types, expectations for research, teaching, and service, and the
different institution types represented in the study, I approach the definition of faculty role as individually defined by each participant.

**Sensemaking.** Sensemaking is the ongoing process of how people derive meaning of lived experiences and perceptions of identity in the context of social environments (Weick, 1995; Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005).

**Short-term study abroad program.** Generally, NAFSA: Association of International Educators refers to programs lasting less than a quarter or semester as short-term. Additionally, NAFSA includes guidelines that short-term programs are “characterized by students traveling as a group led by a faculty (or staff) member from the home institution, with that leader usually teaching at least one course” (Chieffo & Spaeth, 2017, p. 2). This study embraces that definition and delimiting characteristics.

**Student.** In this study, student refers to anyone engaged in the Camino study abroad program that receives academic credit, participates in walking the Camino, and who is not responsible for the administration of the program or instruction of courses.

**Conclusion**

This chapter introduced the study and contextualized the research on the topic of faculty experiences on the Camino and the sensemaking involved related to participants’ faculty roles. This study focuses on faculty members who engage in the Camino as part of a short-term study abroad program with undergraduate students with particular attention to the way they employ sensemaking (Weick, 1995) following that experience. These insights emerged through interviews and observations after participants completed the Camino, either on-site in Santiago de Compostela or via phone within two months of completion. Additionally, the study employs the conceptual framework of faculty growth
(O’Meara et al., 2008). Noting that the literature on student participation in study abroad, as well as that on faculty work and the internationalization of faculty work, is well established, this chapter asserted the purpose and significance of the study to contribute to the broader research dialog.

Now that I have established the context for my project—my Research Camino—I move forward looking at the road ahead. The next chapter addresses the current literature, with a focus on highlighting the gaps that exist pertaining to the topic of faculty growth and sensemaking after leading a short-term study abroad program. There is no extant literature that unpacks the experiences of faculty members leading students on the Camino; therefore, this study contributes to the fields of faculty work, international education, and pilgrimage studies. Chapter 3 more fully explains the methodology for the study. After this methodological discussion, Chapter 4 provides brief participant profiles as well as grounds my own experiences on the Camino in the context of this study. Chapter 5 addresses the emergent theoretical constructs that weave throughout the participants’ experiences leading a program on the Camino. Chapters 6 and 7 provide analysis and discussions of these findings, pointing towards needs for future research and implications for the field.
CHAPTER 2: THOSE WHO HAVE WALKED BEFORE US

In preparing for the Camino, one faces an abundance of guidebooks, blogs, and discussion threads on how to prepare, what to expect, and how best to approach the pilgrimage. Pilgrims rely on the experiences and accounts of those who walked before them in order to plan their own personal journeys. Much like preparing for a hike on the Camino, beginning this study meant developing an understanding of the work that others have done before me. This chapter provides a review of the extant literature related to the thematic areas of this study that focused on faculty sensemaking while leading a study abroad program on the Camino de Santiago. This study examines the experiences of faculty leaders as they embrace new and different roles leading short-term study abroad programs on the Camino de Santiago while still teaching disciplinary content, and, importantly, addresses how the faculty leaders themselves make sense of these experiences in the context of the faculty roles they fill on campus. First, I provide an overview of internationalization in American higher education (Altbach & Knight, 2007; de Wit, 2013; Knight, 2004). This includes an examination of internationalization of higher education globally, the early work of the 1990s to define internationalization, and notable shifts in the post-9/11 world with regards to internationalization research in higher education (De Ridder-Symoens, 1992; Knight, 2012; Rumbley, Altbach, & Reisberg, 2012; Scott, 1998). Next, I address current models of internationalization in U.S. higher education—primarily through reviewing extant research that relates to the American Council on Education’s (ACE, 2017) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) Comprehensive Internationalization Model. As my research focuses on faculty experiences while leading a study abroad program, I turn to study
abroad in contemporary American higher education (Chieffo & Spaeth, 2017; Deardorff, 2006, 2009b; Lemmons, 2015). This section addresses short-term study abroad programs, effects these programs have on students, roles of faculty members in these programs, and the effect on faculty members when engaging in study or teaching abroad. I continue with an examination of the research on faculty roles and work over the past decades, including the effect that internationalization efforts have had on these roles. I then transition to an exploration of the first of two conceptual frameworks employed in this study, faculty growth (O’Meara et al., 2008) and sensemaking (Weick, 1995). The intersection of the two theoretical frameworks builds my conceptual framework.

**Internationalization of Higher Education**

The term *internationalization* emerged in the 1980s as researchers expanded the ways they discussed international dimensions of higher education (Knight, 2012). As discussed in Chapter 1, my study embraces Knight’s (2003) definition of internationalization as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 2). Various stakeholder groups, such as faculty and administrators, have begun to recognize the critical role of internationalization:

Today, internationalization is considered central to the academic enterprise, particularly in terms of planning for the future by policy makers and institutional leaders, and the phenomenon stands out clearly as a strategic objective essential to the relevance, dynamism, and sustainability of the world’s 21st-century institutions and systems of higher education. (Rumbley et al., 2012, p. 3)
Even though the descriptions of international or global activities have evolved over the past three decades, the integration of international perspectives in institutions of higher education is long standing.

For example, de Ridder-Symoens (1992) accounted for academic pilgrims of the Renaissance period who “were the university students and their professors… [travelling] to a university city where they hoped to find learning, friends, and leisure” (p. 280). As Europe became less feudal and nations grew as political, social, and cultural agents, higher education too evolved (Scott, 1998). The loss of Latin as a common language across academia contributed to a decreased international character for higher education, especially as universities sought to support the evolution of European nation-states (de Ridder-Symoens, 1992; Scott, 1998). By the turn of the 20th century, higher education institutions in Europe served a near-exclusive purpose of generating, sustaining, and disseminating national identity (Altbach, 1998; Kerr, 1994; Scott, 1998). As European institutions sought to serve internal interests, the United States began to recognize the importance of engaging with external constituents. In the Middle East, many of the universities had evolved into tropes for colonial power, appealing only to the elite natives or the high class Europeans who could afford to travel to attend them (Mazawi, 2005).

In the years between World War I and World War II, the United States grew as both an importer and exporter of higher education in terms of students, programs, and research (de Wit & Merkx, 2012). During this time period, the University of Delaware began its study abroad program in France in 1923, the first such American program that involved students engaging in academic work abroad (University of Delaware, 2018). This program, initiated by a WWI veteran and a French language instructor, sent students
abroad for their junior year (University of Delaware, 2018). When faculty member Raymond Kirkbride initiated the program, he faced institutional barriers strikingly similar to those today’s faculty deal with, namely a lack of institutional support for funding study abroad, a misunderstanding of the value of study abroad, and difficulty coordinating logistics (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017; University of Delaware, 2018). Ultimately, Kirkbride turned to outside sources for financial support, principally then-Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover (University of Delaware, 2018). Twenty-three years into the program, the University ceased international operations due to WWII (University of Delaware, 2018). In 1948, after WWII ended, the University of Delaware transitioned operations and management of the Junior Year in France (JYF) to Sweet Briar College, a move allowing women to participate in the program, and making the JYF the first coeducational study abroad opportunity in the U.S. The JYF program continues to operate at Sweet Briar College, but is now administered by a corporation. More than 7,300 students have travelled to Paris over the past 70 years as part of the program (JYF in Paris, 2018).

The years following World War II through the turn of the 21st century held significant changes for the global higher education landscape. The United States continued to grow as a global powerhouse for international study and knowledge capital (Goodwin & Nacht, 1991). The Fulbright Act of 1946, and subsequently the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961, served as powerful tools for the United States to exert global influence in two particular ways. First, U.S. scholars and students travelled abroad, taking with them the ideas, values, and cultural norms of post-war U.S. society (de Wit & Merkx, 2012). Second, the Fulbright program, coupled with the Marshall Plan, was a critical
mechanism to provide economic aid to Europe without an explicit expectation of repayment (de Wit & Merkx, 2012; Hogan, 1987). These plans aimed to develop a sense of cultural appreciation among participating countries that would theoretically, and hopefully, help avoid future global conflict (Eddy, 2014).

As the global stage expanded and more actors engaged in international education efforts, the Cold War conflicts that spanned from 1947 through 1991 bled into the geopolitical strategies of the United States and the U.S.S.R. (Holzner & Greenwood, 1995). Both countries established student and scholar exchanges with Southern hemisphere nations to spread their influence and presence (Holzner & Greenwood, 1995). As the Cold War ended with the dissolution of the U.S.S.R. in 1991, higher education began expanding to engage with rising economic powers, including Japan and Australia (de Wit & Merkx, 2012). This expansion marked a shift from geopolitical power struggles toward competition for global economic relevance (Lyman, 1995). Since 1993, there has been a dramatic increase of U.S. institutions establishing programs or campuses in the Arab Middle East (Romani, 2009).

The onset of globalization sparked new interests in higher education. Universities became important figures as “dynamic actor(s) in the global knowledge economy” (de Wit & Merkx, 2012, p. 16). Knight (1997) defined globalization as “the flow of technology; economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas… across borders” (p. 6). This flow, as an externally driven action, merits responses from nations. Knight (1997) viewed “internationalization of higher education as one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalization yet, at the same time respects the individuality of the nation” (p. 6). Scholars began to discuss the globalization of higher education as a distinct line of

My study focuses on the internationalization of higher education with careful attention to the delivery of specific post-secondary educational programs in reaction to globalization. I am interested in how individual faculty members experience aspects of internationalization within the contexts of their work roles. As this review of the literature reveals, there is a lack of research exploring how individual American faculty members experience internationalization, particularly via leading study abroad programs. The particular approach to internationalization varies among campuses, as do individual faculty experiences. However, the model of Comprehensive Internationalization (Hudzik & Stohl, 2012) provides a widely accepted framework to guide conversations on internationalization at the campus and individual level.

**Comprehensive internationalization.** The definition I use for internationalization (Knight, 2003) centers squarely on how post-secondary educators integrate international and global dimensions into the delivery of programs. Additionally, I highlighted ACE’s (2011) CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization. Recall from Chapter 1, Helms and Brajkovic (2017), authors of the ACE CIGE *Mapping Internationalization 2017* report, defined Comprehensive Internationalization (CI) as “a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate policies, programs, and initiatives to position colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected institutions” (p. 1). This approach to CI is common throughout various publications and projects sponsored by ACE and CIGE. The concept of CI itself began to take shape in the early 2000s as a response to the need
for institutions to develop plans for internationalization (Childress, 2009; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Hudzik, 2011). CI acts as an organizing paradigm for institutions to approach international engagement (Hudzik & Stohl, 2012).

There is a common understanding of the characteristics of CI across the literature. Broadly speaking, CI pertains to institutional commitments and priorities, leadership, governance, staffing, learning outcomes, student mobility, faculty work, and internal and external relationships (Green & Olson, 2003; Helms & Brajkovic, 2017; Hudzik, 2011; Hudzik & Stohl, 2012). Hudzik and Stohl (2012) noted, “The most important factor in Comprehensive Internationalization is the faculty” (p. 18). The faculty are at the heart of an institution’s internationalization efforts and should not be marginalized or excluded from planning and implementing new efforts (Postiglione & Altbach, 2013; Stohl, 2007). Dewey and Duff (2009) used their institution’s efforts to highlight a successful CI implementation. They noted that a “faculty-driven approach that focused on mapping internationalization, addressing barriers to internationalization, and improving structures and systems” led to an outcome that satisfied the faculty and the institution’s leadership (Dewey & Duff, 2009, p. 491). The literature is clear on the importance of the role faculty have in CI, and the needs faculty have in increasing internationalization on campus.

If faculty are to engage in CI processes, there are specific recommendations that institutions should follow to ensure faculty support. Helms and Brajkovic (2016) highlighted that while faculty are at the center of CI efforts, the most recent ACE report indicates that institutions are not prioritizing faculty needs or input in their internationalization efforts. Many of these needs are individual and relate to faculty
career choices on engaging in study abroad or international research (Eddy, Barber, Holly, Brush, & Bohon, 2013). In particular, faculty need to see that participation in internationalization efforts will count for tenure and promotion standards (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Eddy et al., 2013; Hudzik, 2011; Stohl, 2007). Faculty also benefit from individual recognition of efforts related to international research via public acknowledgement of their international activities, such as articles in campus-based magazines (Barber, Eddy, & Hanson, 2018). Additional support could manifest through flexible teaching assignments or course schedules that allow faculty to travel abroad during a semester or term (Hudzik, 2011).

As institutions make commitments to faculty at the individual and academic unit levels, they signal a commitment to the broader goals of CI and to sustaining efforts beyond the immediate future (Helms & Brajkovic, 2016). Most of the literature on CI and faculty experiences derived data from focus groups or large surveys of faculty across an institution. Few studies exist that explore an internationalization activity, such as leading a study abroad program, as a phenomenon. My study offers insight into how faculty experience this phenomenon, and I make recommendations in Chapter 7 for how senior administrators, department chairs, or faculty leaders should interpret and evaluate participation in these experiences.

**Study abroad in American higher education.** As discussed in Chapter 1, study abroad has increased significantly in popularity among U.S. undergraduate students (IIE, 2017). This increase has lead not only to the development of more programs for students to engage in, but also to the proliferation of research and literature examining the impact and outcomes of study abroad programs on undergraduate students (Chieffo & Spaeth,
My study focuses on faculty who are leading students on study abroad—not the students themselves. However, it is important to have a general understanding of the extant literature on study abroad in order to highlight the need for more attention on faculty experiences leading students abroad. More specifically, this section addresses the literature on student learning outcomes and development of intercultural competencies resulting from study abroad, as well as forms of academic engagement in global experiences.

**Intercultural experiences.** Throughout the literature, the modifier *intercultural* precedes a plethora of phrases including competence, development, learning, sensitivity, communication, and so on. In one volume alone, there are 17 phrases that begin with *intercultural* (Savicki, 2008). A common umbrella term for these phrases is *intercultural competence*. Darla Deardorff (2004, 2006, 2008, 2009a, 2009b) has written extensively on intercultural competence. Her 2006 study synthesized the definition of intercultural competence in a novel fashion. She brought together characteristics of definitions for intercultural competence from 30 years of research, assembled a panel of 24 recognized leaders in both administration and research, and ranked the aforementioned defining characteristics of intercultural competence (Deardorff, 2006). She distilled the definition further to “the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one’s intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Deardorff, 2008, p. 33). Together with this definition, Deardorff’s (2004) *process model of intercultural competence* highlighted the most critical element as the ability observe, understand, and communicate in different cultural contexts (Deardorff, 2006). Faculty working in study abroad have a unique opportunity to affect a student’s intercultural experiences. My
study examines how faculty perceive their role in leading a study abroad experience and the motivations for engaging students on the Camino.

Many prior studies that focused on intercultural competency used quantitative methods to measure student acquisition. For example, P. Anderson and colleagues (2006) utilized the Intercultural Development Inventory (Bennett & Hammer, 2002) to examine intercultural learning through short-term study abroad. They found that students who participated in these faculty-led short-term programs saw positive developments in their intercultural development. Additional research found that the length of short-term study abroad had an effect on students’ approach to cultural and ethnic identification, as well as communication competencies (Hamad & Lee, 2013). Hamad and Lee’s (2013) work complemented that of P. Anderson and colleagues (2006) and emphasized that the more exposure students have to different cultures abroad, the greater the development.

One mixed methods study highlighted that students experienced positive changes in intercultural knowledge and communication abilities, which are two aspects of intercultural competency (Czerwionka et al., 2015). Though this body of literature aptly addresses student intercultural development, there is scant research on faculty that provides insight into how faculty process and make sense of leading study abroad programs and whether similar intercultural competencies may emerge. The research that addresses the faculty role in intercultural development focuses more prominently on the preparation of the faculty member to enhance student experiences abroad rather than the holistic development of the faculty member’s role (Deardorff, 2008; Selby, 2008).

**Academic learning outcomes.** This section addresses the literature that explores the academic learning outcomes of short-term study abroad. Short-term study abroad
involves “students traveling as a group led by a faculty member from the home institution, with that leader usually teaching at least one course” (Chieffo & Spaeth, 2017, p. 2). Much like literature cited in the sections above, the majority of studies on academic content in study-abroad employed quantitative methods. A traditional view of study abroad programs links second-language acquisition with program goals and outcomes (Lemmons, 2015). Though the variety of short-term study abroad programs has grown, there are still important implications for second-language learning. Lemmons (2015) found significant gains in students’ abilities to “communicate in the target language” (p. 543) as a positive outcome of short-term study abroad. Dwyer (2004) explicated further outcomes beyond foreign language study to include correlations between academic engagement and length of program, as well as the influence study abroad has on academic choices following time abroad. These two studies are among many that address academic learning outcomes through foreign language education abroad (Cubillos, Chieffo, & Fan, 2008; Kinginger, 2009; Reynolds-Case, 2013). In addition to foreign language skills, Perez and Barber (2018) found that short-term study abroad deepened students’ ability to integrate their learning across academic and non-academic outcomes. Ultimately, the literature is clear that short-term study abroad has an effect on academic learning outcomes. However, the extant literature does not adequately address faculty learning while leading study abroad programs. I address this gap through my study.

**Faculty Work in American Higher Education**

Faculty who work at institutions of higher education in the United States have been the topic of intellectual inquiry for quite some time. Before addressing the
evolution of research on faculty work, I first provide an overview of how the definition of faculty roles has evolved. Then, I turn to a review of research that specifically addresses internationalization of faculty work as manifested through faculty’s time spent abroad.

Faculty roles. The role of faculty members on U.S. college and university campuses has won the attention of scholars, with interest growing particularly in the 1990s (Boyer, 1990; Guskin, 1994; Rice, 1996). Traditionally, the idea of a faculty member’s work encompassed three basic functions—teaching, research, and governance (Boyer, 1990; Gappa et al., 2007; Rice, 1996; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Boyer (1990) was at the vanguard of research on faculty roles as appointment types and research expectations began to shift. With the economic pressure to increase student access to and completion of higher education, Guskin (1994) proposed a shift in faculty roles. He saw a need to evolve from the individual work of “research, writing, (and) consulting” and to “restructure the roles of administrators and faculty in order to reduce institutional expense and student costs” (Guskin, 1994, pp. 17-18). He proposed an examination of faculty roles vis-à-vis student learning needs, which would have drastically shifted teaching expectations (Guskin, 1994).

As Guskin (1994) recommended a deeper focus on student learning, other scholars sought to better understand the multiple roles that faculty must fulfilled. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) defined faculty roles through individual properties such as demographics and environmental factors such as workplace culture and socialization. This deeper examination led to an analysis of faculty work within the framework of motivation theory and served as the basis for later research. Following up to Blackburn and Lawrence’s theories for faculty satisfaction, Schuster and Finkelstein (2006)
undertook a massive study of faculty work. They provided historical context of the evolution of faculty roles on U.S. campuses, attempted to piece together data from decades of national surveys on faculty work and demographics, and began the scholarly conversation about the rapidly changing faculty workforce (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). This work emerged as the U.S. economy was entering a financial crisis beginning in 2008, and the dramatic shifts in demographics and appointment types accelerated faster than originally predicted (Finkelstein et al., 2016).

As faculty roles evolved, so too did the research on faculty work. The next section summarizes that evolution. Both the changing definition of faculty roles and the shifts in research on faculty work highlight the importance for understanding how faculty experience their work roles. In many cases mentioned above and in the following sections, this understanding typically derives from analysis of large, quantitative data sets that provide snapshots of faculty from across the nation and across institution types. My study takes a much more nuanced approach to examining faculty roles. My ethnographic methods allow for a deeper understanding of faculty work, specifically regarding how participants experience and make sense of their work roles.

**Evolution of research on faculty work.** Logan Wilson first called for research into faculty work in 1942. Since then, extensive work carried out by researchers first in fields such as sociology and history, and later by academics with degrees and appointments in higher education programs has contributed to our understanding of the U.S. professoriate (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Much of the research on faculty work stems from analyses of nation-wide surveys of post-secondary faculty. These include the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty and the Higher Education Research Institute
Faculty Survey, which both are extensive quantitative approaches to assessing the condition of the U.S. faculty (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). By the 1980s, researchers began to assess faculty work activities, which included teaching assignments and research productivity (Finkelstein, 1984). Bowen and Schuster (1986) worked to establish a thorough account of the demographics and characteristics of the U.S. faculty.

As activities of faculty members became the topic of inquiry, Boyer (1990) highlighted the importance of various types of scholarship as part of the faculty role. Eventually the research exposed emerging trends in faculty appointments, which included the increase of non-tenure eligible appointments (Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998). In a wide-sweeping overview of national survey data from 1969-1997, Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) established the makeup of the second wave of American faculty and the ways in which demographics, globalization, and consumerism interplayed with faculty work. One of the few nation-wide research projects to engage a mixed methods design strategy delved into how faculty members encountered diversity in the workplace and the role that identity played with regards to faculty conceptions of work (Gappa et al., 2007). Qualitative studies on faculty work have focused on demographic characteristics as the unit of inquiry (Baez, 2000; Bracken, Allen, & Dean, 2006; Neumann & Peterson, 1997). My study expands the base of qualitative research through using a specific work activity as the unit of inquiry as opposed to personal characteristics. I focus on the role of faculty work in study-abroad programs, and place that aspect of faculty work within the larger context work roles of college faculty.

**Faculty work abroad.** The work of American faculty members has grown increasingly international in scope as American higher education has become more
internationalized (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). This section highlights two particular facets of internationalization within faculty work—teaching abroad and spending time abroad. As discussed above, intercultural development for students is a critical component of study abroad program development and implementation (Deardorff, 2009a). Though research has not yet explored how faculty develop intercultural competence as a result of teaching abroad, there is an assumption that faculty members be prepared and trained to engage students in cross-cultural environments (Deardorff, 2009a; Verbik, 2007). In addition to emphasizing the need for this preparation, the literature also explores the consequences of a lack of training for faculty who will teach abroad (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007).

Among the different consequences that the extant literature addresses is the failure to successfully engage students to help them develop appropriately as a result of their experiences abroad, and the potential for the faculty members to fail to meet the expectations that they themselves established for the courses taught abroad (Paige & Goode, 2009). Similar to Deardorff’s (2006) framework for intercultural development, Gopal (2011) developed a framework to assist faculty in preparing for teaching abroad. The addition of a framework to help guide faculty is useful, but there remains a gap in the literature concerning understanding faculty perceptions of their experiences teaching abroad vis-à-vis their conceptions of their faculty role. My research seeks to further this understanding.

Time spent abroad has the potential to affect significantly the way faculty members perceive and engage with other cultures (Gouldthorpe et al., 2012; Hamza, 2010). As discussed in the next sections on faculty growth, the literature is clear that
faculty members carry multiple layers of identity (O’Meara et al., 2008). Time spent abroad and the shifts in perceptions of other cultures inevitably intersects with other professional identities and personal identity markers (Hamza, 2010). Just as with students, faculty who spend time teaching or researching abroad may have intellectual outcomes that manifest in their research or writing (Festervand & Tillery, 2001; Gouldthorpe et al., 2012; Vincenti, 2001). Even though there is the potential for this faculty affect to take place, the literature falls short in addressing the ways in which faculty members make sense of changes to their understandings or their experiences abroad. I address how faculty make sense of time abroad when they are in an official work capacity as the director of a study abroad program. In the next section, I discuss how the literature supports the development of faculty work as a conceptual framework for analysis.

Faculty Growth

The concept of faculty growth provides an initial framework for analyzing how my participants talked about their experiences. O’Meara and colleagues (2008) defined faculty growth as “change that occurs in a person through the course of her or his academic career or personal life and that allows her or him to bring new and diverse knowledge, skills, values, and professional orientation” (p. 24). This approach to growth mirrors the work of Erikson (1993) that examined the concept of faculty growth through the lens of human development and the lifespan. In particular, O’Meara and colleagues (2008) defined faculty growth:

As (1) ongoing and in a constant state of becoming as opposed to being fixed, (2) a process that is facilitated by external environments but that also must be viewed
in terms of what individuals themselves want and need as developing persons, and
(3) set in a specific sociocultural and personal context relative to faculty
members’ identities, roles, and work. (p. 26)

These three characteristics come together in a way that, when utilized as a guiding
framework for my study, create an opportunity to better understand how my participants
made sense of leading students on a study abroad program within the context of their
faculty roles. Additionally, these traits of faculty growth fit together well with the social
constructivist ideas of three-fold dialectic—internalization, externalization, and
objectification (Berger & Luckmann, 1966)—and the theoretical approaches of
sensemaking (Weick, 1995; Weick et al., 2005). The following sections expand on the
four tenants of faculty growth.

**Faculty learning.** The concept of faculty learning builds from the assumption
and expectation that faculty members are master learners (Neumann, 2009). As teachers
and scholars, faculty craft their careers around the creation of knowledge. Neumann
(2005) provided a framework definition of faculty learning, she posited “Learning, as
changed cognition, involves the personal and shared construction of knowledge; it
involves coming to know something familiar in different ways, or to know something
altogether new, from within one’s self and often with others” (p. 65). Learning,
therefore, is a process driven by both internal and external circumstances.

The process of learning for adults is shaped by the social world in which the
learning takes place (Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2007). The settings in which
adults learn within this social world are generally viewed as formal institutional settings,
non-formal settings, and informal contexts (Merriam et al., 2007). Formal education
takes place in classrooms and follows a vertical hierarchy of settings (Coombs, 1985; Schugurensky, 2000). Non-formal education is typically voluntary, has no expectation of prior subject knowledge, and follows a set curriculum with learning outcomes (Merriam et al., 2007). Finally, informal learning is “the spontaneous, unstructured learning that goes on daily” and is the most common source of learning for adults (Coombs, 1985, p. 92). As faculty are indeed adults, connections between the concept of faculty learning and adult learning merits exploration, particularly within the informal context.

There are six assumptions that guide common understanding of adult learning which support the concept of faculty learning. Knowles (1980) presented the original four assumptions as follows:

1. As a person matures, his or her self-concept moves from that of a dependent personality toward one of a self-directing human being.
2. An adult accumulates a growing reservoir of experience, which is a rich resource for learning.
3. The readiness of an adult to learn is closely related to the developmental tasks of his or her social circle.
4. There is a change in time perspective as people mature—from future application of knowledge to immediacy of application. Thus, an adult is more problem centered than subject centered in learning. (pp. 44-45)

In follow-up work, Knowles (1984) advanced two additional assumptions:

1. The most potent motivations are internal rather than external (p. 2)
2. Adults need to know why they need to learn something (p. 8).
These assumptions lay the groundwork for a conceptual framework regarding adult learning, rather than establish a theoretical concept (Knowles, 1989). This framework supports the aforementioned research on faculty learning, and serves as a useful point of departure for analysis and theme development for my own research on faculty learning as part of leading students on the Camino de Santiago pilgrimage.

In the context of my study, the participants may have experienced learning in each of the ways outlined by Knowles (1980, 1984). The Camino is a communal activity, and particularly so for faculty who are leading a group of students as part of a study abroad program. Simultaneously, the Camino environs encourage and support internal reflection. The participants in my study may have found that both contexts encourage learning.

Agency. Sociologists define agency as the “the human capacity… to act intentionally, planfully, and reflexively and in a temporal or a biographical mode” (Marshall, 2000, p. 11). As previously noted, faculty learning grows out of both internal and external contexts that an individual faculty member experiences. The concept of agency as defined by Marshall (2000) takes root in the ability of faculty members to construct those contexts (Neumann, Terosky, & Schell, 2006). This construction speaks to faculty members’ capacities to act in the ways that “garner power, will, and desire to create work contexts” (Elder, 1997, pp. 964-65). Within the framework of faculty growth, O’Meara and colleagues (2008) emphasized three critical moments of understanding within the broader literature on faculty agency.

First is the differentiation between the sociological concept of agency and the concept of academic freedom. Gappa et al. (2007) offered an updated treatise on
academic freedom. They stated that academic freedom is a faculty member’s “freedom in the classroom to discuss their subjects, freedom to conduct research and publish its results, and freedom to speak and write as citizens” (Gappa et al., 2007, p. 227). Even though this serves as one aspect of how faculty members engage in their work, O’Meara and colleagues (2008) argued “agency applies to the lives of personas more broadly” and beyond the execution of behaviors and specific job tasks (p. 28, emphasis in original).

A second important characteristic of agency within the framework of faculty growth is the recognition that agency is exercised—or not—within the context of a social world. Elder (1994) emphasized the interplay between agency and the social order of the world in which individuals live. As part of constructing contexts via agency, individuals engage in a dialectical process that contributes to the construction of their social reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Finally, agency is part of an individual’s temporal experience. Emirbayer and Mische (1998) viewed this temporal characteristic as also acting through “different structural environments… in interactive response to the problems posed by changing historical situations” (p. 970). Thus, one situation where agency takes place and is at play is as faculty members construct their social reality within the context of their past, present, and future experiences (O’Meara et al., 2008). These experiences include interactions with others via the development of professional relationships.

**Professional relationships.** As faculty members grow and develop professionally, they form relationships that invigorate their work. These relationships with colleagues are integral to career satisfaction (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). The literature has explored the impact of relationships across demographic variables as well.
Neumann (2006) found that faculty members who recently earned tenure highlighted the importance of relationships with colleagues. Other studies have noted that women in the academy feel more strongly about their relationships with students, not just colleagues, than their male counterparts (Ropers-Huilman, 2000). The development and maintenance of these relationships contribute to both the agency faculty members have in constructing their social worlds and the ways in which they engage in learning opportunities. Within the context of my study, I am interested in understanding the types of professional relationships my participants develop in order to carry out their role as a study abroad program director.

**Commitments.** Commitments affirm an individual’s values and represent “a conscious act or realization of identity and responsibility” (Perry, 1968, p. 135). These conscious choices interplay with the other components of the faculty growth framework. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) extrapolated institutional commitment through longevity at an institution as an indicator of job satisfaction. The commitments that individuals make inform the relationships they develop and affirm “personal dedication to particular people, groups, or social concerns” (O’Meara et al., 2008, p. 31). Within the context of my study, participants are making commitments in many ways to the programs they are leading, students they are teaching, and roles that fulfill on their home campuses.

The literature shows the four aspects of faculty growth are rooted in long-held understandings of faculty work. In many cases, the sociological and psychological underpinnings of these concepts are based on studies dating back to the mid-twentieth century. More recent studies supporting the faculty growth framework focused on demographics. This research included examining agency among faculty of color (Baez,
2000), exploring relational constructs employed by recently tenured faculty (Neumann, 2006), and commitments of individuals working in a specific agricultural sector (Peters, Jordan, Adamek, & Alter, 2005). These nuanced studies contribute to the framework of faculty growth. However, little to no work exists examining the experiences of faculty who lead study abroad programs and the ways in which they make sense of those experiences vis-à-vis this professional growth framework. My study seeks to understand how faculty members make sense of their experiences leading a study abroad program on the Camino de Santiago, with particular attention to faculty growth presented in the analysis in Chapter 7 of this dissertation.

**Sensemaking**

As an organizing theoretical concept and a set of behaviors, sensemaking “involves the ongoing retrospective development of plausible images that rationalize what people are doing” (Weick et al., 2005, p. 409). This process of sensemaking grew out of an organizational theory approach to the ways people constructed meaning out of their lived experiences (Weick, 1995). Sensemaking has seven properties that distinguish it from other social constructivist actions; it is “grounded in identity construction, retrospective, enactive of sensible environments, social, ongoing, focused on and by extracted cues, and driven by plausibility rather than accuracy” (Weick, 1995, p. 17). Higher education scholars have used sensemaking as an effective framework for analyzing and interpreting a variety of research questions. Below I provide examples of sensemaking within the higher education context and note how this framework connects to my research study.
Research that employs sensemaking spans across the various themes and populations in higher education studies. Scholars have used sensemaking to examine how undergraduate students engage in discipline-specific identity construction and skill development (Eliot & Turns, 2011; Harmer, 2009; Smith, 2006). Other studies have explored undergraduate identity development and behavior decisions outside the classroom (Ellison, Lampe, & Steinfield, 2010; Harper, 2009; Norman, Conner, & Stride, 2012). Graduate students have also received attention in the literature. Suspitsyna (2013) examined international graduate student narratives of their experiences in the United States. Many scholars have discussed graduate student development as future researchers and practitioners (Boyatzis, Stubbs, & Taylor, 2002; Dervin, 1998; Mumford et al., 2008). In addition to the extant literature on students, many studies address sensemaking among faculty members.

Faculty engage in sensemaking in a variety of scenarios. Bensimon (1991) highlighted the implications for sensemaking among faculty concerning the conceptualization of faculty roles and work identities. Much of the literature on faculty sensemaking relates to times of transition. These transitions occur on the individual, unit/departmental, or institutional levels. On the individual level, O’Meara (2003) explored faculty reactions to post-tenure review and Neumann (1995) studied how faculty made sense of financial stress. These studies found that individuals made sense differently, even when faced with similar contexts. On the departmental level, faculty engage in sensemaking when there are reorganizations that impact how faculty do their work and with whom they engage on a daily basis (Mills, Bettis, Miller, & Nolan, 2005). The way that faculty described these transitions is important. Bean (1998) emphasized
the language faculty used when engaging in sensemaking has the power of legitimizing new situations or individuals in new roles. This concept of legitimization derives from Berger and Luckman’s (1966) discussion on developing “new meanings that serve to integrate the meanings already attached to disparate institutional processes” (p. 85). These moments that need sensemaking typically surface when there are transitions that require connecting disparate processes or groups. Leadership transitions at institutions create situations that result in sensemaking across the university (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Birnbaum 1988). Sensemaking is an important factor in guiding institutions through change and transformation (Kezar, 2013b; Kezar & Eckel, 2002). While moments of change and transition have emerged as critical sources of inquiry for higher education scholars, there is a gap in the literature for further exploring sensemaking and faculty roles. Namely, the areas of sensemaking for faculty leading study abroad is unexplored.

The employ and analysis of sensemaking “holds much promise for understanding faculty responses to new, unfamiliar, or otherwise complex situations” (O’Meara et al., 2008, p. 142). These situations can occur at any point in a faculty member’s career and are not limited to moments of transition, though the extant literature focuses heavily on significant moments of transition. The analysis that I present in Chapter 6 engages a sensemaking framework to explore individual faculty experiences in a particular iteration of their faculty role. This approach differs from the previous studies mentioned here in that the unit of analysis does not revolve around a significant transition.

Chapter 6 maps the theoretical constructs that emerged in my study to the framework of sensemaking. Sensemaking provides a vehicle for my analysis to show the
social construction in which my participants engaged. This theoretically informed analysis provides insight into how the individual participants viewed and experienced their time leading a study abroad program on the Camino. Then, in Chapter 7, I discuss how those constructs and the process of sensemaking contribute to a counternarrative on faculty growth. The framework of faculty growth allows for a different, though related, approach. Analysis based on faculty growth sheds light on how these experiences fit within the framework and provides examples that guide recommendations in Chapter 7 for future research and for higher education leaders on how to effectively promote faculty growth. Through this approach, I link both theoretical and practical analysis in a way that contributes to a better understanding of faculty work.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I highlighted some extant research on the internationalization of higher education, study abroad impacts on students, and faculty work. Additionally, I provided an overview of my study’s theoretical and conceptual frameworks. Research exists on these topics independently; yet there is a gap in the literature regarding how faculty members make sense of leading study abroad programs. These experiences connect issues of internationalization and faculty work in an important way. Understanding my participants’ experiences leading students on the Camino offers the opportunity to examine these issues at the individual level, whereas much of the extant research analyzes internationalization and faculty work at a much broader level.
CHAPTER 3: FOLLOWING THE ARROWS

Contemporary pilgrims navigate the Camino by following yellow arrows across the Spanish countryside. These arrows provide direction and uniformity to the experience, allowing pilgrims to recreate a medieval route through modern towns and cities. This chapter serves as a set of yellow arrows for my study, guiding the reader through my thinking and research methods in a way that provides direction and an understanding of my approach.

My qualitative study analyzes the experiences of U.S. faculty members who lead students on a short-term study abroad program that incorporate hiking the Camino de Santiago, a pilgrimage route in Northern Spain. As described in Chapters 1 and 2, U.S. higher education has undergone significant internationalization efforts, including the increase in undergraduate study abroad programming (Chieffo & Spaeth, 2017; Ogden, 2017). Additionally, the nature of faculty roles has shifted over time (Finkelstein et al., 2016; O’Meara et al., 2008), which merits further research particularly concerning internationalization and sensemaking on an individual faculty level (O’Meara et al., 2008). This chapter describes the evolution of methodologies for my study. I discuss the design of the study and the evolution of my methodological approach. Then, I detail my experiences with the Camino and teaching abroad to provide context for my positionality. I move to a discussion of the interpretive framework and philosophical assumptions, and the methodological grounding for participant selection. I then describe the sources and collection of data, data analysis, and the steps taken to address...
trustworthiness. Finally, I review the delimitations, limitations, and assumptions of my work. The research questions that guide my study are:

1. How do faculty members who lead study abroad programs on the Camino make sense of that experience in the context of their faculty roles at their home institutions?
   a. How do responsibilities associated with participants’ faculty roles on their home campus shape participants’ experiences teaching on the Camino?
   b. How does the Camino culture and discourse shape faculty members’ experiences?

**Study Design**

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the literature regarding student learning and study abroad, internationalization of U.S. higher education, and faculty roles consists of research approaches from qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods research designs. The studies that use quantitative methods typically glean data from multiple large-scale surveys that focus on the profession of faculty as a whole across the United States (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Finkelstein et al., 2016; Gappa et al., 2007; O’Meara et al., 2008; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The qualitative studies reviewed that focused on faculty work took nuanced approaches to demographic variables such as gender and career-stage (Bracken et al., 2006; Neumann, 2009). I use an inductive qualitative approach that examines the experiences of a community of faculty engaged in a particular cultural practice. My research addresses a gap in the literature on faculty roles and international education regarding how individual faculty members relate their
experiences with international education to their faculty role. To accomplish this aim, my research design evolved over the course of collecting and analyzing data and immersing myself in the extant literature. Initially, in the pilot studies, I employed an emergent, flexible design shaped by a phenomenological perspective (Patton, 2002; Vagle, 2014). As I continued to immerse myself in the development of my research project, this approach shifted. Ultimately, I employed ethnographic methods for participant observation, reflection, data gathering, and data analysis and interpretation (Fetterman, 2010; Wolcott, 1999).

Research Method

Because I want to understand how faculty members experience leading a study abroad on the Camino, a qualitative approach is appropriate. My research design uses qualitative methods to allow for the voices and experiences of my individual participants to emerge. “Qualitative research begins with assumptions and the use of interpretive/theoretical frameworks that inform the study of research problems addressing the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 44). To comprehend the shared lived experience fully and meaningfully, my research method involves “talking directly with people, going to their homes or places of work, and allowing them to tell the stories unencumbered by what we expect to find or what we have read in the literature” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 45). Creswell and Poth (2018) highlighted various situations in which utilizing a qualitative approach is appropriate. Table 1 connects Creswell and Poth’s (2018) seven appropriate uses of qualitative research with key elements in my study.
Table 1

*Connections Between Qualitative Research and My Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative research</th>
<th>Key concepts guiding my study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is conducted because a problem or issue needs to be <em>explored</em> and...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a <em>complex</em>, detailed understanding of the issue is needed.</td>
<td>We know little about how faculty who lead students on study abroad on the Camino make sense of their experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a desire to <em>empower</em> individuals exists.</td>
<td>Faculty agency is a key component of the faculty growth framework (O’Meara et al., 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a <em>literary, flexible style</em> of reporting is appropriate.</td>
<td>Providing meaningful accounts of experiences warrants a more literary writing style (Fetterman, 2010; Wolcott, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an understanding of <em>contexts</em> in which participants in a study address a problem is warranted.</td>
<td>The construction of context within a social world leads to sensemaking of experiences (Berger &amp; Luckmann, 1966; Weick, 1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a follow-up <em>explanation of mechanisms</em> about quantitative findings is sought.</td>
<td>Much of the research on faculty work has focused on national surveys and data sets, therefore a deeper understanding of individual experiences is needed (Finkelstein et al., 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a <em>theory</em> to address gaps in understandings is developed.</td>
<td>While not in the scope of this study, future research should aim to develop a theory on faculty experiences leading students on study abroad programs in general, and specifically on experiential programs like the Camino.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a <em>lack of fit</em> between quantitative measures and the problem exists.</td>
<td>Developing a deep understanding of a specific group’s experiences and values requires a research approach that allows for flexibility and interpretation as the project evolves (Wolcott, 1999, 2001).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Guidelines for use of qualitative research reprinted from Creswell & Poth (2018, p. 46), emphasis in original.

Given the alignment my research questions and the purpose of my study with the guidelines for appropriate uses of qualitative research (Creswell & Poth, 2018), choosing
a qualitative approach is appropriate. In the beginning stages of this study, I opted to employ a phenomenological design. At that time, I understood the act of leading a study abroad program to be a singular experience—a faculty member would leave their home institution, direct the program, and return. Phenomenology would have provided me the framework to analyze this experience and draw conclusions related to how faculty made sense of the experience as an isolated act, or, quite literally as a phenomenon. As I approached summer 2018 when I would be conducting my interviews, I continued thinking about my methodology, the questions that I sought answers to, and most importantly my own experiences with the Camino and study abroad programs. I began to understand more clearly that this project was not about the singular experience, or phenomenon, of leading students on the Camino. This project was about discovering how individuals belonging to a vast cultural group—U.S. faculty members—created meaning from their experience leading students on the Camino in the broader context of their faculty roles (Fetterman, 2010; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999).

Ethnography is a method and outcome that seeks to describe, understand, and analyze the behaviors of a particular cultural group (Fetterman, 2010). Ethnography can help us understand “how a cultural group works and to explore the beliefs, language, behaviors, and issues facing the group” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 93). With disciplinary roots in cultural anthropology, ethnography began as a scientific method for observing the foreign world with the aim of contextualizing exotic cultures within the colonial psyche (Erickson, 2018). In the mid-20th century, ethnography turned to constructing the reality of other cultures through strict observations (Erickson, 2018). This approach, “realist ethnography,” had a “literary quality of ‘you are there’ reporting,
in which the narrator presents description as if it were plain fact, and *general* because it attempted a comprehensive description of a whole way of life in the particular setting” of interest (Erickson, 2018, p. 42, emphasis in original). Moving into the 1980s, anthropology shifted as a discipline toward cultural interpretation. Culture grew into something much larger than the quotidian; it became a topic for analysis and at times a subject of critical inquiry calling for change (Fetterman, 2010). Ethnography, then, as a tool for observation, interpretation, and analysis “offers investigators the opportunity and the tools necessary to enter into new field situations and to investigate newly identified social issues or behaviors without the constraints of preexisting instruments or assumptions about the situation” (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p. 38). I began to see clearly that my study was inherently ethnographic.

However, the Camino does not lend itself to traditional ethnography (Frey, 1998). Nancy Frey (1998), the noted anthropologist whose decades of work on the Camino began with her own dissertation research in the early 1990s, talked about the Camino as a research topic:

As a field site the Camino presents a number of challenges methodologically. First, unlike most anthropological studies conducted in fixed locations, both the Camino itself and the population of pilgrims are in a constant state of flux. When the pilgrimage is completed, the pilgrims return to more than sixty countries. Second, pilgrimage is process and pilgrims often discuss how their motives evolve over time. And third, pilgrims frequently find themselves at a loss to articulate this process while doing the Camino and may only realize its importance after they return home. (p. 195)
As discussed in Chapter 1, the Camino is a peculiar place. Frey highlighted the challenges associated with studying pilgrims decades ago in the 1990s. These challenges have become more prescient with the advances in technology and increased internationalization of the pilgrim population.

The ethnographic work for this study took place in Santiago de Compostela, along the Camino Francés and the Camino Inglés, and in Williamsburg, Virginia, in the United States. This study is, therefore, a multi-sited ethnography. I chose to “follow the people”—a method Marcus (1995) highlighted as critical method for multi-sited ethnography:

The exchange or circulation of objects or the extension in space of particular cultural complexes such as ritual cycles and pilgrimages may be rationales for such ethnography…. Their strategic significance as single-site research with multiple sites evoked is their ‘off-stage’ knowledge, so to speak, of what happens to their subjects in the other sites. The sense of ‘system’ in their work arises from the connection between ethnographic portraits of their subjects and the posited relationship of these portraits to the fates of these same subjects in other locations. (p. 106)

Over the course of this research, I have engaged a population that we knew little about in order to better understand the ways in which these individuals make meaning from shared practices within the large context of their cultural group. My research examines a place and population that transcended traditional, single-site ethnography and delved deeper into the participants’ experiences across different contexts and roles in their professional lives as faculty members.
Ethnographic Presence

Fetterman (2010) names the understanding of “how close the ethnographer is to the people and to the data and their role in the story” the ethnographic presence (p. 128). Here, the researcher shares this presence throughout an ethnography in ways that emphasize the depth of understanding of the data, the richness of shared experiences, and the ideas, values, and assumptions that evolve throughout the study (Creswell & Poth, 2018; DeWalt & DeWalt, 2011; Fetterman, 2010; Wolcott 1999, 2001). I provided a brief history of my relationship with the Camino in Chapter 1, and in this section, I delve deeper in those experiences and the processes involved in the development of this study.

As I wrote in Chapter 1, my involvement with the Camino began in spring 2013 on the invitation of George Greenia. I was in the beginning stages of my doctoral program and working in the Dean of Students Office at William & Mary. In my professional role, I managed enrollment services and transfer student services, and spent a great deal of time counseling distressed students with issues ranging from homesickness to deep depression and anxiety. As I walked with George, the other faculty, and the students, I started thinking about how the Camino offered a time-and-place-bound opportunity for reflection and escape from quotidian life. It was on this trip that I first met Kathleen (Kay) Jenkins. As we walked together, we talked about how we both were observing the Camino world through our respective lenses—she is a sociologist who studies family and religion, at the time I was a student affairs practitioner deeply involved in the emotional work of supporting students academically and emotionally. I started to muse about dissertation topics that would include studying how students reacted to their time on the Camino.
Next, I accompanied George and Kay in summer 2014 as they directed the study abroad program through William & Mary. I spent five weeks in Santiago, half of which I spent in town with Kay as she taught classes on field methods, note-taking, and basic sociological concepts. During the other half of the trip, I walked with a group of students and George for six days on the Camino Inglés. This year was different than 2013. The group this time was formal—the students enrolled in a program, George was teaching on landmarks and cultural history, and I was the program assistant. This position entailed providing logistical support for George, caretaking for the students, and overall serving as the second-in-command for the group. I noted how it felt different on the Camino this time. I felt that the journey was not my own like it was in the prior year. I had responsibilities, students acknowledged that I had positional authority and power, and I felt like I occupied an odd role where I was neither teacher nor student nor friend. Back in Santiago, things were different as well since I had my own hotel room with privacy and Kay and George were in charge of the program. I had no more responsibility, authority, or power.

After that summer, I became involved in the Institute for Pilgrimage Studies. I started helping with the logistics for the annual symposium that William & Mary hosts. Through the symposium, I met dozens of scholars who researched and taught about the Camino. Many of them shared stories about how they took students on the Camino, either through official study abroad programs or as unofficial field trips. By this time, I was well into my doctoral coursework, and had started the research sequence in the program. Everyone was telling me to start thinking about a dissertation topic as soon as
possible. I was intrigued by the idea of writing about the Camino. I was still in my student affairs role, and the work was getting more emotionally taxing.

I did not travel to Spain in the summer of 2015. I was unable to take off enough time from my professional position to both travel to Spain and maintain my travel to Nicaragua with the non-profit organization I had worked with since 2007. George directed the study abroad program again with another faculty member. I continued my work with the Institute for Pilgrimage Studies, organizing most of the logistics for the symposium and working more closely with Kay and other faculty on strengthening the organization.

The 2015-16 academic year marked a turning point in many ways. In the fall, I had the opportunity to co-teach a course in my graduate program with Dot Finnegan. Dot had retired just as I was beginning my doctoral work and had been a mentor for me since my master’s program. Co-teaching History of Higher Education with her was my first opportunity to teach. Dot graciously spent hours with me as we reviewed the syllabus, updated the readings, and wrote lectures—hours she did not have to spend as she had taught this course for decades. Learning how to prepare and deliver a course from Dot sparked an excitement in me for teach and showed me that I had the capability of doing so. Simultaneous to my co-teaching with Dot, I was taking a course on the Internationalization of Higher Education from Pam Eddy—my dissertation chair. The confluence of teaching the history of higher education and learning about the internationalization of the same exposed me to the connections, and lack thereof, between the two, specifically regarding faculty. My work with Kay continued that year as well, and she invited me to come to Santiago in summer 2016 as her research assistant. Over
the course of that year, I had my first opportunity to teach, I began to isolate gaps in the literature regarding faculty and internationalization, and I had the opportunity to serve as a research assistant in Spain. By the time I travelled to Spain in May 2016, I knew that I wanted to learn more about faculty who taught study abroad, and I wanted to learn how to learn more about them.

The month of fieldwork with Kay in summer 2016 was fundamental in deepening my understanding of the Camino and developing my observational and interview skills. During this time, I worked in the Pilgrim’s Office for what was now the third year. I spent time welcoming pilgrims and identifying potential participants for Kay’s research. Kay and I spent time finding participants, observing interactions, and talking about my research ideas. I was able to identify and speak with many faculty who were leading study abroad programs on the Camino over this time as well.

In August 2016, James Barber and I were selected to lead the 2017 study abroad program. We began working together to redevelop the program and design our courses. This was the first time that I had designed a course from scratch and working with him through this process was invaluable. At the fall Symposium for Pilgrimage Studies, I had many conversations with faculty who had taken students on the Camino. They shared insights on how they structure their classes, strategies for interacting with students, and logistical suggestions for accommodations. I began to understand that this experience was something completely different from normal teaching for them; they spoke about leading these kinds of programs as a stark departure from their normal approach to work.

The five-week program that Jim and I led consisted of us both teaching a class and walking from León to Santiago with our seven students. The complexity of my role
in 2017 completely overshadowed the ambiguity I experienced in 2014. Jim and I were immersed in the lives of our students for the 15 days we were walking. By this point, I had transitioned to my new role in Arts & Sciences and no longer worked in the Dean of Students Office. While I was no longer working with students on a daily basis, I found myself thinking many times over the course of the trip about how grateful I was for the eight years I spent in student affairs. Jim also has a background in student affairs, and I believe that this shared background provided context for the work that we were engaging in on the Camino.

The final portion of fieldwork that I engaged in was during the summer of 2018. The five weeks I spent in Santiago focused on identifying participants, conducting interviews and observations, and volunteering in the Pilgrim’s Office. This dissertation is the culmination of a journey that started six years ago on a Camino. My study began with a curiosity of how students experienced the Camino, shifted toward faculty perceptions of students while on the Camino, and ended as an investigation into how faculty made sense of leading students on the Camino as part of study abroad. These experiences with the Camino have provided me a depth of understanding about the shared culture among pilgrims and what it is like to lead and teach students in a study abroad program on the Camino. This journey would not have been possible without the guidance and mentorship from my dissertation committee members. Both Jim and Kay have been central figures in how I interact with the Camino from teaching to research to writing. My dissertation committee has not only guided me through the mechanics of writing up my study, but through the entire process from initial ideas onward. As I write this dissertation, I am bringing these years of experiences into my analysis and
interpretation. The experiences with my participants, my students, and my committee members influence how I see the social world of the Camino and how I approached this study as an insider of the cultural group of faculty who lead students on the Camino through study abroad.

**Interpretive Framework**

Ethnographic methods within a qualitative design guided the methodology of the study and the analysis and interpretation of the data that emerged. These practical approaches were supported by the philosophical assumptions and the research paradigm that informed the conceptualization of the study, namely an interpretative framework. Interpretive frameworks “may be paradigms, or beliefs that the researcher brings to the process of research, or they may be theories or theoretical orientations that guide the practice of research” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 22). I discussed above how I approached the study based on my previous experiences. In this section, I connect those experiences to philosophical assumptions.

**Philosophical assumptions.** My study takes into account the ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological assumptions inherent in qualitative research, as identified by Creswell and Poth (2018). Ontological assumptions address the ways in which reality emerges through the interpretations of multiple points of view of individuals (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Within my research, and particularly through the employ of a social constructivist paradigm, those multiple realities emerge through the documentation of individual participants’ experiences, as well as deliberate reflection of my own experiences, in relation to developing themes. Establishing my ethnographic presence outlines how I approach my research from professional, personal, and academic
perspectives. Chapter 4 contains profiles of my participants, summarizes their experiences and history with the Camino, and highlights their reflections on their role as a study abroad program director. The summative experiences I had spending time in Santiago de Compostela, walking the Camino with students as a program assistant, and teaching in a study abroad program on the Camino formed the epistemological grounding for this study (Wolcott, 1999). As outlined above, these experiences undoubtedly contribute to different values I bring to my work and the assumptions that I make throughout the research process (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The values and assumptions that emerged from my time in the field influence the way that I approach my observations, the analysis of the interviews and time spent with my participants, and the way that I write about these things (Denzin, 1989).

Finally, the methodological assumptions of this qualitative study guide the inductive approach to my research. The methods, which I discuss in detail below, allow the study to evolve as the data collection and analysis continuously inform decisions regarding the larger, more generalized, design of my project (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In particular, the methodological assumptions that guide my study are rooted in ethnography and nested within a social constructivist research paradigm (Creswell & Poth, 2018; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Wolcott, 1999).

**Research paradigm.** Part of the design for my ethnographic study is the adoption of a social constructivist research paradigm (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Research through the lens of social constructivism emphasizes that, “individuals seek understanding of the world in which they live and work. They develop subjective meanings of their experiences” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 24). Within this paradigm,
researchers provide breadth and openness in their methods to allow for individual stories, experiences, and meanings to emerge (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In addressing the philosophical assumptions discussed above, social constructivism allows for an emphasis on individual interpretations of knowledge, a co-constructed reality between the researcher and participant, recognition of the values of each individual participant, and an inductive and emergent research design.

Berger and Luckmann (1966) discussed the dialectic nature of constructing social realities: “it is important to emphasize that the relationship between man, the producer, and the social world, his product, is and remains a dialectical one” (p. 57). Within the context of my research, the faculty participants engaged with the social world of the Camino as a classroom. The participants internalized the world around them, a process “by which the objectivated social world is retrojected into consciousness in the course of socialization” (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 57). This cycle of externalization, objectification, and internalization forms the basis of how individuals construct the realities they occupy and begin to legitimize them internally and externally. The construction of social realities leads to the need to make sense of these realities based on the social roles that individuals fulfill. Thus, I use sensemaking as a theoretical framework for analysis and discussion of the data that emerged from my study (Weick, 1995).

**Sampling Strategies and Participant Recruitment**

In this section, I outline how I recruited and selected participants for my study. I discuss my criterion-based sampling strategy, which included a multi-faceted recruitment effort.
**Sampling approach.** Ethnography evolves from a coincidence between place and purpose (Wolcott, 1999). My place, Santiago de Compostela, is the central location of a culture-sharing group; the social practices, experiences, and motivations for those leading study abroad along the Camino about which were relatively unknown. U.S. faculty who took students on the Camino constitute this cultural group with shared roles, attitudes, languages, and patterns of behavior (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Once I selected the place and identified the group, I started to “examine people in interaction in ordinary settings and discern pervasive patterns” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 93). In my fieldwork, I began to identify members of the cultural group, and at the point in my research where I made determinations for interviews, I employed a purposive, criterion selection process (Wolcott, 1999). The foundation for my study, as noted above, formed years before my interviews took place in summer 2018. As May 2018 approached when I would arrive in Santiago to conduct interviews, I developed a selection process to narrow the field of potential participants.

I implemented two levels of evaluation for potential participants. This selection process took place in spring 2018, and I outline below the nature of selecting participants and the final participation rate of potential participants. The first level was the individual level. The potential participant must:

- Be responsible at least in part for the administration and/or direction of a study abroad program that incorporates the Camino;
- Be a faculty member at a U.S. institution of higher education;
- Be responsible for teaching an academic credit-bearing course during the summer of 2018 as part of a study abroad program, and;
• Be walking the final 100km of any Camino route with the students enrolled in said program.

Regarding the second criterion noted above, I define faculty member as an individual who carries an academic appointment and has the authority to teach courses and award grades for credit. I do not restrict the definition of faculty member to any particular appointment type, (e.g., tenured, tenure-track, adjunct, or continuing non-tenure-track).

The criterion related to walking the Camino—for both the individual and the program—merits further explanation. The faculty participants I sought were those who led programs designed to walk the Camino; initially I did not intend to engage with programs that included motorized transportation between sites or cities along the way. However, as I will discuss in Chapter 4, two of my participants designed a program that incorporated multi-modal transportation in order to see as much of Spain as possible, and then walked the final 120km to Santiago.

The secondary level of criteria for potential participants focused on the program itself. The program must:

• Be based at the home institution of the faculty director;
• Involve undergraduate students;
• Offer academic credit as part of the program;
• Involve walking at least 100km of the Camino, and;
• Ideally end between May 30 and July 1, 2018.

These selection criteria on both the individual level and program level focus on ensuring that, within as much reason as possible, participants would be members of the
aforementioned cultural group of U.S. faculty who took students on the Camino as part of study abroad.

**Participant recruitment.** The purposeful, criterion-based selection process for this study began in December 2017. My initial goal was to have interviews scheduled prior to my arrival in Spain. The principle method for identifying potential participants was a Google search for the phrase “Camino de Santiago study abroad summer 2018.” This preliminary search in December 2017 yielded 32 potential participants who would be engaging in programs in summer 2018. Upon application of selection criteria, however, this number reduced to 15 potential participants. These potential participants included faculty members with whom I had previous conversations during my earlier fieldwork from 2013-17. I conducted another Google search in May 2018 to identify more potential participants. This final search did not yield more participants, and I decided to move forward with contacting the 15 potential participants I had identified in December 2017. Upon identifying these potential participants, I sent an email (see Appendix C) requesting participation in my study. Twelve individuals volunteered to participate after receiving my initial email.

I had intended to employ a secondary method of participant identification and solicitation via an email sent to a listserv of U.S.-based study abroad administrators (see Appendix C). I requested access to this listserv via the Associate Director of Global Education at William & Mary, who would then send the message on my behalf. The goal of this message was to yield a different population from the Google search, which was dependent on institutions having updated websites. Ultimately, I decided not to use this listserv to solicit more participants. I made this decision because I knew I had 12
individuals who had agreed to participate in interviews with me. Further, given the nature of my role in Pilgrim’s Office, I did not want to create any uncomfortable situations in which a potential participant may feel awkward declining an interview. Additional potential participants would have allowed for flexibility in the case that a participant was unavailable or the case was compromised, for example a participant was no longer able to engage in the study for various reasons, or it became clear that the program did not meet the selection criteria.

Of the 12 individuals who initially volunteered to participate, I lost contact with six. They either stopped responding to my emails, or we were unable to connect while in Santiago and they declined interviews when they arrived home. While in Santiago, I identified two additional participants through my work in the Pilgrim’s Office and observations in the streets of Santiago. The final participants for this study were seven women and one man. Four of the eight had academic tenure, and seven of the eight worked at institutions classified as high-research. Fetterman (2010) emphasized that doing ethnography means finding saturation within the fieldwork through analysis of participant-observation, interviews, and other data in order to be able to describe the social world the participants inhabit. Eight interviews provided the deep, rich context of the participants’ experiences needed to move forward with appropriate data analysis.

**Data Sources and Gathering**

In ethnographic studies, the principle method for gathering data is participant observation (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Fetterman, 2010; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Wolcott, 1999). My fieldwork over six summers formed the foundation for this participant observation and allowed me to hone my questions and be more explicit with
the types of data I gathered (Wolcott, 1999). Initially I arrived in Spain in May 2018 to gather three types of data for this study that could be “found in everyday life and in other research approaches” (Dahlberg, Dahlberg, & Nystrom, 2008, p. 171). These data include participant observation, interviews, and various sources of documents for analysis.

**Participant observation.** The participant observation associated with my research constitutes a critical source of gathering stories, information, and practices, as well reflecting on my own experiences (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The role of the participant/observer cannot be underestimated in ethnographic research (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2011). I wrote above about my own experiences with the Camino and how I developed the research questions and focus of my study. Observations and personal experiences allowed me to view firsthand social interactions at work in the field site. The documentation of these observations and experience took the form of field notes.

Field notes from my observations and personal experiences frequently served as a data source alongside intensive interviews and acted as a corroborating source for the information my participants shared with me (Warren & Karner, 2010). They represent my observations of the social world in which I conducted my research (Esterberg, 2002). The notes I compiled of my observations started as handwritten scratch notes or notes that I quickly typed into my iPhone. These basic notes then transformed into thick, rich descriptions, in the form of a field log that I wrote as soon after the observation period as possible (Esterberg, 2002; Warren & Karner, 2010). I structured the electronic document for my field log in a way that clearly distinguished between my observations of the situation and my interpretation of those observations (Esterberg, 2002). This process of
note writing supplemented the data I collected from interviews as well as the various forms of document analysis that I engaged.

**Interviews.** I engaged in a single in-depth, semi-structured interview with seven of my participants. These interviews “combine[d] the flexibility of the unstructured, open-ended interview with the directionality… to produce focused, qualitative, textural data” (Schensul, Schensul, & LeCompte, 1999, p. 149). Of the seven interviews, six took place in Santiago de Compostela in May and June 2018. The final interview was via phone in August 2018 because the travel schedule of the participant prohibited us from meeting while she was in Santiago. As described above, five interviews were scheduled ahead of time, and I met two participants while in Santiago and scheduled their interviews as soon as I was able. The eighth participant did not engage in a formal interview. Instead, I spend a significant amount of time with her informally asking questions while she, her students, and her family were in Santiago. I outline this experience further in Chapter 4.

The interviews I conducted gave me deep insight into understanding how participants interpret their experiences and share those interpretations (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). I developed an interview guide (Appendix B), which allowed me to fully develop the questions and keep the interviews appropriately focused (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). However, the guide did not restrict lines of inquiry that develop through a conversation, as I sought to learn as much about each instructor’s experience as possible (Vagle, 2014). I developed the interview guide through a series of pilot studies that I conducted beginning in summer 2014. The final working draft of this guide emerged from an exploratory interview in spring 2018 with a faculty member at William & Mary.
I chose her for the pilot interview for two reasons. First, she had directed a weeklong intensive study away program at William & Mary’s Washington Center. Through this experience, she spent significant time with undergraduate students in contexts that were dissimilar to her role as a faculty member on the main campus. The experience was not on the Camino, nor did it share many characteristics of a Camino-based program. However, it provided the participant with an experience outside of her normal faculty role where she was responsible for directing an academic engagement for undergraduate students. The second reason I asked this individual to participate in a pilot interview was she had experience in qualitative methodologies, specifically in interview-based research. Her expertise was in a different field; however, she was able to help me reflect on the ways I asked questions, the organization of my questions, and the mechanisms of the interview process.

This pilot interview prompted me to rearrange the thematic grouping of questions in the interview guide to better align with the natural progression of a participant’s description of his or her work on the home campus.

**Document analysis.** The final process of data gathering for my study was through identification of various written documents that represented digital communications and representations of these study abroad programs. In the context of this study, documents existed as Web sites, Facebook groups and pages, blog pages, syllabi, or other publicly available written materials faculty produced and were associated with the study abroad programs which my eight participants directed. Oftentimes, the documents that were available online focused significantly on the student experience. Even though this is a valuable line of analysis and inquiry, the student experience was not
germane to my study. I also examined syllabi and course descriptions of the programs my participants directed as well as other U.S.-based programs. These too did not shed light on how faculty members made sense of leading the programs within the context of their faculty roles on campus.

Not all document analysis was superfluous. University webpages in particular were helpful to triangulate the data that I observed and gathered through interviews. I was able to confirm important details about my participants’ work environment, teaching and research expectations, and departmental characteristics. By engaging in this triangulation, the interpretations and analysis of my participants’ experiences are strong and more reliable (Fetterman, 2010; Wolcott, 1999).

**Data Analysis**

In ethnographic projects, data analysis is much like hiking the Camino. Fetterman (2010) described the analytical process as:

The fieldworker must find a way through a forest of data, theory, observation, and distortion. Throughout the analytic trek, the fieldworker must make choices—between logical and enticing paths, between valid and invalid but fascinating data, and between genuine patterns of behavior and series of apparently similar but distinct reactions. Choosing the right path requires discrimination, experience, attention to both detail and the larger context, and intuition. The best guide through the thickets of analysis is at once the most obvious and most complex of strategies: clear thinking. (p. 93)

The trek through the data forest was long and tedious for; there were unmarked paths, paths that led to dead-ends, and paths that led to thematic goldmines. After returning to
the United States, I began the process of thinking through my experiences and the interviews that I had conducted. These reflections began to bring together my own “personal or idiosyncratic approach, together with an assortment of academic theories and models” (Fetterman, 2010, p. 94). This initial thinking created the space for me to more clearly see and understand the relationships between my participants’ experiences on the Camino and the way they talked about their roles on their home campuses. Once I developed an intimate familiarity with my field notes, interview notes, my own experiences, and the various bodies of relevant academic literature, I embarked on an analytical process utilizing key tools that Fetterman (2010) identified as critically important to ethnographic work: triangulation, pattern identification, key event description, and crystallization.

**Triangulation.** Fetterman (2010) constructs his guide for ethnographic research around the basic employ of triangulation. This analytical tool “compares information sources to test the quality of the information (and the person sharing it), to understand more completely the part an actor plays in the social drama, and ultimately to put the whole situation into perspective” (p. 94). I used triangulation on three different types of data, and with three different thematic foci. The types of data included documents, interviews, and my personal observations and experiences. The analysis focused on three different levels in relation to these data—the individual faculty member’s demographics and work contexts, the experience of walking the Camino, and the concept of the participants’ faculty roles in U.S. higher education.

At the individual level, I reviewed my field notes and verified statements from participant interviews with information from various sources. The primary source for
verifying a participant’s employment details, the scope of their role at their home institution, and their teaching and research assignments was via internet searches of the participants’ home institutions’ webpages. Through documents on the internet I was able to verify that my participants’ statements were accurate, and that their personal biases or opinions did not affect the representations of their roles on campus.

The next thematic level of triangulation dealt with the experience of walking the Camino. Much of this analysis is grounded in personal experiences with the Camino and its environment. After six years walking and studying the Camino de Santiago, working in the Pilgrim’s Office, and serving in a leadership capacity for the Institute for Pilgrimage Studies, I have developed a deep understanding and knowledge of the realities of the Camino by 2018. I have walked the Camino with undergraduate students as a program assistant and as an instructor. I have seen three different iterations of the Pilgrim’s Office. These experiences give me the context to know what is likely and realistic to happen on the Camino. I was able to relate my participants’ stories to my own experiences and the experiences of the faculty on my dissertation committee who have also directed study abroad programs on the Camino.

I recognize that individuals experience the Camino in their own ways. My experiences, those of my committee members, and those of the dozens of pilgrims that I have come to know over the years are all influenced by individual circumstances. However, there are ubiquitous experiences that take place on the Camino, some of which I have highlighted in Chapter 1 and in this chapter as well.

The final analytical focus evolved through the triangulation of data with the extant research literature on faculty work. Understanding the state of affairs of faculty work in
the United States in 2018 was critical to interpreting and analyzing my participants’ experiences. As mentioned above, half of my participants were tenured; half of them occupied non-tenure eligible roles. The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (n.d.) ranks seven of the eight institutions represented in my study as high research. Seven of my eight participants were women. As I will discuss in further detail in Chapter 5, all of my participants discussed these three theoretical constructs—family, appointment roles and expectations, and sources of inspiration—frequently in our interviews and interactions. In analyzing their comments, I relied on the extant research literature, historical trends, and specific institutional data to contextualize their experiences more in the broad landscape of U.S. higher education.

**Key event description.** Ethnographers rely on specific shared events within a cultural group as a means to gather details and deeper understandings of how the group functions in a social context (Fetterman, 2010; Geertz, 1973). Much like Frey’s (1998) study, my study focused on a group of individuals whose membership and location was in a state of flux. This group consists not only of the eight participants in my study, but the many other faculty who led students on the Camino both in summer 2018 and in years prior. Members of this group do not all reside in one place; they engage the Camino and then they return to their home campuses. Central to the experiences of the participants, and their membership within this group, was walking the Camino. Walking the Camino also represents a key event within this group. The section on ethnographic presence in this chapter describes my perspectives and experiences walking the Camino. Chapter 1 provides other perspectives and a description of the history and evolution of walking the
Camino. Finally, each of my participants talked about their experiences walking, and described what they encountered on the trail.

**Pattern identification.** Whereas triangulation is a form of ethnographic validity, “patterns are a form of ethnographic reliability” (Fetterman, 2010, p. 97). Through the months-long journey of analyzing and thinking about the data, I engaged in multiple forms of coding to identify patterns. Researchers in the grounded theory tradition, which oftentimes adopts ethnographic methods, create new frameworks and theories to explain processes and experiences of a particular group of research participants (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). I borrowed an analytical tool from grounded theory during the data gathering and analysis processes of the study—the utilization of sensitizing concepts. Blumer (1954) introduced sensitizing concepts as ideas or terms that give general direction to inquiry. Sensitizing concepts can serve “as points of departure to form interview questions, to look at data, to listen to interviewees, and to think analytically about the data” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 31). I employed sensitizing concepts to inform the creation of the interview guide (Appendix B) and eventually to shape the development of initial themes during the coding process. While my study was an ethnographic study, this particular grounded theory method was useful to strengthen the development of questions for my interviews and they ways in which I approached coding the data.

With the first close readings of my notes and transcripts, I engaged in open coding (Esterberg, 2002). In this open coding stage, I made note what categories and themes emerged from the data without relying on pre-existing codes or assumptions (Esterberg, 2002). I then revisited the data through focused coding to identify emergent and meaningful themes in a close, line-by-line reading (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Esterberg,
Finally, axial coding explored the relationships between codes and themes (Lofland, Snow, Anderson, & Lofland, 2006). Writing notes and memos at each stage of the coding process deepened the analysis of emergent themes (Esterberg, 2002).

**Crystallization.** The various analytical tools that I used during this study led to the crystallization of key concepts and themes that emerged from my participants’ experiences (Fetterman, 2010). This came after building “a firm knowledge base in bits and pieces, asking questions, listening, probing, comparing and contrasting, synthesizing, and evaluating information” (Fetterman, 2010, p. 112). Crystallization of findings represents the culmination of these activities, yet is itself a form of analysis—much of the crystallization happened after I began writing. Once I started to describe my participants in Chapter 4, I realized how interconnected their experiences were. When I returned to this chapter for revision, I more clearly saw the extent to which my analysis and thinking had crystallized. The process of writing up the study became an exercise in testing analysis and solidifying themes (Fetterman, 2010; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Wolcott, 1999).

**Ethical Considerations**

William & Mary’s Protection of Human Subjects Committee approved this study (Appendix D) as well as an updated protocol (Appendix E). Initially my research proposal indicated that all participants would sign an informed consent document (Appendix F). The language that I used in my recruitment emails (Appendix C) indicated the parameters of the study and instructed faculty to respond if they were willing to participate. When I arrived in Santiago and began conducting interviews, I encountered two problems with this design. First, it was socially awkward to ask participants to
complete paperwork in the middle of a café or hotel lobby. Second, two participants did not want to agree to the typed stipulations in the informed consent document; primarily they did not want to be audio-recorded. I did not record these interviews but typed up my notes after the completion of each interview. After consulting with my dissertation chair, I submitted an addendum to my research protocol that stipulated that faculty would be giving consent through a positive response to my email invitation that indicated the parameters of the study (Appendix E). I have used pseudonyms for my participants throughout this manuscript. This addendum to my protocol was approved by the William & Mary IRB review board. Data from interviews, observations, and document analysis notes have been kept in a secure location where only I have access to the information. After each interview, I shared the highlights from my notes with the participants to ensure that I accurately represented what they discussed with me. In some cases this was via verbal confirmation at the end of each conversation and in others via email. I also engaged in this member-checking throughout each conversation, asking participants to clarify what they said and repeating back to them the interpretations that I wrote in my notes. Finally, and perhaps most critically, I have anonymized my participants to the greatest extent possible. The Camino community is small, and internal confidentiality for a study focusing on its members may not be possible. I have taken steps to protect the identities of my participants that include creating pseudonyms and altering details in ways that do not affect the analysis or discussion.

**Trustworthiness**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed four variables for establishing trustworthiness in qualitative research. The first, credibility, focused on the level of confidence of the
findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In order to establish credibility, I engaged in three recommended interventions. Over the course of my study, I had prolonged engagement with both the subject matter and the participants. I have at this point invested years in learning about the Camino, faculty life, and establishing relationships with some of the participants in my study. I also spent time this summer engaging with participants as they finished their walk and arrived in Santiago. The second intervention was triangulation of the data, which I discussed above. Finally, I engaged in member-checking following each interview to ensure that my interpretations aligned with the participants’ experiences.

The second criterion Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed is transferability, which speaks to the ability for the findings to relate across other populations. Thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973) are one means to establish transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Denzin (1989) defined thick description in that “it presents detail, context, emotion, and the webs of social relationships that join persons to one another. Thick description evokes emotionality and self-feelings… in thick description, the voices, feelings, actions, and meanings of interacting individuals are heard” (p. 83). In this dissertation, I have provided thick descriptions of my data and my participants. I believe that by telling their stories in detail, readers will be able to envision shared experiences with the participants and ultimately gain insight into their own perceptions of work and career.

Third, Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommended using an inquiry audit to establish dependability, which will show that findings are replicable and consistent. For this study, the dissertation committee served as de facto auditors. Working with the committee
members, I ensured that data were not manipulated in a way that decreases dependability or threatens the quality of the findings. Committee members also had access to my data analysis through the memos that I produced.

Finally, Lincoln and Guba (1985) called for confirmability, which speaks to ensuring that findings are not a result of the researcher’s bias rather they emerge from the data. This process was particularly important, as the Camino as a place and an activity is quite value-laden. First, one cannot escape the reality that Camino began as a Catholic pilgrimage that earned sojourners penance for sins (Melczer, 1993). Religious symbols are inescapable on the various routes (Frey, 1998; Gitlitz & Davidson, 2000; Melczer, 1993). Second, modern discourse on the Camino highlights the tension between those who engage in pilgrimage for religious reasons and those who view the Camino as an act of tourism, physical exercise, or other secular journey (Chemin Filho, 2011; Hesp, 2013; Lois-González & Santos, 2015). Triangulation of data perspectives served to support this as well as additional audits by the committee (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Ultimately, through implementing these four criteria, the study built trustworthiness, and the findings represented valid and rigorous research.

**Delimitations, Limitations, and Assumptions**

This section provides details on the boundaries of my study. Then, I address the limitations that exist in the context of this study. Finally, I describe the assumptions that I carry into the execution of this study.

**Delimitations.** This study focused on faculty from institutions of higher education in the U.S. who led undergraduate students on study abroad programs during the summer of 2018 that incorporated the Camino de Santiago in Northern Spain.
Additionally, as explained above, I limited participation in the study further to only include faculty who walked a minimum of 100 km. Furthermore, these faculty members were instructors at the institution hosting the study abroad program and were responsible for delivering an academic course during the program itself. I purposefully eliminated non-academic programs that incorporated the Camino, programs that were hosted by a third-party company, and programs that did not walk the minimum distance required by the Cathedral for a Compostela.

**Limitations.** There were specific limitations to my study. First, I am not a full-time faculty member. Though I have taught undergraduate students and co-led a program on the Camino, I do not have the same experiences as a full-time faculty member. This means that I was unable to identify fully with my participants’ experiences, concerns, or perspectives.

An additional limitation was the amount of time in which I completed the data collection. My study was limited by the extent to which my participants could articulate their perceptions about themselves, their careers, and their institutions. Finally, there was a limit to the transferability of my study to other faculty experiences, including different types of study abroad programs.

**Assumptions.** A major assumption in this study was that faculty members were aware of how they perceive their professional work. This starting point was a critical assumption because without this basis, there could be no reflection on these perceptions. An additional assumption was that participants will be open to discussing their careers, perceptions of self, and work issues they may face. I also assumed that my participants would share experiences both on the Camino and at their home institutions that represent
their lived reality—even if that reality does not represent what others may define to be
*Truth*. Finally, I assumed that there would be enough participants to draw meaningful
recommendations that were be generalizable to U.S.-based faculty.

**Conclusion**

My study contributes to the understanding of how faculty members make sense of
their experiences leading study abroad programs along the Camino. I designed the study
with a flexible emergent design using ethnographic methodology. My study involves
triangulation at three levels—individual contexts, experiences on the Camino, and
experiences in faculty roles. I purposefully selected participants according to well-
established criteria and they consented in writing to participation in the study. The
coding and analysis of the data allowed for emergent themes to surface. Finally, I ensure
trustworthiness through following the recommendations of Lincoln and Guba (1985).

Thus far in my dissertation, I have introduced my study, provided an overview of
extant research, and explained my methodology. At this juncture, the Research Camino
is well underway. In Chapter 4, I introduce the pilgrim participants who joined me on
this journey. I share their backgrounds and experiences leading students on the Camino
de Santiago as part of a study abroad program.
CHAPTER 4: PILGRIM PROFILES

Along the Camino, pilgrims develop short caricatures, or profiles, for each other. Groups and individuals earn nicknames by which they are known for the entirety of the journey. In this chapter, I introduce the pilgrim profiles for the eight participants in my study. This study has evolved over six years through the myriad interactions I have had with faculty both in Spain and in the U.S. who have been engaged in some way with the Camino de Santiago. Some of these individuals led students on the Camino as part of study abroad; others were researchers who spent their professional lives understanding various aspects of the Camino across the centuries. These interactions, coupled with my own experiences in Santiago de Compostela, sharpened my research questions and the ways I understood the data that I collected in the final phases of my study. I include these experiences in the ethnographic presence section of Chapter 3. I want to understand how faculty members who lead study abroad programs on the Camino made sense of that experience in the context of their faculty roles at their home institutions. Nested within this line of inquiry is the need to understand how responsibilities associated with participants’ faculty roles on their home campus shaped participants’ experiences teaching on the Camino. Finally, given the unique characteristics of the Camino itself, I seek to understand how the Camino culture and discourse shape faculty members’ experiences.
As I discussed in Chapter 3, this ethnographic study emerges from six summers of fieldwork in Santiago de Compostela, Spain. I spent the first five of those summers working as an assistant in William & Mary’s study abroad program on the Camino, serving as a research assistant for Dr. Kathleen Jenkins, and teaching as one of the two faculty members leading William & Mary’s program in summer 2017 with Dr. James Barber. The sixth summer, summer 2018, I immersed myself in the Pilgrim’s Office and made contact with as many U.S. faculty members as I could. Eight of those faculty agreed to be part of this study and to spend time talking with me about their experiences on the Camino.

This chapter profiles the eight participants who I interviewed over the course of summer 2018 both in Spain and over the phone in the U.S. Each of these profiles read like the quick conversations pilgrims have with each other. The first question is typically, “where do you come from?” This opens the conversation with an exchange of details like names, places of origin, and departure points for the Camino—which here become brief snippets of the participant’s background. Then follows the inevitable question of, “how has your walk been so far,” a question I interpret as sharing details about the study abroad program. Sometimes pilgrims walk together for only hour; sometimes pilgrims walk together for weeks on end. Regardless of the time together, the question of “why” surfaces rather quickly, and with the expectation that the fellow pilgrim will provide an honest and meaningful answer. Here, I ask my participants “why” in a way that draws me closer to understanding how they came to be involved with the Camino study abroad programs and what they thought of the experiences. I more
thoroughly explore their “why” responses in Chapters 5 and 6, but this section provides a snapshot.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, I use pseudonyms for the faculty participants I interviewed in summer 2018. When discussing details or characteristics that have the potential to reveal identities, I remain vague. Finally, recall that I have changed details or specific phrasing of quotations in ways that do not effect analysis or discussion in order to further mask the identity of my participants. Table 2 provides a demographic snapshot of the 11 individuals whose profiles follow.
Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PhD, Spanish</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Public, Master’s level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PhD, Spanish</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>Land grant, High research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PhD, Spanish</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Land grant, High research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PhD, Spanish</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>Private, High research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarlett</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M.S.Ed.</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>Land grant, High research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PhD, Sociology</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Land grant, High research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PhD, Anthropology</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>Private, High research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PhD, Philosophy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Private, High research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charlotte

Charlotte is a tenured Associate Professor at a public regional university. She earned her Ph.D. in Spanish and her teaching responsibilities consist of introductory courses with occasional upper-level courses. She teaches five courses per semester and the research expectation at her institution is minimal.

Background. I have crossed paths with Charlotte on various occasions over the course of my involvement with the Camino. She has engaged with study abroad
programs on the Camino for many years. Charlotte’s research addresses early modern and contemporary Iberia. The interview for this study took place at a popular coffee bar along Rúa Vilar, in the old zone of Santiago in June 2018. The conversation was much like a reunion of pilgrims who spent time walking together along the Way, became separated, and crossed paths again in Santiago. I look back on my time with Charlotte as I came to know her, and I see how her perspectives and experiences helped shape my thinking about this study.

**Program details.** When I spoke with Charlotte this summer, she had just arrived from along a less-developed route with a group of seven students and two other adults. The two adults that accompanied Charlotte were a campus minister and a staff person from her university. Their participation was out of both personal interest and practical concerns of providing support for the students. In order for the program to run this year, Charlotte needed 10 participants. In what Charlotte referred to as a fortunate loophole, the international travel company with which her institution has a contract allows non-students to participate—and count as paying members—in trips. The group walked approximately 200km to arrive in Santiago de Compostela. Along the route the group stayed in a variety of lodgings including municipal albergues, *donativos* (albergues where patrons pay what they can afford for dinner and accommodations as opposed to the set fee charged by municipal albergues), hotels, monasteries, and private residences. Charlotte believed these different accommodations provided her students a glimpse into the authentic Camino world. As Charlotte and I spoke, she made it clear that the only way she will continue to bring students on the Camino now is if she can travel the less-developed routes. The Camino Francés, in her opinion, has become too commercialized.
The opportunity to share an authentic Camino experience with her students drives Charlotte.

**Motivations.** Charlotte recognizes that students at her institution do not generally have an opportunity to travel abroad. By taking students out of their familiar surroundings, Charlotte sees herself as “maximizing the opportunities” for them. She feels travelling the more rural routes also maximizes students’ opportunities—there are more options for food and lodging, students are more likely to interact with more non-Americans, and students have to do more for themselves regarding caretaking and procuring food and water while walking.

She believes that these experiences are critical for her students, and she is willing to make what she perceives as logistic and pedagogical sacrifices, such as using the tour company, in order for this trip to take place. In the past, Charlotte has not engaged with the company, but she perceived pressure this year to do so. Ordinarily, Charlotte would design the itinerary and serve as a guide herself around the many sites the students visit. This year, she left that role to the tour company. She made clear through our conversation that she was doing so only to satisfy the company and her institution—despite the fact that she found many issues with how the trip was implemented.

Charlotte has led multiple trips on the Camino with students, and she intends to do so in the future. Looking forward, she is hopeful that her university will begin to recognize her efforts. As Charlotte continues to develop the Camino study abroad program, she also manages the university’s study abroad program in a country in Latin America. Both of these programs require intense work on her part, but she finds great satisfaction in providing students with these opportunities. After all, she says, “I got a
Ph.D. in Spanish so I can have a job teaching language courses—the real work I do is my research and giving students these kinds of opportunities to see and experience the world.”

**Rachel**

Rachel is a Senior Lecturer of Spanish at a large university. She earned her Ph.D. in Spanish and began her current faculty role as a non-tenure track lecturer immediately following graduation. She teaches introductory courses and an occasional upper-level elective for her department during the academic year. Her teaching load is four courses per semester and, as she occupies a non-tenure track role, there is no expectation for her to engage in research. Rachel is in a large department.

**Background.** Rachel and I met a few years ago in Santiago as she was ending a Camino with her students. In addition to the travel and teaching opportunities that come with leading the program, she sees it as a means to stay engaged in the modern discourse of the Camino. By the summer of 2018, Rachel had led students nearly 10 times on the Camino as part of a study abroad program. Typically, Rachel also travels with her son and husband. As a family, they have travelled with students in multiple countries in Europe and Latin America. I had the opportunity to spend a significant amount of time with Rachel, her family, and her students during my fieldwork in June 2018. Because I was able to spend extended time with Rachel and her group, I gained deeper insight into how Rachel approaches her work, the ways in which her faculty role intertwines with personal life, and her perspectives on the Camino, students, and study abroad.

**Program.** Rachel’s study abroad program has remained relatively unchanged since its inception. She walks approximately 200km over the course of two weeks with
Rachel’s second activity is group trivia. She finds that incorporating trivia contests each night keeps the students motivated to learn and is a more engaging and fun way to review information than what she would do in a typical classroom at home. I was around her students in Santiago for mere minutes before I heard stories about the trivia games, the information they learned, and just how competitive everyone became. Finally, each student contributes to the group’s blog. Rachel has kept this blog running for each iteration of the program. Students document each day of the Camino with pictures and brief narrations about the journey. These three activities are hallmarks of Rachel’s program, and have earned the program a reputation at her home institution.

**Motivations.** Rachel has travelled and lived in Spain for a significant amount of time. She sees the Camino as an opportunity to share these experiences with her students. Within the context of her department and university, she understood that the only way to accomplish this would be to design a summer short-term study abroad
program. Because Rachel is a non-tenure track instructor, she does not have the pressure to engage in research during the summer that her tenure-eligible colleagues have. She reflects that her department is “pretty hands off during the summer,” and that there was neither encouragement nor discouragement for her designing the Camino program.

Rachel spent time designing and developing the program to meet particular goals. She knows that her students leave the program with a deeper understanding of Spanish language and culture, and, more importantly, “increased ability to cope with challenges both physical and emotional.” She feels that the structure of the program represents the best of study abroad—students leave their comfort zones, immerse themselves in a new culture surrounded by a different language, and learn how to live with new people in very different environments than what they are accustomed.

There are also practical benefits to leading the Camino program that Rachel shared with me. The program has created a following of students for Rachel at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Each year, she has a teaching assistant who is a graduate student in the department’s M.A. programs. The teaching assistants are students who previously enrolled in the undergraduate study abroad program with Rachel; they enroll in the graduate programs in part because of the opportunity to engage in the Camino program again with Rachel. Rachel’s senior colleagues see the creation of this pipeline from undergraduate to graduate programs as a positive attribute of the program. Rachel has also developed a strong following in her on-campus courses with students who have gone on the Camino with her. This leads to increased enrollment in the special topics classes that Rachel occasionally has the opportunity to teach. While her colleagues
were ambivalent about the creation of the program, they now see a strong benefit to the department, which in turn benefits Rachel.

The other practical motivations for Rachel to lead the two programs she designed are for personal reasons. Rachel earns extra income from leading the study abroad programs. This income helps offset the lower salary she earns in comparison to her tenure-eligible colleagues. With the extra money she earns, she is able to justify staying in her current position. Another motivating factor for Rachel is her child. She has brought her son on nearly every trip that she has led since he was old enough to travel. Rachel sees these opportunities as invaluable in her parenting role.

Rachel finds her motivations grow from both personal and professional domains and become intertwined in the way she carries out her faculty role. While in some years the students in her programs have been difficult to manage, Rachel generally finds that her energy and willingness to lead these programs comes from her students. She could earn the extra income by teaching on-campus courses during the summer, but the personal benefits to her family and the life lessons her students learn abroad make the effort worthwhile.

**Mark**

Mark is a tenured Associate Professor at a large land grant university. He focuses on the early modern Hispanic world and transatlantic literature. He has a moderate teaching load of two classes per semester and splits his teaching between the undergraduate Spanish program and the master’s program his department offers. The courses he teaches are within the area of his Ph.D. specialty.
Background. I met Mark in May 2018 as his program arrived in Santiago de Compostela. I had reached out to him via email in the spring semester and his response was very positive. Mark and I met for our interview in the lobby area of a busy hotel near the main plaza in Santiago. This hotel is a hot spot for pilgrim activity. There are hundreds of pilgrims staying at the hotel, and many others come through the lobby to see if they can reconnect with fellow pilgrims they met along the Camino. The room was crowded; people gathered in small groups around the lobby drinking wine and coffee. The crowd and noise made our initial conversation difficult; we had to sit closer together than what we may have preferred, and it was hard to hear at times. The conversation started with him asking questions about my project, William & Mary’s Institute for Pilgrimage Studies, and W&M’s Camino study abroad program. As I shifted the conversation to Mark and his experiences, he seemed slightly hesitant to provide the same level of information that I shared with him about my experiences. I look back on our interactions and see that his guarded approach to our conversation aligns with his experiences with students and colleagues regarding the program.

Program. Mark originally designed this program with a colleague in his department a few years ago. When he has led the program, Mark has travelled with a co-director–another faculty member from his institution. Mark’s program has a unique approach to the Camino among my participants. He starts with his students in a major city. The first 10 days or so consist of walking, bussing, and taking the train across northern Spain. Over the course of the last five days, he and the students walk the remaining 100km. Throughout the program, students and faculty stayed in hotel rooms, not albergues. When I asked Mark about that choice, he was clear that his institution
made him arrange for hotels and that he was not allowed to have his students stay in albergues.

The three-week program included a course on Spanish literature and culture that Mark taught. He was very detailed in how he arranged the course, accounting for each activity on a spreadsheet so he would be able to prove that he had enough contact hours to justify the academic credit. This accounting of hours was a unique concern among my participants—no other faculty member talked about needing to account for contact hours or more generally justifying the academic rigor of the experience. Overall, Mark thinks that this structured approach to the program was key to its success.

He expressed that this program structure provided the most exposure for his students to “experience modern Spanish culture and see a non-evil side of Spain.” When I probed what the evil side of Spain was, he made vague references to Francoism, Basque terrorism, and party culture in Barcelona. This opened the door for an in depth conversation about his motivations for leading the program.

**Motivations.** Relationships drive Mark’s work leading students on the Camino. Both personal and professional relationships anchor his desire to lead the program, the way he structures it, and how he makes sense of it in the context of his faculty role on campus. A devout Catholic, Mark had strong religious motivations for personally completing the Camino and for exposing as many Catholic students to the Camino as possible. He originally wanted to target marketing explicitly to Catholic students, as a colleague who directed a study abroad program in Israel did with Jewish students. His department would not support him in advertising the trip directly to Catholic students, which was disappointing. That obstacle, however, did not prevent the program from
running or from being successful. Mark’s relationship with his department surfaced as an important factor in his experiences. He shared with me his respect for senior colleagues. His department seems rather hierarchical, and relationships with senior faculty are important to cultivate and maintain.

Mark’s relationships with colleagues came up frequently in conversation. He led the program this year with a colleague from the natural sciences. When talking about what Mark most valued from this year’s program, he referenced the working relationship with his colleague: “He was very chill, and not an alpha-type, which is what I was worried about. But because he was chill it made leading the program much less stressful.”

I learned that Mark invested a lot of energy into his professional relationships. The Camino study abroad program was an important way for him to build those relationships across his campus. However, it was also a source of concern for him in other relationships. He shared with me that his colleagues and his former advisor warned him about designing and leading this program. According to Mark, they warned against it because it was lost writing time, would not count in his promotion to full professor, and would not contribute anything to the department during the semesters. He found support, though, in his department chair. That support seemed critical for Mark embarking on designing this program and leading it multiple times.

Mark’s perspective on the administration of the study abroad program was also of interest to me. He focused a lot of his energy, he shared, on mitigating risk for his students and himself. Much of this focus seemed to derive from institutional policies. In particular, Mark noted that he would be very uncomfortable sharing lodging with his
students in albergues. He asked multiple times how I dealt with that on my own trips with students and how William & Mary allowed for that.

Mark said that he enjoyed the program this year and felt that students had a good experience. Ultimately, he said, “That’s what it’s all about. Did they come and see a new side of Spain and have a good experience?”

Elsie

Elsie is a Senior Lecturer at a medium-sized university. As part of her full-time non-tenure track position Elsie carries an administrative role, which offsets her teaching load. She continues to engage in research, but it is not part of her faculty role. In general, she teaches language courses and an occasional upper-level elective.

**Background.** Elsie and I met in the Pilgrim’s Office on a cold, rainy day in late May 2018. She and her students had just arrived from hiking 200km; I greeted them at the door of the office and explained the process for groups to receive the Compostela without having to wait in the more than two-hour queue. Elsie was not pleased with the lack of signage leading to the Pilgrim’s Office nor was she happy that her students did not want to wait in line to experience getting their Compostela first-hand. As she and her students were filling out the paperwork for the Compostela, I approached her in the courtyard. After a short conversation, we realized that I had emailed her about my study earlier in the spring. She said she would write back to me to set up a time to talk in the following days.

We met at the group’s hotel; this one was further from the main plaza and out of the way of the busy pilgrim foot traffic. Elsie was running late and seemed stressed about getting tickets for her students to tour the roof and crypt of the cathedral. The first
question Elsie asked me at her hotel was “¿Y tú, tú hablas castellano, no? Cómo no, si escribes este tésis sobre el Camino. Vale, entonces seguimos en castellano” [And what about you, you speak Castilian, right? I mean, of course you do, if you are writing this thesis on the Camino. Ok then, we’ll just keep going in Castilian]. After passing her litmus test of authenticity and capability, she said she would speak with me briefly if we hustled to the ticket office so she could straighten out their schedule. She emerged from the ticket office victorious, with reservations for both tours, and much more relaxed. She offered to extend the conversation, in Castilian of course, over coffee. The next 90 or so minutes we spent on the busy Rúa do Franco shed light on why she continues bringing students to Santiago and how she balances the program with her teaching and administrative role on campus.

Program. Elsie has directed her study abroad program on the Camino for nearly a decade. Each year she brings between 7 and 14 students and engages in a multi-modal trip that involves taking a bus between two walking stages—and of course finishing the last 100km on foot. This travel plan allows students to see as much of the Camino as possible while still walking enough to earn the Compostela. She has designed the program to offer students some degree of autonomy and flexibility while maintaining a rigorous academic component. She allows the students to walk in small groups of no fewer than three and sets expectations for breakfasts and dinners together. While on the Camino, Elsie and her students stay in bed and breakfast-style lodgings, which allows her the ability to plan and make reservations ahead of time. Each morning they go through the route for the day, and at night after dinner, the group discusses various articles that Elsie has assigned for the course. Elsie maintains that this structure ensures the students
spend enough time focusing on academics at night and absorbing the Camino during the day. Elsie focuses the course on the Camino—its evolution, modern representations in Spanish cultural production, and current polemics surrounding the route. This exposure to the people, culture, and history of northern Spain is a key outcome of the program and serves as a strong motivation for Elsie to return with students each year.

**Motivations.** Elsie was born and raised in Galicia, Spain. Her first career was related to business, and she began teaching full-time at her institution after receiving her Ph.D. in the same department. Years ago, she saw an opportunity to design and implement a study abroad program that incorporated the Camino. She drew motivation for creating the program from her desire to share her homeland with students. There were no courses in her department that incorporated the Camino or Galicia, and she wanted students to know that “hay más aquí en España que el flamenco, la sangria, y las playas” [there is more here in Spain than flamenco, sangria, and beaches]. Her first few years leading the program were difficult for her. She learned quickly that there were only but so many roles she could fill at once for her students—guide, teacher, mentor, and caretaker, among others. After a few years, she began bringing a TA with her on the program to take on some of these roles.

As the program evolves, Elsie discovers new motivations for returning year after year to the Camino. Professionally, she finds the program to be invigorating and rewarding. “Como un NTE, no escojo lo que enseño. Púes sí, tengo un poco más autonomía que otros, pero de veras no los escojo yo mis cursos. Este programa es una cosa que puedo hacer para enseñar lo que quiero” [As an NTE, I don’t pick and choose what I teach. Ok, well, I do have a little more autonomy than the others do, but really, I
don’t get to pick my classes. This program is one thing that I can do in order to teach what I want]. The autonomy that Elsie refers to derives from her administrative role in her department. Even with the authority that role provides, Elsie shared about how designing and leading this program was important to her professionally because it offered autonomy in designing her own class. During the semester, she teaches courses that follow a departmental syllabus and curriculum, as do all the non-tenure track faculty. Teaching on the Camino allows her the same academic agency that she perceives the tenure-eligible faculty in her department have.

Elsie also finds motivation in her relationships with students. These relationships are very important to Elsie. In the first few years of the program, Elsie worked diligently to maintain her on-campus identity with students–she had a reputation as a strict teacher with high standards and as the enforcer of departmental policy. She found that this reputation, and her attempt to maintain it, impeded her ability to connect with the students. She has since made an effort to work with the students prior to their trip to Spain to establish a different rapport. While in Spain, she asks that students call her by the same nickname she goes by with family, friends, and colleagues. She works hard to be approachable for students and makes an effort to connect with each one while walking.

In one particular way, however, she still maintains a distance from her students. In the process of becoming more personal and less professorial, Elsie realized that the students began referring to her as their Camino mom and expected her to act in a motherly caretaking role. This role had a practical side to it—Elsie knew best how to care for blisters. She felt that if she did not properly dress the students’ wounds, the
The group as a whole would suffer. The cost, however, was that students began seeing her as too much of a caretaker. This is a primary reason that she began enlisting a TA for the trip. With the caretaking in the hands of the TA, Elsie feels that she is able to get to know students better. One of the highlights for her in leading the program is that she develops a deeper understanding each year of how her students interact with the world around them. She talked about how this knowledge informs her teaching on campus, where she can better spot student distress or can alter her assignments to better align with how students are learning. These outcomes keep Elsie engaged in the Camino, but the physical nature of the program may become a barrier for her participation in the near future. “Sigo envejeciendo y ellos se quedan jóvenes” [I keep getting older and they stay young]. She recognizes that she will not be able to lead the program indefinitely, and as a result, “disfruto de cada verano que tengo esta oportunidad” [I savor every summer that I have this opportunity].

**Scarlett**

Scarlett is the only participant whose faculty role is part of a full-time administrative role. She works at a large university, where she earned her master’s degree in Education. Her administrative role includes teaching between one and four courses per semester, based on demand. She does not engage in research, and teaching is her favorite part of her job.

**Background.** During my second visit to Santiago in summer of 2014, I was sitting in a café along the Rúa Azabache—the street that funnels pilgrims from the Camino Francés the final 100m into the Praza do Obradoiro—and I heard two women talking about their experience on the Camino, a conversation far from uncommon there. They started
talking about how happy they were that the students were happy and the program was successful. I approached them and started a conversation. Scarlett was one of the two women, and, with her colleague, she has directed a Camino study abroad program every-other-year since then. This year, I met Scarlett in her hotel lobby. We ordered tea and found a quiet nook in the back of the room. Her colleague was on the way to Finisterre with the students, and Scarlett decided to stay in Santiago for a few days by herself. This time alone, and our conversation, created a space for her to reflect on her three Caminos, each of which was with students, and how she finds personal and professional value in the program each iteration.

**Program.** Scarlett’s program is an extension of a semester-long course that she and her colleague teach on global leadership and citizenship. Scarlett walks with her students from the town in France that many consider the starting point of the Camino Francés. Her program is one of two at her institution that incorporate the Camino. The other program operates through a different college, does not walk as far, and enrolls both graduate and undergraduate students. Scarlett takes a slower pace with her students, building in 35 walking days and 5 rest days throughout the journey. They stay in all types of accommodations, and Scarlett stays with them each night. The students engage in reflective journaling, observations on particular events that are relevant to their degree program, and take turns planning each day’s walks and meals. Scarlett purposefully designed the program to create spaces where students would have to step in and take responsibility for the larger group. She felt that this was important given the degree program in which the students were enrolled and the learning outcomes she identified for the program.
When Scarlett first sought to lead a study abroad program, her supervisor and dean were unconvinced. Scarlett realigned her proposal to emphasize the High Impact Practices (HIPs) that she planned to implement in the program. Her institution’s reaccreditation plan called for increasing HIPs across the curriculum. Her proposal was successful, and now she enjoys the support of her director and dean each time she takes students abroad. She has found that the incorporation of HIPs, particularly the reflections that students engage in, has significantly increased the educational value of her program.

**Motivations.** Scarlett’s husband died suddenly when she was 54 years old. Understandably distraught, Scarlett searched for a way to process her grief and discern what her new life would look like. She came across the movie *The Way* and knew that she wanted to go on the Camino. Her colleague that co-directs the program with her told Scarlett that she needed to figure out a way to make a study abroad program that incorporated the Camino so she could go walk. As Scarlett has led the program three times now, in 2014, 2016, and 2018, she has found that her personal motivations evolve with the seasons of her life. Initially she walked to reflect on life and the loss of her husband. In the second program, she focused on planning the final stages of her career—she chose a retirement date, set goals for projects in her unit, and developed personal metrics to be financially ready for retirement. The 2018 program brought her attention to what her life after her professional career ends will look like. She has two more years to retirement, and if she follows the program schedule from years past, she will lead students on one final Camino in 2020. Scarlett has used the Camino study abroad program to meet her personal goals of reflection and life planning. Professionally, she
has found motivation to continue the program through watching her students interact with the world around them.

When Scarlett was sharing about the 2018 program she had just completed, she began to get emotional. She started to weep, and I asked what had made her feel this way. “The students. I’m just so proud of seeing what they go through to finish and the way that they manage everything that comes at them. This is just the best—seeing them finish and seeing how proud they are.” I asked if there was anything in particular that made her feel this way with this group, and she told me a story of a wheelchair-bound man that the students walked with for a few weeks of their journey. She talked about how they cared for the man, how they intervened when necessary to help him, and how they processed their experiences with him. In the program that Scarlett directs, there is a strong emphasis on citizenship and ethics. Seeing her students interact with the man on the Camino served as an affirmation for Scarlett that she and her colleagues are accomplishing their goals in the program. She was proud that students reflected on their coursework when they were talking about their Camino interactions. Charlotte summarized, that she felt the students were engaging in “big-picture, real-life conversations. This wasn’t just a field trip for them or a time to talk about whatever was happening on social media. They were tackling big problems, big ideas.”

**Olivia**

Olivia is a tenured Associate Professor at a large university. Her teaching responsibilities are within her field of research specialization in sociology, and she has a teaching load of two courses per semester and a high expectation of research output.
Background. I became aware of Olivia’s program through my work at the Pilgrim’s Office. Pilgrims who were arriving in late May told me about a study abroad group from Olivia’s institution that would be arriving in early June. After searching online, I found Olivia’s information and emailed her. We arranged to meet for breakfast on one of the two mornings that she and her students were in Santiago. During our time together, Olivia shared about her experiences co-leading the Camino study abroad program. She became involved in the program just six weeks before it started. Originally, her department chair was supposed to lead the program along with an adjunct from their department. The co-leader has a full-time position as the departmental administrator. Olivia’s chair had been planning to travel with family, but the university prohibited this. In the weeks leading up to the trip, her chair asked Olivia if she would co-lead the program. Olivia believed the chair approached her because the chair knew Olivia thru-hiked the Appalachian Trail. Olivia agreed, but “had no idea what [she] was getting into.”

Program. Because she became involved so late in the program’s development, Olivia had very little to do with the logistics and planning for the program itself. The university’s study abroad office had approved the logistics of the program, and the co-leader had begun to market it to students. The co-leader assists with the large introductory courses in the department and has two master’s degrees from different disciplines. Before proposing the Camino study abroad program, the co-leader had not designed a course of her own. When Olivia started working with the co-leader, they had to resubmit the course to the study abroad office because the faculty committee rejected the original proposal because it was not rigorous enough.
The course that Olivia and her co-leader taught on the Camino focused on liminality/communitas, rituals, and social stratification. Olivia’s research and teaching deals with social stratification, so she felt more comfortable with this portion of the course. The 15 students enrolled in the course during the summer term. They walked 200km, staying in albergues for the majority of the time. While the students were walking, they completed assignments that focused on observation and interview skills. After the students completed the Camino portion of the course, they returned home and finished the course online over three weeks. This allowed students to complete the Camino and the Camino-based assignments but then finish the course with a heavier focus on academics.

Motivations. Olivia never intended to lead students on a hiking trip through Spain. As mentioned above, she became part of the program close to the start date with only a matter of weeks to prepare. For Olivia, co-leading this program was more of a favor to the department chair, the co-leader, and the department than it was a personal or professional goal. Olivia’s reflections on her experiences with the program touched on three different topics—the relationship with her co-leader, the group’s social dynamics, and the climate/culture of her home department.

Prior to the study abroad program, Olivia had worked with her co-leader for five years via the co-leader’s administrative role in the department. Olivia had a cordial relationship with the co-leader and did not anticipate any issues with the program. As the program began and the group hiked the Camino, Olivia learned more about her co-leader and the dynamics of shared authority. Olivia came to understand that the co-leader’s primary motivation for designing the program and engaging the Camino was religious in
nature. As an atheist, Olivia began to feel uncomfortable with the degree to which her co-leader would speak about faith and religion from the position of an instructor. Olivia found herself countering her co-leader’s faith-based observations and lectures, which led to friction between the two. Additionally, students began to come to Olivia with concerns over the co-leader’s religious affiliation and the degree to which the co-leader developed closer relationships with the Catholic students on the trip. This was the first occasion that Olivia had co-taught a course; much less co-led a program abroad. Olivia reflected often during our conversation that managing the relationship with the co-leader was difficult and something that prior to this trip she had never negotiated.

The relationship with her co-leader added to the strained group dynamics that Olivia encountered on her trip. Olivia understood going into the program that the experience would be unlike her regular teaching, research, and service duties on her campus. She did not fully grasp the extent to which the experience would push her out of her comfort zone, however. Olivia talked about how she often is known as the caretaker within her department—“I am the one that the graduate students come to to cry, to laugh, to celebrate, to commiserate with.” She noted that she was comfortable with this reputation. She quickly realized on the Camino, however, that these kinds of interpersonal relationships would happen with greater frequency and fewer boundaries. Olivia found herself intervening in conflict that students were having with each other, particularly around issues of morality and politics. “It wasn’t just that it was the Catholic students versus the non-Catholic students. The conflict really was more a traditional liberal/conservative nature.” Olivia became the confidant for the same-sex couple that was on the trip, as well as two other more liberal-leaning students. While Olivia does not
normally talk about her personal life with her undergraduate students, she found herself opening up more with this group; specifically, she came out as a lesbian on the trip much sooner than she would have in a traditional setting with students. Navigating these social situations with students, and in such close quarters with little to no privacy, was a new experience for Olivia.

Finally, Olivia reflected frequently on her departmental culture and the ways in which her colleagues operate. Her institution is a high-research university and her department has a strong doctoral program. The expectation for Olivia is that she publishes frequently and in highly regarded journals. The culture in her department is that tenured and tenure-eligible faculty spend the summers in isolation doing their research. Faculty who voluntarily teach or engage in study abroad programs like Olivia had done, are viewed as either sacrificing their research for the unworthy cause of teaching or as being financially desperate. “But summer teaching is seen as optional and a distraction. And if you're doing it, you're only doing it because you need the money. Obviously that's not what my case was.” She recognized that her merit evaluations would suffer for doing this, because “the only thing that gets rewarded are grants and pubs.” While she talked about how she would have to explain to her colleagues why she chose to spend her time leading a study abroad program, she also noted this type of teaching—voluntary, over the summer, leading a study abroad program—does not fit with her institution’s profile. She viewed these kinds of activities as being more suited for faculty who work at liberal arts colleges, not at high-research universities.
Alice

Alice is a Senior Lecturer at a large university. She has taught at her institution for over 20 years. Her research interests have had to take a back seat to her teaching since her faculty role is non-tenure track and she is required to focus solely on teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning. She has a moderate teaching load of five classes per academic year and most generally fall within her area of specialty and interest.

**Background.** Alice was not part of my original scan for participants that I outlined in Chapter 3. I learned of Alice and her program from other pilgrims who arrived at the Pilgrim’s Office. I reached out to Alice, and she agreed that my project seemed interesting and that she would consider participating in my study after she learned more about my project and me. Alice and I had a series of email exchanges during the final days of her Camino, her initial stay in Santiago, and her round-trip venture to Finisterre. Through these emails, Alice interrogated my project, my background, and my methodologies. At first, I was surprised by her questions. She asked to see my dissertation proposal and invited me to walk with her group from Santiago to Finisterre. After conferring with my dissertation committee, I politely declined to share my proposal with her. While my proposal included the possibility of my joining groups to observe faculty members, I was not able to go with Alice’s group. Once she returned to Santiago, she agreed to meet me in the Praza do Obradoiro.

When we met, Alice suggested we go for a coffee and we ended up at the same busy café where Elsie and I had our conversation. Alice started the conversation by asking me to describe my project—how long I had been working on it, what my basic
line of inquiry was, and how I was going about my research. I decided to give one final effort in convincing Alice that I was doing legitimate work and that she should talk to me about her experiences. At this point, I was not sure whether we would be able to have a productive interview because she seemed so skeptical of my work and particularly of my continual emphasis that I was interested in her experiences and not those of her students. I took about 10 minutes to describe my background, my research, and my experiences with the Camino. I remember thinking a few times while I was talking about how I felt the roles were reversed—here was a participant in my study interviewing me. As soon as I finished my story, Alice took a long sip of her tea. She then looked up at me and said, “So it sounds like you’re doing an ethnographic dissertation. You should have included more about methods when you emailed me because it sounded like you just wanted to interview me. Interviewing is not ethnography. What you’re doing is, though.” At that moment, I did not know whether to be frustrated, relieved, or proud. What followed was an hour and a half long conversation about Alice’s career, family life, and her journey along the Camino with her undergraduate students.

**Program.** Summer 2018 was a repeat iteration of Alice’s Camino-based study abroad program. For the first iterations, Alice walked the crowded Camino Francés. She decided this year to take a different route for two main reasons—the route she chose is less crowded than the Francés and others, and she wanted her students to walk a newly-revitalized portion of the route. The program fits within her institution’s Maymester, which involves students meeting occasionally during the spring semester and then leaving campus for approximately one month to complete the course. The focus of the course within the program is in Alice’s specialty. She works with students throughout
the semester preceding the Camino to build a foundation of knowledge in her discipline’s methodologies, spiritual practices across cultures, and the history of the Camino. Once on the Camino, the students design a research question and develop a project using the methodologies they learned throughout the semester. The students also write blog entries that Alice curates for publishing on the internet. Alice turns over teaching responsibilities on the walk and students take turns introducing the towns and routes for the next day after the group has dinner together. These dinners are mandatory for students and take place either in their accommodations or in local restaurants. Alice develops a detailed itinerary to make sure the students gain exposure to a variety of lodgings and meals. The only rule the students have for walking is that they must save Alice a bottom bunk when they arrive at the next destination. Alice’s focus throughout the program emphasizes the student experience, because for Alice, “my Camino is the students’ experience on the Camino.”

Motivations. The Camino program is not the first study abroad program Alice designed and implemented. For three summers, Alice took students to South America as well. Alice only became aware of the Camino the summer that her daughter studied abroad in Spain and invited Alice to come walk with her. She saw the opportunity to design a Maymester program that incorporated the Camino as a means to get her students out in the field to “actually do anthropology; I wanted them to walk the walk—not just learn about it in the classroom.” Prior to her first time on the Camino with her daughter, Alice had no connection to Spain, Galicia, or the Camino. Alice’s motivations for both the South American and the Camino program come from her desire to enhance student learning.
Alice views the program on the Camino as a means to get her students out of the classroom and immersed in the act of doing anthropology. She designed the program to be financially and academically accessible. Even though her institution has a variety of administrative structures through which faculty can take students abroad, Alice chose the Maymester program because students pay for the class with their spring tuition and financial aid, and they are able to return home in time to secure a summer job. This accessibility increases the diversity of the students who apply to the program, and Alice believes this is critical for students individually and the group as a whole. For students without a background in anthropology, Alice provides a strong foundation through the class meetings in the spring semester. She incorporates visits to and observations of various spiritual sites near her home campus. She believes this provides students not only with the academic tool kit for the Camino, but also exposure to the diversity in their campus’ community. Alice is committed to her students broadening their perception of the world around them and deepening their ability to engage different cultural practices.

A contributing factor to Alice’s dedication to her students is a desire to see them develop and grow as individuals. She says that leading the program, for her, “is just like good parenting.” While she is there with them on the Camino, she is “a friend, a companion” in addition to her roles as “a teacher, a grader.” Alice views her time on the Camino as a time “when [she] never get[s] to go home.” This role of friend and “Camino-mom” is one that Alice embraces. As she reflected on this role, she told me “my career went on a different track. I didn’t do the tenure track, I did the mommy track.” Her career has been flexible enough to allow her the time and space to raise her two children, one daughter and one son. She credits that flexibility, and her longevity in
her non-tenure track position, to her the fact that her husband “is a big-wig tenured guy in the department.” She seemed to understand that her professional career was unlike most non-tenure eligible faculty. She recognized that she was privileged to teach courses that she had designed, but she talked about how she still had to repeat them every semester. Despite that flexibility, she said that the Camino program “has kept me alive. This is the fun stuff. I don’t rely on others for this, it’s all on me.” It was clear that Alice took professional pride in the program, but that she also drew motivation and joy from the close relationships she developed with her students and their families.

In light of seeing herself as a “Camino-mom,” Alice draws on her own experiences with motherhood to guide her work in the program. Our conversation circled back many times to stories of how Alice would treat her students like her children, who were close in age to her students at the time of our interview. She talked about relying on her son to process the day’s activities or any social tension that came to the surface with the students. Alice relied heavily on her experiences a mother to guide her work with the students on the Camino. She also tapped in to her personal experiences as a mother whose children travelled abroad as she interacted with her students’ families. She has transparent, frequent communication with families leading up to the trip. She told me, with great pride, of the several times mothers have interviewed her before sending their children on the Camino. She has even hosted some students’ mothers at her house so they could get to know her. She believes this relationship building was important for the students’ moms—particularly because the students were multicultural first-generation college students who had never been far from home, let alone out of the country. These experiences of motherhood drove her to lead the Camino program, and she views them as
strengths that she brings to the program. Alice recognized that she struggled at times to help students and their families see her beyond her role as a professor, but she met that challenge with enthusiasm, and she credits her success to her own experiences as a mother.

**Jessica**

Jessica is a Professor and has taught at her medium-sized, religiously affiliated university for approximately three decades. Her teaching load is two classes per semester in her area of research specialization. Her department is central to the general education program at her university and thus she finds herself teaching courses for the general education curriculum more often than for her department’s majors.

**Background.** Like a few other participants, I first heard of Jessica and her students while working at the Pilgrim’s Office in June 2018. As I shared about my research with a pilgrim couple, they excitedly told me about a group from a religiously affiliated university that was due to arrive in Santiago in the next day or two. They could not remember the specifics of their program, but I made note of their observation. A few days later, while I was having my early evening tapa on the Praza de Cervantes, I spotted a group of students wearing sweatshirts from the institution the pilgrim couple had told me about. I called out to them as they walked by and asked about their sweatshirts. Eventually I learned enough about their program that I knew I needed to talk to Jessica. I passed them my card and asked them to give it to her. That night, she emailed me to let me know she would be interested in speaking about her program. The only problem was that they left for Madrid the next morning.
Two months passed, and in late August, I finally reached out to Jessica to arrange for a phone conversation. She agreed, and we were eventually able to set up a time to talk. While we spoke on the phone, she was driving home to walk her dog. The hour-long conversation started and ended with her dog and her home—two markers that weighed on her as she first thought about leading the Camino program.

Program. The program that Jessica directed has its roots in a family trip that one of her colleagues took on the Camino. That faculty member, also a full professor in Jessica’s department, believe the Camino would be an ideal setting for a philosophy course based on the theories of discernment and the religious teachings of the institution’s order. Six faculty travelled the following year with the individual who did the original trip and they all walked a portion of the Camino, and together they designed a program that launched three years later.

Jessica agreed to lead the program for summer 2018 because of its close alignment with the department’s culture and values, as well as her own. The program consists of a two-week, 200km hike. The students and Jessica stayed primarily in albergues along the way. The course that Jessica taught over the summer focused on walking and discernment. The students kept reflection journals and took turns leading debriefing conversations each night. There was also an overnight retreat one weekend in the spring semester, which the philosophy faculty designed as an integral part of the program and an opportunity for students and the program director to get to know each other.

Motivations. “This just made sense—for me, for the department, for the university.” From the outset of the program in 2016, Jessica’s department was supportive
and involved. While her institution’s office for student religious development administered the program the first year it was offered, the philosophy department has taken over all aspects of program administration. Jessica had two primary motivations for leading the Camino program—a desire to engage in a spiritual pilgrimage, and a desire to support the department.

Jessica has been teaching at her institution for nearly three decades as of 2018. Her personal values align with the institution’s faith-based values. While she never discussed her personal faith with me, Jessica did emphasize that she wanted to go on the Camino “to experience a prolonged journey of discernment.” She saw the summer 2018 as an opportune time in her personal life for her to lead the program. “Unlike [the faculty member who designed the program], I couldn’t just up and leave for a summer. My husband has a real job; his wife is an academic. Our realities weren’t the same.” Jessica’s role as a mother and wife was a factor in her delaying directing the program. She told herself that she would not do it “until the last kid graduates from high school.” When she reflected on her desire to lead the program, Jessica reflected on the personal opportunities and costs associated with dedicating three weeks. These opportunities and costs were different from her colleagues who had directed the program in the past and from the faculty member who will lead it in summer 2019. She had a family to worry about, and additionally she wanted to “make sure [she] was in the right place at the right time” to do the Camino.

Leading a program focused on discernment was an ideal fit for Jessica. She felt that “the program was another way for me to do what I’ve been doing all along.” She approached the spring semester as she would any other class she was teaching. Instead of
accepting a course release for the Camino program, she opted to teach a paid overload. She recognized that it would be better for the department not to hire someone to teach just one class for her. In addition to taking on additional teaching responsibilities, Jessica also managed the finance for the program. This was one of the harder parts of directing the program—“I felt like I turned in to a receipt collector.” While there were new administrative skills that Jessica talked about learning, she also detailed what she learned from the students that would benefit her work in the future. “The weird think about the Camino is that I found I had to think more about boundaries and less narrowly about academics.” Jessica discovered she had to change the way she taught and interacted with students after she saw how they reacted outside of the classroom setting. She did not realize “how much work I have to do to think about them socially,” and not just as students in an academic class. While this was challenging for Jessica, she told me that she learned a great deal about how students engage course material, stress, and social connections—which provided insight for her in different ways than she has experienced previously in her career.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the profiles of eight participants in this study who I interviewed during the summer of 2018. Within each profile, I provided information on the participant’s work environment, their faculty role, and the background of how I met them. Then, I provided details on the programs that they led during May and June 2018, and the highlights from our interviews and time spent together. In Chapter 5, I discuss three emergent themes that surfaced in my study. I contextualize the themes regarding my participants’ experiences, my personal experiences on the Camino leading a study
abroad program, and the literature on faculty work in the U.S. Chapter 6 connects these themes and other experiences to sensemaking. Finally, in Chapter 7 I show that the faculty participants in my study contributed to a counternarrative for faculty growth. I also make recommendations for both research and practice in light of the themes that surfaced in my study.
CHAPTER 5: CONSTRUCTING MEANING ALONG THE WAY

Although each pilgrim’s Camino is their own, certain symbols, rituals, and stories are part of every journey. Every pilgrim follows yellow arrows to get to Santiago. Every pilgrim has a credencial (pilgrim’s passport) that grants them access to albergues and records the journey via the stamps one collects along the Way. Every pilgrim can tell a story of their journey that personalizes these universal symbols and experiences. Much like the yellow arrows and pilgrim’s passport, faculty who lead short-term study abroad programs that incorporate the Camino share experiences and perspectives. Even though each experience is unique, including my own as a faculty member co-directing such a program, there are uniting themes that emerge. With this dissertation, I seek to understand the experiences of faculty members engaging with the Camino. How do they make sense of the role of program director? How does this fit within their conception of their role as a faculty member on their campus? How does walking the Camino as a pilgrimage route and using it as a classroom play in to all of this?

I have spent six years thinking about these questions in various iterations, five summers volunteering in the Pilgrim’s Office, three summers walking with students (including my own experiences as a faculty leader), two summers doing fieldwork, and one summer of interviewing faculty participants. Through this research journey, three theoretical constructs emerged as faculty who led students on the Camino as part of a short-term study abroad program spoke about, and made sense of, their experiences.
In this chapter, I introduce these constructs from the perspective of my participants, while also drawing on my own experiences and perspectives relating to the Camino and study abroad. The immersive and reflective nature of ethnographic work presents a challenge in separating the emic and etic perspectives (Fetterman, 2010; Wolcott, 1999). Thus, this chapter includes both, with the aim of providing simultaneously a detailed, nuanced view of individual experiences and a broad understanding of the environment in which those experiences occur, primarily that of the Camino. The descriptions associated with each construct derive from my own lived experiences and observations over six years and the experiences of my participants shared through our interviews. The concepts that emerged as meaningful devices that faculty employ in making sense out of their experiences leading students on the Camino are family roles, expectations associated with diverse faculty appointments, and inspirations for leading a study abroad program on the Camino.

**Family**

Family is a complicated construct that ethnographers attempt to explain within the context of culture (Wolcott, 1999). Wolcott (1999) illustrated that like culture, family is a “handy label to identify” patterns or behaviors that we see in cultural groups, according to our own established frameworks (p. 260). I view the topic of family in the context of this study as manifesting in two forms. First, there is the socially constructed nuclear family unit consisting of two adult partners and possibly children. My study shows that the topic of the nuclear family almost exclusively referred to the roles and expectations associated with being a spouse/partner and/or a parent. The second form of family that I observed in this study as being critical to the ways that faculty leaders spoke about their
experiences was the construct of the Camino family. The theoretical concept of the Camino family permeates first-person accounts of the Camino published since the pilgrimage’s reemergence in the 1980s (Genoni, 2012; Hesp, 2013). In this section, I highlight how these two particular constructs of family emerged as concepts to contextualize and make sense of the experiences of leading and teaching students in a study abroad program that incorporates the Camino de Santiago.

**Nuclear roles.** Throughout my career in higher education, I have developed a keen sense of awareness regarding how professional expectations, opportunities, and challenges are intimately intertwined with nuclear family obligations and identities. This sense of awareness evolved from my experiences in my professional role in Student Affairs, coursework in my doctoral program, and, most relevant to this discussion, my work on this dissertation. We also know from the extant literature that family is an important construct in how faculty make meaning out of their work in general (Armenti, 2004; Neumann, 2009; Park, 1996). With regards to pilgrimage and this study, I turned earlier to Turner’s (1969) concept of communitas, and how it represents a social worldview for individuals once they assume the identity of a pilgrim. Talking about pilgrims through this framework alone negates the rich and varied experiences pilgrims bring to the Camino, which includes their experiences as family members in their personal lives.

In the context of this study, those experiences that faculty bring to the Camino and to their study abroad programs influence how faculty made sense of the study abroad enterprise and how they engaged with students. The participants occupied two social roles simultaneously, one as a pilgrim in Turner’s liminal community and the other as a
faculty member overseeing an academic program for a higher education institution in the U.S. In doing so, faculty engaged the expectations associated with their professional roles and their experiences relating to nuclear family structures as they made sense of and contextualized the Camino experience. For some faculty, family roles and expectations had a structural role in determining when and to what extent they engaged in these programs. For others, parenting roles and expectations drove choices and behaviors while on the Camino. For me, this construct of family offered an opportunity to understand how faculty made sense of the experience leading a Camino study abroad program.

When George Greenia invited me in spring 2013 to walk a portion of the Camino a few months later with him, three faculty (including Kay Jenkins), and five students, I had little more to consider than how I would afford the plane ticket and who would feed my cat for the two weeks I was gone. I recall that he asked me one week, and by the next week, I had purchased my tickets and was eagerly awaiting the trip. This flexibility to make a decision so quickly that would, unknown to me at the time, have such a profound effect on my academic and professional life was a privilege to which I was blind. On that first walk, I watched George, Kay, and the other faculty members who were with us carve out intentional time to communicate with their families at home. One faculty member with three children commented toward the end of that trip that he would likely not be able to return to Santiago because it was too much time away from his responsibilities to his family. As the years passed by, I arranged for five more trips to Santiago. I no longer had a cat, so my biggest obstacle in arranging these trips was picking flight times and making sure I had funding. It was not until I started talking with faculty leaders who
were travelling with students that I understood how complex decisions were in relation to leading in study abroad programs like those on the Camino.

One of the more complicated aspects of the decision for my participants related to family commitments and expectations. Leading a program on the Camino requires time and flexibility. Most study abroad programs situate students and faculty in one city for the duration of the program, in which case it may be easier for a faculty member to bring family members with them, easing the burden of deciding how to manage familial expectations while teaching abroad. This is not the case with Camino-focused study abroad programs. The Camino is a mobile, multi-sited activity, which complicates the idea of faculty families travelling with the program directors. These complications begin with the preliminary work of designing the programs themselves.

*Now is not the time.* Jessica, the philosophy professor at a religiously affiliated institution, encountered the dilemma of family expectations early on in her program’s design. Recall that her colleague initiated the study abroad program on the Camino after his own experience walking with his family. He invited faculty from Jessica’s department to join him on an exploratory trip to Spain, and ultimately to help design the program. Jessica immediately saw a conflict with her role as a parent. “I couldn’t just up and leave for a summer,” she recalled telling him. She felt that she needed to stay home to maintain her family’s routine. Her children were still in high school and her husband worked “a real job.” Jessica had to make a decision to pass on a professional opportunity to participate in the design phases of the study abroad program because of her parent role. Eventually, however, she was able to direct the program in 2018. She felt she “was in the right place at the right time” to be able to leave. Her parental role had shifted as both her
children were out of the house. Jessica’s experiences reminded me of other faculty leaders I have spoken with over the years who faced similar dilemmas.

Over the course of my fieldwork, I encountered a number of program directors who made comments or alluded to their family roles and the effect those roles have on directing a study abroad program. Like Jessica, many of them felt a tension between their professional goal of leading such a program and the responsibilities they had to their family. One faculty member talked to me about this tension this summer as I was working in the Pilgrim’s Office. He had just finished his Camino on the Francés. We chatted as he waited in line for his compostela. In our conversation, as in most every conversation I had this summer in the crowded lines at the office, we reached the point where I asked what he did at home. He replied he was a science professor at a large, high research university. After talking about my research project, he replied “yeah I have no idea how I would have been able to do a study abroad like this when my kids were young.” Our conversation quickly focused on issues of faculty work and ways that different faculty balance work roles and family roles. As he was standing at the doorway to the room where pilgrims receive their certificates, a flashing number directing him to an available window, his last few words were about the ways that female faculty have a harder time than male faculty with “this stuff, you know the whole family-work struggle.” Our brief conversation illustrates a small insight into how nuclear family expectations can conflict with work expectations. For Jessica, this significant conflict of work-family balance defined her involvement with the Camino study abroad program. She delayed participation until that conflict resolved. In doing so, when she directed the
program she did so with a well-grounded belief that it was “her time” to engage this opportunity at no cost for her family.

**I needed this for me.** Nuclear family roles also weighed on Mark as he spent the better part of a month in Spain with his students. As Mark reflected on the program, he circled back to his role as a father as a touchpoint for contextualizing his experience as a program director. Mark’s perceptions on parenthood drew on his worldview as a devout Catholic. Recall that while his research and teaching align with the geographic, historical, and cultural aspects of the Camino, Mark found strong motivation to lead students on study abroad along the Camino from his faith. As I reflected on how Mark talked about his family, I found it very difficult to disentangle what he was saying from my perceptions of conservative Catholic family roles.

Like Jessica, Mark acknowledged that the decision to leave his family to direct a study abroad program was a difficult one. Unlike Jessica, however, Mark made the decision to do so. His wife stayed at home with his two young sons. Mark talked about how he felt in leaving them behind. “I feel kind of bad leaving my wife and sons to come do this, like it makes it seem like I’m selfish.” Also unlike Jessica, Mark did not see his directing the program abroad as solely a professional commitment. “I needed this time for me. So yea, I want to make it a good experience for the students, but it’s also important for me personally.” This awareness of personal goals was an important characteristic of the trip in how Mark contextualized the experience. While he was saddened to leave his wife as the sole caretaker of his children, he saw his role in the study abroad program as something that would ultimately benefit his family. He also noted that his wife “supported me in this, she knows I have to do it for me, like that it will
make me a better person.” Mark understood that his directing the program would have a negative effect on his wife and sons, but that he needed to do it so that he could be a better father for them. His nuclear family role was as a strong father and husband; he saw his wife’s role in the nuclear family as one that should support him in his quest to fulfill his own role.

There are clear differences in how Jessica and Mark perceive their individual roles in relation to their nuclear families. Jessica viewed her family role as incompatible with her directing the Camino program, and therefore waited until her role at home evolved before engaging the program. I want to emphasize here that at no point in my conversation with Jessica did she say anything that would have indicated she was disappointed with this decision or that she felt that her family role held her back from something she fervently wanted to participated in from the context of her faculty role. She talked about the conflict between the two as a simple fact of her lived experience.

This significantly differed from the ways in which Mark talked about his two roles—as father and as faculty director. Mark saw the conflict but acknowledged that he was justified in his choices because his wife knew it was important to him personally and professionally to leave the country for an extended period. These two different perspectives on family represent a more traditional, gendered approach to family roles. A third approach to resolving the tension between family and faculty roles within the context of leading study abroad programs on the Camino was to embrace both roles simultaneously. This was the approach Rachel employed.

A family affair. In recent years, the idea of walking the Camino as a nuclear family unit has grown in popularity. Families with children of all ages have begun to
view pilgrimage as an ideal activity wherein they escape their day-to-day to routine, spend time with each other, and see the world—for a fraction of the price of a traditional vacation. Over the summers that I have volunteered in the Pilgrim’s Office, I have noticed this increase firsthand. I was surprised that in my time in the office in 2018 I saw so many children and teenagers finishing the walk with their parents and siblings. As Jim and I led the study abroad program in 2017, we encountered a number of families that were hiking the Camino, with the number dramatically increasing as we reached Sarria. During my fieldwork in 2018, I had the opportunity to spend an extended amount of time with Rachel after she finished the Camino portion of her program and her students took classes at a local university. Part of spending time with Rachel meant spending time with her family as well.

Rachel’s son comes to Spain each summer, and in recent years has started walking with the study abroad group. He participates in activities, stays in the same accommodations as the students and Rachel, and walked the same paths that the students walked. As her son has grown up, Rachel took deliberate steps to design the study abroad program in a way that accommodated her bringing her son with her. As I spent time with her family and her students, I saw clearly that Rachel incorporated her family into the study abroad group in a way that allowed Rachel to navigate the tensions I addressed earlier in this chapter. Rachel spoke frequently about her dedication to making sure that the programs she designed were family friendly and would benefit her son. This work was possible in part because her institution had flexible policies regarding children accompanying faculty on study abroad programs. By designing her programs with her
family in mind, Rachel created a structure that allowed her to fulfill the expectations associated with both her role as a faculty program director and as a mother.

**Motherhood as a credential.** A common experience for all the participants in my study, for my own work with the study abroad program at William & Mary, and for every faculty member I have spoken to over six years of studying Camino-based study abroad programs is the task of recruiting students to participate in our programs. Faculty want to ensure that students understand what they are signing up for and that everyone has realistic expectations of the experience. One of my participants, Alice, extended the recruitment process beyond students to their families as well. Recall from Chapter 4 that one of the hallmarks of Alice’s experience was the way in which she aligned her role as a mother with her role as a program director. Alice worked extensively with her students’ families to assure them that, as a mother herself, Alice would be able to provide a safe experience for the students.

Alice’s embrace of her parenting role was unique among my participants. Unlike Jessica and Mark, who both talked about their parenting roles weighing heavily on their decision to direct the programs, Alice came into directing the Camino study abroad program because of walking the Camino with her child. She viewed her role as mother as an asset to the program, the students, and their families. While her children did not walk with her during the program, Alice talked about how she consulted them regularly throughout the trip. The tension between family role and faculty role that Jessica, Mark, and Rachel talked about was seemingly non-existent for Alice. Alice’s integration of her identity and role expectations as a mother are strong throughout her reflections on her experience.
I believe this directly relates to the ways in which these participants spoke about their identity as faculty members and the various sources of motivation for directing these study abroad programs. With these examples, I have introduced how being a parent played a structural role designing and directing study abroad programs. I also shared insights from my observations at the Pilgrim’s Office and on the trail with my students. What has emerged so far in this discussion of the concept of nuclear family is the establishment of how the roles and expectations associated with parenthood interacted with the experiences and motivations of faculty leaders who inhabit those two roles. In the next sections, I focus on the development of Camino families—a ubiquitous phrase to describe the social bonds between pilgrims.

**Camino family.** I spent six weeks in summer 2016 in Santiago work with Kay Jenkins as her research assistant. Her research focused on the experiences of parents and their adult children who walked the Camino together. As part of my work with Kay, I volunteered in the Pilgrim’s Office greeting and receiving pilgrims as they ended their journey. My role was to identify families and learn more about their background and journey. I walked up and down the hallway of the Office. Sometimes, the line would stretch through the building, spilling out into a shaded courtyard with a fountain, winding down the staircase into a garden. While in line, pilgrims display the widest range of emotions—joy in arriving to Santiago, anger at waiting in line, grief over the impending return home. I would spot groups of people, usually pairs, huddled together. When these groups looked as if they could be parents and adult children, I approached them to start a conversation. After hearing how the pair travelled together, shared in meals and joys and sorrows along the way, and planned their time in Santiago, I would ask if they were
related to each other. Countless times, the answers would be along the lines of, “yes, this is my dad (mom/brother/sister/uncle). Well, not my real dad, but my Camino dad.” As pilgrims made the journey across Spain and Portugal, they formed strong social bonds with other pilgrims that more frequently than not they labeled as a family-like bond. Oftentimes the bonds were complex and part of a larger network of a Camino family. This was especially true for pilgrims who had walked from France. The Camino family construct permeates the pilgrimage experience, and study abroad programs are not immune.

One morning, a student and I were walking together as our group travelled from Pontedeume to Betanzos along the river. I asked her about her walk so far—this was day three of six. Within a few moments, I connected the dots that the student I was walking with was the same student that I had worked with in my professional role. The year before our Camino program, I helped her navigate what I knew to be a death in her family. As we walked through the bucolic fields, however, I learned much more. She shared with me the details of what she had experienced and the impact it had on her as a student and as a human being. We paused at one particularly picturesque point on the trail where the gravel path left a small forest. We waited for the group to move on ahead of us and she continued her story. I will never forget that morning. We watched as the sun hit the field of wildflowers and she finished telling me about her family member. Then, wiping a few tears away, she looked at me and laughed. “I bet you didn’t think you were signing up for this kind of stuff when George asked you to come along.” She told me that very few people outside of her family knew the details of what had happened. I was surprised by just how comfortable she was sharing this with me. As I
reflected on the day’s walk with George later that evening, he smiled a characteristically wry grin and said “that’s what the Camino will do to you.” I have come to understand the “that” he was referring to was the sudden, emotional, and deep connection that develops among pilgrims; the “that” was the Camino family. This story is like a handful of other experiences I have had walking the Camino with students.

Another student on this first trip confided in me about his mental health struggles and the various coping mechanisms he employed. As we arrived to Santiago, he shared with me, “you know, nobody knows about this stuff except for my family. But I guess while we’re out here on the Camino, we are kinda like a family.” The student saw my role on the trip not as a chaperone of sorts, rather as just another pilgrim who became part of his Camino family. This example emphasizes the liminality of the social structure on the Camino.

The Camino can be an intensely moving emotional experience, not to mention the physical demand it places on the body. Students frequently looked to me or the other faculty members walking with them to provide both emotional and directional guidance. As leaders, we defaulted into fulfilling whatever need the students presented. This came a bit easier for me and for Jim—we both have extensive backgrounds in student affairs and a well-developed understanding of student development theory. Other faculty members find this role of family member and caretaker to be daunting. I have learned that faculty often felt that students called upon them to act in roles that are outside the traditional expectations of faculty members on university campuses.

The relationship between student and faculty member is oftentimes socially constructed as a hierarchy where the professor is the expert who holds the knowledge and
power and the student is the receiver of that knowledge. Higher education in the U.S. continues, for the most part, to reify this hierarchical relationship. This is particularly true in many of the classrooms where students and faculty interact. The rooms are set up to focus on the screen or podium where the professor is sharing knowledge about the course subject. Students write papers and take tests that the faculty member then evaluates and grades. There are exceptions to this pattern and the structure of this relationship to be sure. Some students engage in research with faculty in labs, they visit office hours, or they establish a connection with faculty outside the classroom in some other way. The Camino as a site for study abroad complicates these experiences. Faculty and students come to the Camino and have to negotiate new social boundaries and relationships. The construct of the Camino family effects how faculty members, and particularly participants in my study, interact with students. While my participants established new roles and relationships, they also had to maintain the roles associated with directing an academic study abroad program.

_They are real people._ Walking the Camino is an activity that goes far beyond the physical act of walking for days on end. The experience involves staying in albergues, the shelters where pilgrims find affordable accommodations. Rooms in albergues sometimes sleep four pilgrims; some rooms have beds for 150. Pilgrims share meals together and do laundry together. These activities expose some of the most intimate and private areas of our lives. Sleeping, washing clothes, and taking care of personal hygiene are all private moments that faculty would most likely never share with students on their home campuses. While directing a Camino study abroad program, however, these private moments suddenly become semi-public. The first time I travelled with students
on the Camino, this erasure of boundaries was shocking and uncomfortable. But, the erasure of boundaries also allows for pilgrims—students and faculty included—to establish connections not possible in such short time periods in normal lives.

In this context, students and faculty see each other in a new light. As Jessica recounted, “I got to know them as real people.” She had never spent significant time with students outside of the classroom, let alone in an environment like the Camino. Her experience led her to “have to negotiate a new social contract” with her students. She became a part of their world in a new way. As she sat in a chair in the common room of an albergue somewhere before Sarria—the point where common rooms and spontaneous social activities greatly diminish with the influx of more pilgrims—she watched her students playing a card game. They were laughing, joking, and “just being regular people.” She had never shared a social space like this with students. This new interaction was not always positive. At one point, Jessica had to step in to help settle a conflict within the group. She felt that this put her in a very odd position “because I was still the professor, but I had also become a member of the group.” This new role strayed from Jessica’s experiences as a professor in the classroom.

Olivia also had to develop her confidence in walking the line between being part of the group and still maintaining some authority. “There was a lot of conflict in our group at one point on the trail. I had to act as the mediator, which was weird.” While Olivia was accustomed to dealing with conflict in her former role as graduate studies director, she had not before been involved in facing interpersonal conflict with undergraduate students. Like Jessica, Olivia learned more about her students when she had to expand her role to meet expectations along the Camino.
The concept of seeing students as *real people* extends beyond social conflict management. The opportunity to spend extended amounts of time with students offers faculty leaders a glimpse into college student life. Just as faculty members may feel out of place spending so much time with students, students themselves share aspects of their lives that they normally would not share with faculty. Over time, I have seen these interactions and exchanges cover a wide range of topics. I learned a great deal about popular music, slang, trends in social media, and new technology, among many other topics. While those topics may seem trivial, they are critical to students and the way they shape their worldview. These insights were incredibly valuable to me as a student affairs practitioner. I never would have learned about new social media tools or slang from students when I was helping them navigate a personal crisis or holding them accountable for their academic progress back on campus.

Likewise, as a faculty member teaching in the study abroad program in 2017, I learned an immense amount from the students about how they engaged and absorbed course material. After the first few days of teaching, I shifted my approach to better meet student needs and preferences. This shift was the direct result of conversations I had with students while having a glass of wine and a tapa (small bite of food that accompanies your beverage) at a café on the Plaza Cervantes. I am certain that if I had been teaching this course in Williamsburg, I would not have gone to one of the college bars with students for a beer to talk about teaching and learning. Things were different in Santiago. We were staying in the same hotel, eating most of our meals together, and having a glass of wine and a tapa was part of a nightly cultural ritual in town.
Camino family expectations. I am not alone in my experiences of learning more about my students through the study abroad program. Many of my participants have heavy teaching loads of three or more courses per semester, and many of those courses are language instruction. A language instruction class is intense. The curriculum is set, the timetable for the course is rigid, and the assessments can be painfully traditional and rote. Oftentimes, faculty teaching these courses may not have the opportunity to get to know students in the same ways that their colleagues may be able to in smaller, upper-level seminars. Elsie offered, “Este programa me permite conocer mis estudiantes como seres humanos, más que un estudiante” [This program lets me get to know my students like human beings, more than just a student]. She found great joy in getting to know her students in a different way. The concept of the Camino family and sense of communitas created a venue in which she learned about how they perceived their experiences on her home campus, what their frustrations were with her department, and how she could be a better instructor. This closeness, however, also created a tension for Elsie. While she enjoyed getting to know students on a more informal and personal level, she encountered gendered family role expectations that conflicted with her professional identity. As the students talked about their Camino family, they would refer to her as their “Camino mom.” She would reply, “No soy tu madre, soy tu profesor” [I’m not your mom, I’m your professor]. The role of Camino mom carried the expectation that Elsie would provide for them in ways they expected their mothers to provide, primarily in the form of physical caretaking. Elsie recalled one night in particular a few years prior to our conversation.
This story emphasizes the tensions that can emerge between the roles of the Camino family, roles of faculty director, and expectations students have of both. Elsie found
herself in a situation where her professional identity as the faculty program director was, in her perspective, compromised by the gendered expectation of motherly caretaking that her students had of her. She made a decision regarding the structure of the program based on this experience—from the next year onward she hired a teaching assistant whose primary role was to serve as the caretaker and motivator for the students. Important to note here is Elsie’s rebuke of the caretaker or stand-in mother role for the students, which contrasts with Alice’s approach to wield her personal experiences as a mother as a tool to help her navigate her experiences. Unlike Alice, Elsie does not have children and therefore did not have the cache of mothering experiences to draw upon during the program. The sudden realization in this particular moment that her students sought a caretaking relationship seemed to shock Elsie. Perhaps if in the same situation, Alice would have fully embraced this physical caretaking role and not thought twice about caring for the student’s blisters.

The ways in which the construct of the Camino Family emerges has the potential to affect the way that faculty leaders view and make sense of their experiences on the Camino. On one hand, where Elsie found joy in knowing her students in a different way, she also found frustration in their gendered expectations and the ways she perceived those expectations conflicting with her professional identity. Scarlett, on the other hand, found different meaning in her role as the matriarch of the Camino family. She found great pride in getting to know her students personally and seeing them develop close bonds with one another. One factor in this was the length of her walk. She was the only program director I spoke with in summer 2018 who walked from St. Jean Pied-de-Port. “I really think doing the whole Camino is so important for these kids. It not only gives
them the full range of Camino experiences, but it also gives them time to know one another.” Scarlett returned to the notion of the “whole Camino” multiple times during our conversation. Readers familiar with Camino discourse know that the construct of a “whole Camino” is problematic and wrought with ideological and theoretical baggage; this dissertation does not wade into these debates. Readers unfamiliar with Camino discourse should note that the route from St. Jean in France is commonly referred to as the “whole Camino” in that St. Jean marks the convergence of the medieval European routes and is the starting point of the Camino Francés.

The importance here for Scarlett was that she felt the experience of walking 764km over the course of more than a month was critical to her students’ experiences and her own goals for the program. She found particular delight in watching her students interact with each other and with other pilgrims. “I can’t tell you how touched I was when I saw them really connect. Especially when they would come together on something I knew was tough, like when they decided how to respond to the pilgrim in the wheelchair.” In this situation, Scarlett was referring to a decision the group of students had to make to cease their support for a pilgrim who was struggling to complete the Camino. Up to that point, the students helped him by literally carrying him across mountains, paying for his meals, and providing emotional support. Scarlett had to step in and ask that the group come up with a plan to part ways with him, which they ultimately did. She felt like this was a meaningful embodiment of the Camino family construct.

**Summary.** The theoretical construct of family emerged in many ways through faculty experiences leading short-term study abroad programs on the Camino. Nuclear family role expectations influenced how faculty members made decisions about
participating in the design and implementation of these study abroad programs. Beyond the social construction of nuclear family roles, the construct of a Camino family emerged as a salient force that influenced how faculty members reflected on the experience. Through all of their reflections, faculty touched on constructs of family and the ways this construct became a useful means to make sense of the program activities in the contexts of their faculty roles.

**Appointments and Role Expectations**

Job roles and titles affect how individuals construct their identity within the work environment (Belbin, 2010). Faculty members begin to construct their professional identity in graduate school, where they prepare for their academic career in a field of higher education that has changed dramatically over recent decades (Austin, 2002; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Finkelstein et al., 2016; Gappa et al., 2007; Kezar, 2012). As faculty appointments change, expectations and perceptions of those roles continue to evolve. In this section, I present how academic appointments and the expectations associated with those roles shaped the way that faculty made sense of their experiences leading a study abroad program on the Camino.

One of the most significant changes to take place since the new millennium is the expansion of the non-tenure track professoriate (Finkelstein et al., 2016; Kezar, 2012). Kezar (2012) defined non-tenure track as individuals in fulltime or part-time appointments that are not eligible for tenure and share a long list of common work conditions. These conditions focus on what these faculty members lack—long-term contracts, assurances of continuing appointment, and clear career pathways (Kezar, 2012). Rachel, Elsie, and Alice, the three participants in my study who occupied full-
time, non-tenure track appointments, did not share any of these characteristics. They each had multi-year contracts that presumed renewal and each had been through at least one formal promotion process in their home departments. Scarlett, the fourth non-tenure track faculty member, taught classes as part of her fulltime administrative appointment, a role that also did not align with Kezar’s (Holcombe & Kezar, 2018; Kezar 2012, 2013a, 2013b, 2018; Kezar & Sam, 2010) definition of non-tenure track faculty. Given the contrast between Kezar’s deficit-oriented characteristics of non-tenure track faculty and the realities of the non-tenure track participants in my study, I wanted to better understand how non-tenure track status affected participants’ perceptions of their experiences leading the Camino study abroad programs in the context of their role on campus.

Just as non-tenure track roles have a diverse array of characteristics and expectations, so do tenured and tenure-track roles. While nationwide standards for tenure track and non-tenure track positions do not exist, there are basic presumptions both within the literature and in practice. Charlotte’s tenured role, for example is unique among the other tenured faculty participants. Her institution’s mission focused on students’ classroom learning experiences, which translated to increased value on teaching. This changed Charlotte’s role regarding research as a result. The other tenured faculty participants—Jessica, Mark, and Olivia—hold positions at high research institutions where tenured faculty are expected to excel in research and teaching. Though not official participants in this study, I note that Jim and Kay’s tenured roles at William & Mary carried similar expectations for blended excellence in teaching and research. This blended focus was evident in my analysis of institutions’ websites, including that of
William & Mary. Each website included, as of February 2019, images and text that emphasized the institution’s commitment to undergraduate education, first-class research, and international opportunities for students. These shared values, so vividly expressed online, raised an important question in the context of my study: How do faculty make sense of their experiences leading a Camino study abroad program in the context of their tenured faculty roles at institutions that espouse strong value in both teaching and research? Similar to my wanting to understand how non-tenure track faculty made sense of their experiences given appointment-specific role expectations, I wanted to learn about the perceptions of tenured faculty as well.

These two different appointment types—non-tenure track and tenured—carry different expectations and assumptions. Kezar (Holcombe & Kezar, 2018; Kezar 2012, 2013a, 2013b, 2018; Kezar & Sam, 2010) is not alone in viewing non-tenure track faculty as professionally and academically constrained by their lack of tenure. The American Association of University Professors (2019) staunchly defends the institution of tenure in order to preserve academic freedom and professional value of the professoriate. A simple view of the non-tenure eligible versus tenure eligible dichotomy focuses on academic and economic freedom. The assumption is generally that tenured faculty have both of these freedoms and non-tenured faculty do not.

The theoretical construct I introduce in this section helps to understand how faculty leaders who direct study abroad programs on the Camino made sense of their experiences in the context of their faculty appointments and the expectations associated with those appointments. Faculty leaders referred to their appointment type and role expectations as they discussed two broader roles related to their experiences—teaching and research.
Notably absent from their reflections was any mention the role of governance or service.

Teaching along the Way. Different faculty roles have different teaching expectations. These expectations oftentimes are more complex than just the number of sections that a professor teaches per semester and, as mentioned above, the level of courses they teach, such as introductory language courses or small, topic-specific seminars. I have discussed how the different kinds of courses and materials effect the relationships that the faculty in my study have with their students. In this section, I highlight how institutional teaching expectations that faculty perceived to be associated with their appointments related to the how they made sense of their experiences leading these programs.

Findings in this study highlight how teaching abroad can expand the opportunities that a faculty member has regarding the material they teach, the methods they use, or the types of assignments students complete. For example, Jim’s typical teaching responsibility is two courses per semester in the School of Education’s graduate higher education program. These courses focus on student development theory, multidisciplinary approaches to educational research, and assessment methods of college student learning. In his teaching experiences abroad in both Prague and Santiago, Jim had the opportunity to design new courses for undergraduate students. Directing study abroad programs was one avenue that Jim explored to diversify his course offerings and the student audiences for those courses. Like Jim, my experience teaching abroad introduced me to new opportunities and was a creative way to engage material that I was passionate about. My professional career has been in full-time administration, first in student affairs and then in faculty development work. While teaching in Spain, I was
able to blend my academic and personal interests together to provide a challenging and engaging course for undergraduates. The course I taught dealt with the intersection of pilgrimage studies and cultural studies, focusing on how the Camino becomes a contested space for establishing dominant narratives through language, history, politics, and food. While I have plans to teach this class in the future on campus, teaching on-site in Spain provided opportunities for me and my students to engage the material in a different way.

**A chance to break free.** Teaching language instruction classes can often serve as an exercise of repetition and constraint. I recall my own experiences as a Teaching Assistant for the introductory Spanish language courses at William & Mary during my undergraduate years. For two years, I worked with the instructor to develop lesson plans for each Friday when I would review the week’s material with 10-12 students. I remember little about the exact activities, aside from the wretched mispronunciation from one particular student, but I distinctly remember the conversations I would have with the lead faculty member. Bored to tears with repeating the same vocabulary drills, I asked if we could be creative and incorporate movies or music into our reviews. Time and again the response would be along the lines of “no, we can’t do that because that’s not following the course curriculum.” As an undergraduate student, my initial reaction was that she did not want to take the time to be creative or expand the way we were working with students. I better understand now that a different, and much more plausible, rationale would be that she felt confined by the expectations associated with the course. When the students enrolled in the next semester’s course, they needed to have mastered a specific skillset. Her role was to impart the knowledge and skills so that students could continue their studies successfully. The case was not her unwillingness to be creative,
rather the practical demand that students learn a prescribed amount of material in preparation for the next course.

Elsie, Rachel, and Charlotte all would have understood my instructor’s sense of feeling constricted in her teaching role. Each semester, these three participants in my study offer courses in language instruction, translation methodology, or introductory literary surveys. Recall that Elsie and Rachel are non-tenure track faculty who have been promoted into senior positions, and Charlotte is an associate professor with tenure. They each shared with me that their teaching loads vary little year by year, with the occasional opportunity to cover a more advanced topics course for a tenured colleague on sabbatical. Elsie, for example, had the opportunity to teach an upper-level seminar. She shared, “Fue una de las primeras veces que había hablado yo sobre el tema de mi tesis. Imagina que alegría para revivir esto” [It was one of the first times that I had the chance to talk about my dissertation research. Just imagine how great that was to relive that]. While she never insinuated that she was unsatisfied with her teaching responsibilities, this story served as an example of the energy and delight she felt to be able to teach something new and different. Rachel shared that she, too, finds her standard teaching responsibilities to be monotonous at times. She occasionally will “spice things up a bit and toss in some Camino terminology or a passage from the Codex” in her courses. Here she refers in shorthand to the Codex Calixtinus, the famous 12th-century guide to the Camino. Alice described her teaching role in similar terms, noting that while she “gets to teach pretty much in [her] area of interest,” they are usually the same courses every year. Alice also occupies a non-tenure track role at a high-research institution. Despite different roles at different institutions, these four women all expressed a common sentiment relating to
their teaching in a Camino study abroad program. This was their chance to teach what they wanted to teach. Not constraining them to language acquisition learning outcomes, departmental expectations, or the need to cover expansive fields of knowledge in an introductory course, the summer study abroad program offered the non-tenure track faculty participants in my study a chance to break free of their regular teaching role’s responsibilities and be creative in their pedagogy.

Teaching the good stuff. At its simplest, teaching while on the Camino was exciting for these four faculty members. In more complex terms, this teaching created a space for them to embrace their passions, share their joy of learning with their students, and challenge themselves in new ways. Charlotte shared, “I get to teach about the real good stuff over here. I got my Ph.D. in Spanish so I would have a job.” She adds that her most sincere teaching interests focus on the Camino, and, “that’s what I get to do with this program.” While Charlotte had a tenured position at her university, she found that her normal course load restricted what she was able to teach. In her interview, Charlotte talked about how the study abroad program was part of her larger strategy for finding joy and meaning in her professional role. She understood early in her career that finding a permanent position that would allow her to focus on her research and teach her passion would have been a difficult task. She shared with me that she started planning the Camino program early in her current career. “As soon as I was on campus I started looking in to how I could make this happen. I knew I would need institutional support and permission, so I just had to figure out how to get it.” Teaching on the Camino, for Charlotte, was a way to connect her teaching role with her research passion.
While Charlotte spoke about the Camino program allowing her an opportunity to pursue her passion in teaching Camino-focused material, Alice found in the Camino a live laboratory to teach discipline-specific methodology. Alice shared, “one of the wonderful things I get to do with this course is teach them how to do cultural anthropology” (emphasis added). Part of the course that Alice taught abroad focused on ethnographic field observations. Her students had to maintain field notes, speak with other pilgrims who were not part of the study abroad program, and write reflective analyses on their experiences. Recall that Alice and I had our conversation on the terrace of a busy café in the old town of Santiago. As she told me about the assignments for her course, she became increasingly excited and used our surroundings as examples. “So if we were sitting here on a break, I would make them all sit at different tables, talk to different people. This would have made a great place for them to do their work!” Her sense of excitement and joy as she shared about her course and her work with students was on par with the emotions I observed daily in the Pilgrim’s Office as people ended their long journeys. Teaching on the Camino not only offered Alice’s students the opportunity to learn observation and interview skills, but it also brought joy and excitement for Alice. “It’s so refreshing,” she shared, “to be able to leave campus and do this kind of teaching with students these days.”

It’s my time. Not only did teaching on the Camino allow the faculty I spoke with to teach new or different material, the experience also offered them autonomy in managing the aspects of on-campus teaching that they normally do not enjoy. Both Rachel and Elsie regularly teach language courses and do not have tenure. They shared that their teaching schedules were assigned to them based on the needs of the department,
and there was little freedom in setting their own schedules. The summers, and study abroad in particular, offered a reprieve from this. Rachel spoke about how her appointment as a non-tenure track faculty member offered her a certain degree of freedom during the summer months that her tenured or tenure track colleagues did not enjoy. “The summer is mine. I basically get a carte blanche from my department to do whatever because I’m on a 9-month contract. They don’t expect me to do research; they don’t care what I do in the summer.” Both she and Elsie found that their colleagues’ initial ambivalence toward their summer activities faded quickly with the study abroad programs’ increasing popularity. “Ya que el programa se ha establecido, se ve como un beneficio al departamento. No había esos programas antes. Yo y mi colega quién también es un NTE, diseñamos los primeros programas en el departamento y ahora nos apoyan” [Now that the program is up and running, it is seen as a benefit to the department. Before there weren’t any of these programs. My colleague, who is also an NTE, and I designed the first study abroad programs for the department and now they support us]. This movement from ambivalence to support also emerged in the conversation with Scarlett. As an adjunct instructor with a fulltime administrative role, she found that the program began as her “little pet project, but has really grown and now the dean and the faculty support it fully.” Support from the department for these programs was important to the participants who had non-tenure track roles and for Charlotte, whose tenured role carried higher expectations for teaching.

Summary. Teaching abroad allowed these faculty leaders an opportunity to pursue their passion through the courses they designed, and doing so during the summer imparted a sense of freedom and autonomy they all felt was lacking during the regular
academic year. They made sense of their experiences teaching both on campus and abroad in the Camino study abroad program through reframing their construction of the teaching expectations associated with their non-tenure track roles. While they viewed their less flexible teaching responsibilities as a hindrance to their creativity and professional autonomy, their involvement with the Camino offered a way to expand their teaching opportunities and thus develop a stronger sense of agency in their roles as teachers. Likewise, these faculty framed their perceptions of role expectations regarding the summer months as an opportunity to establish further pedagogical autonomy. Importantly, the three non-tenure track faculty leaders eschewed deficit-oriented perceptions of their teaching roles—lack of freedom and autonomy—in favor of agency-oriented constructs of pedagogical creativity and role expectations during the summer months. In the next section, I discuss how the faculty participants with tenure at high research universities engaged the construct of their faculty appointment as they made sense of their experiences with the Camino study abroad programs.

**Researcher identity and expectations.** Since as early as Boyer’s (1990) seminal *Scholarship Reconsidered*, the gap between what faculty did and how faculty evaluated each other has been a central discussion in U.S. higher education. As discussed in Chapter 2, the nature of faculty work has evolved significantly since the 1950s. In the current U.S. higher education environment, the three-legged stool trope for faculty work persists—the faculty career consists of teaching, research, and service. The stool looks different at different institutions, and these distinctions often map nicely to Carnegie Foundation classifications. For reference, I included the classifications for each of the universities represented in my study in Chapter 4. That listing shows that each of my
participants worked at institutions that have very high research activity, with two exceptions. The exceptions in the context of this study were Charlotte, who worked at a comprehensive master’s university, and the experiences that I discuss relating to Jim and Kay, since William & Mary is a high research activity institution. This context is important because the research classification of an institution affects the expectations of a faculty member’s professional role. The influence of context and role expectations is particularly true for tenured and tenure-eligible faculty. As participants talked about the Camino study abroad program, the expectations for research associated with their tenured faculty roles emerged as a construct they employed to contextualize their experiences.

But not before tenure. In the context of U.S. higher education, many full-time faculty have 9-month contracts that span the traditional academic year, typically late-August through mid-May. Recall that these contracts, and the autonomy derived from the summer gap in contractual obligations, served as the catalyst for non-tenure track faculty like Elsie and Rachel to lead their study abroad programs. For faculty who are on the tenure track, or who already have tenure, the contractual obligations to their institutions are no different. However, the findings of this study show that there is a significant gap in the way that faculty appointment type influenced role expectations and the ways faculty leaders made sense of their experiences leading Camino study abroad programs.

When I went on my first Camino with George and Kay, a pre-tenure faculty member accompanied us. She had just finished her second year at William & Mary. Over the course of the trip, George and Kay would talk about the future of the study abroad program and which faculty on campus may be interested in leading it. The pre-
tenure faculty member who was with us expressed great enthusiasm for directing a study abroad program, and it was clear she was enjoying the Camino. There was a particular conversation that stands out to me as the first glimpse I had into the reality of pre-tenure faculty roles.

Even though this faculty member was talking about her excitement in leading the study abroad program, her demeanor shifted. She then admitted, in an almost confessional tone, that she was unable to lead the program for the next few years. George’s initial response was his characteristic enthusiasm and encouragement. He, too, then saw the truth that was clearly apparent to him and the other professor, but still shrouded in mystery for me. His response was along the lines of “oh right, you need to get tenure. Don’t think about this until well after you’re promoted. Let’s get that done first.” This faculty member felt pressured to not participate in leading the study abroad program because she did not yet have tenure. Jim is an example of the converse situation. He directed an undergraduate study abroad program within two years of his appointment as a tenure-track faculty member. The key difference between Jim and the other faculty member was that Jim had the support of senior faculty in his program to pursue the study abroad opportunity. That support was critical to his ability to lead the program. These are two examples of pre-tenure faculty who faced pressure to focus on research during their initial summers instead of directing study abroad programs. My personal assumption as I started this study was the pressure would disappear once faculty members earned tenure, that with the protections of tenure, faculty would be free to engage in whatever professional activities they most valued.
Tenure yes, autonomy no. In a typical summer, Olivia would spend her days in her office on campus working with her collaborators to advance any number of her research projects. With her schedule free from teaching, she would be able to focus on her research and make up for not being able to spend as much time during the semester writing as she would like. Recall that Olivia is an associate professor, which means that ideally one day she would apply for promotion to full professor. At her institution, she shared, a promotion would require her to have a steady stream of multiple publications per year. I asked her if she would need to focus more on teaching than when she went up for tenure, or if she needed to assume more responsibilities for departmental administration. “Hah, no,” she replied. I must have looked surprised, because she continued, “Sorry, that was blunt. No, because the only thing that matters is research.” Summer research was critical for Olivia to produce the publications she would need for promotion. I asked her what her involvement in the Santiago program would mean for her colleagues. Her response was: “They’ll be like, ‘that was her choice, she could’ve not done that.’ The only thing that gets rewarded are grants and pubs… summer teaching is seen as optional and a distraction.” Olivia was clear that she was not going to reap any reward for her work in Spain. In fact, teaching in the Santiago study abroad program would most likely lead to a lower merit evaluation because she would not be able to publish as much that particular summer.

The pressure to publish continued for post-tenure faculty members, as Mark recounted too. For Mark, the pressure was not just from his current colleagues. He was surprised, in fact, by his mentor’s response. He stated that “Even my advisor told me not to do this. He doesn’t think this will get me promoted, and honestly, I think he’s a little
disappointed in my output so far.” Despite earning tenure at a *highest research* institution, Mark felt the pressure to continue publishing just as much as he did during his pre-tenure years. “I know this isn’t what I’m supposed to be doing, but I really wanted to do this,” he commented. Mark, like Olivia, knew that leaving campus for the summer would result in less research productivity. Unlike Olivia, however, Mark talked about experiencing pressure from his advisor in a way that showed he felt he was disappointing a valued mentor.

Mark and Olivia contextualized their experiences with the Camino study abroad programs with the expectations associated with their faculty roles on campus. For both, this involved acknowledging that their summers—months when they were not officially under contract with their employer—were not opportunities to engage in activities of their choosing. Instead, they viewed summers as months they needed to dedicate to research to meet the expectations of their colleagues and for promotion requirements. Tenure did not always offer the freedom to pursue new opportunities like study abroad, nor was it a shield to protect against pressure to conform to expectations for faculty work at a research university. In their faculty roles, they were researchers first and foremost, and this identity contributed in other ways to their making sense of the Camino study abroad experiences.

“But I’m still a researcher.” Recall from Chapter 3 the evolution of my own evolution through this dissertation process. When I started working on my Ph.D. in spring of 2012, I would have painted a very different picture of where the journey would lead me. In those first semesters, I envisioned a lifelong career in student affairs at William & Mary. Eventually I would continue my climb from Assistant to the Dean of
Students to an Assistant Dean, then Associate Dean, then maybe Dean one day. As of writing this dissertation, I live a very different reality. Instead of supporting students, I support faculty. I am still working at William & Mary, and I am nearing the end of my doctoral program. That program has fundamentally altered my journey. As I have discussed earlier, I knew early on in my involvement with the Camino that I would focus my dissertation studies on the pilgrimage route and its intersections with higher education.

As I continued in my doctoral program, I spent more time with Kay as she was researching her book. I watched her learn about the Camino. I watched how she approached her learning about the Camino in a methodical and inspiringly thorough fashion. Through watching her project take shape, I began to develop my awareness of how research gets done. I learned how to observe the world around me. I learned how to talk to people and learn about their stories. I learned how to craft questions and conversations to draw out meaningful responses. Much of this learning happened in Santiago de Compostela. Each time I returned home from Spain, I felt more strongly the desire to go back and learn more.

Fast forward to February of 2019. I am writing my dissertation. I am combing through years of memories, field notes, interview notes, and navigating a never-ending maze of extant research and literature. I am doing research. I am a researcher. The Camino is my laboratory. My identity as a researcher is inextricably linked to the Camino de Santiago and the study abroad programs that occur along the Way. Teaching in William & Mary’s program, doing field work under Kay’s mentorship, doing my own field work, and writing about the faculty members who lead students on study abroad
along the Camino are key characteristics of my identity as a researcher. That identity revolves around the Camino.

Given how central the Camino and Camino-based study abroad programs have been to my own identity as a researcher, I was surprised to learn from tenured faculty leaders their perspectives on how directing their programs threatened their identities as researchers. Throughout these conversations, researcher identity emerged as a lens through which the faculty made sense of their experiences. In this section, I draw the distinction from the previous section, where I discussed how Olivia and Mark shared how expectations associated with their roles as researchers at high research institutions complicated their understanding of their experiences leading Camino study abroad programs.

Jessica was the most senior of my participants with regards to academic rank, years at her institution, and the length of her faculty career. Recall from Chapter 4 and previously in this chapter that Jessica’s role as a professor of philosophy at a religiously affiliated institution influenced the way she made sense of her experiences. In particular, she shared to a great extent the integral nature of her department in her university’s core curriculum. The topic of her course on the Camino focused on discernment, an area of personal interest—not research or teaching expertise—for Jessica. During our interview, Jessica spoke at length on each of these topics. As I spent time with the notes from our conversation and reflected on the cadence of her stories, I realized that each thematic area had a common final chord—her role as a researcher. For example, when talking about her role as a mother that I discussed above, she noted her pride in raising two children while earning tenure and promotion to full professor. She spoke about her role as program
director and the responsibilities that role carried throughout the academic year prior to her going to Spain. That vignette ended with her highlighting her publications for that year. Finally, she told me about her experiences on the Camino in Spain and how meaningful the experience was for her. “But,” she interjected, “this was a onetime thing for me. I’m still a serious researcher and I still have an active line of research. I publish quite a bit.” Jessica made sense of her experiences leading students on a Camino study abroad program by downplaying that very experience because it conflicted, in her mind, with her identity as a researcher.

Mark shared in Jessica’s tendencies to couch his participation in the study abroad program with statements about his identity as a researcher. One story in particular stood out as an example of his concern about the perception he was giving up on research. He shared,

I’m starting down a new line of thinking about my research. I’m really interested in the digital humanities. I mean, this is a really strong new field and I think I could get in to it with some work I want to do connecting my Golden Age research with new digital tools.

Mark talked about using the Camino study abroad program as a platform for testing new approaches to gathering, coding, and analyzing information through digital formats. As he was sharing this, I got the feeling that he was testing out my perceptions and opinions of digital humanities. I shared with him that at William & Mary faculty have started to incorporate these methodologies and perspectives across many different humanities departments. He sighed in relief and responded, “Well, you know there are some people out there that don’t think it is real research, but I do. I really think this is cool stuff and
important.” Mark made clear that he was concerned about how people would perceive him as a scholar if he pursued a new venture that was tangentially connected to the Camino.

**Summary.** Research and teaching expectations associated with faculty members’ professional roles affected the way these faculty made sense of their experiences on the Camino de Santiago while leading a study abroad program. Expectations for tenure and promotion related to research output weighed heavily on how faculty chose to spend their time, the roles they assumed outside the classroom, and how they spoke about their identity as faculty members. In this section I discussed how these role-related expectations of teaching and research differed in surprising ways between the non-tenure track and the tenured participants in my study. The non-tenure faculty found freedom in their ability to teach what they want to teach—a freedom they associated with their tenured colleagues’ privileges—as long as it was over the summer and not during the academic year. The expectations associated with their non-tenure track appointments created opportunity for them to assert agency in their work during the summer months. During those same summer months, the tenured participants felt pressure to produce research, that there was not freedom to decide what they would do while off contract. They also felt a strong need to reaffirm their identity as researchers throughout the various interviews and conversations, as if they believed that their leading the programs threatened their bona fides in this area. Next, I elaborate on the third theoretical construct that emerged through this study, the role of inspiration in making sense of faculty experiences.
Inspirations

Motivational factors drive faculty members to make decisions and engage in activities that have some apparent value within the environmental and social context of their work (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) developed a theoretical model of faculty motivation and work that demonstrated how the end product of a professor’s work, such as teaching or research, was the result of a series of decisions affected by an individual’s social knowledge. External factors affect the construction of that social knowledge and drive the motivation of the decision-making process. To some extent, the theoretical construct I introduced earlier in this chapter relating to role expectations associated with faculty appointments speaks to external motivational factors. For example, family roles also have the potential to serve as a type of external motivational factor, particularly in the ways that people react to the socially constructed concepts of family. With this final construct of inspiration, I highlight how faculty members made sense of their experiences with the Camino study abroad programs through relating the experiences to factors inspiring them.

Inspiration is more complex than motivation. This dissertation did not seek to uncover or analyze motivational factors. Motivational factors for decision making and behavior execution are but one aspect of the sensemaking process, which I will discuss further in Chapter 6. Instead, I wanted to understand how faculty made sense of their experiences in the context of their faculty roles. In the process of understanding how this occurred, I noted that when faculty leaders spoke about the reasons they engaged with the study abroad programs they were leading, they did not refer to motivation in a traditional fashion. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) noted the traditional construct of motivation
formed “in achievement contexts, situations in which there are performance outcomes that define levels of success” (p. 18). Instead, the faculty leaders I interviewed and those who I have observed over the years have described their drive to engage in a way that I classify as inspiration. Here I borrow from social psychology in defining inspiration:

Inspiration implies motivation, which is to say that it involves the energization and direction of behavior (Elliot, 1997); inspiration is evoked rather than initiated directly through an act of will or arising without apparent cause; and inspiration involves transcendence of the ordinary preoccupations or limitations of human agency. (Thrash & Elliot, 2003, p. 871)

Inspiration extends beyond motivation and speaks to a deeper sense of calling and urging that is not directly connected to metrics of success. In this section, I focus on two particular sources of inspiration that faculty referred to as they spoke about why they chose to direct a study abroad program on the Camino de Santiago—the self and the student.

**Inspiration from within.** I received an email in early June 2016 from Jim asking me if I would meet with him to talk about his application to direct the 2017 Santiago de Compostela study abroad program at William & Mary. As we talked about his interest in the Camino over lunch, he asked if I would apply with him as the Assistant Director for the program. I was a week away from leaving for Santiago, where I would meet up with Kay to do field work related to her study. I do not remember my exact response to Jim at that lunch table, but I am sure it was along the lines of “oh, um, yea I would really like to do that, but I’m not sure if they would ever select me or if I could get the time off work.”
We talked more and decided that we would apply as a pair. The deadline was in just two weeks.

As I prepared to leave for Spain, I had to think deeply and quickly about this opportunity. What was I about to do and would it even be possible? Looking back, I realize that my decision to dive into the application process with Jim was inspired by a deep desire to find fulfillment in my life—academically, professionally, and personally. I wanted to stay involved with the Camino program and the Institute for Pilgrimage Studies after finishing my degree. I wanted to teach. I also was developing serious compassion fatigue in my professional role. Student crises were more frequent and more intense; parents were more demanding of time, services, and support for their students. Our office was chronically understaffed. As I mentioned earlier in this chapter, I became painfully aware that my status as a young, single professional with no nuclear family commitments awarded me the privilege of being the go-to guy for putting out fires or taking on new initiatives. Personally, I was searching for some way to make sense of all of these roles and find value in the choices I had made that kept me rooted in Williamsburg and at William & Mary. I needed to find my Way.

I was writing my comprehensive exams when I got the email from the chair of the International Studies Advisory Committee offering me the position of Assistant Director for the 2017 Santiago program. The chair, ironically, was my freshman advisor and the faculty member who led the study abroad program to Cádiz that I enrolled in as an undergraduate. It was also during my comprehensive exams that I applied for my current professional position in Arts & Sciences. Things started to fall in place like the little yellow arrows along the Camino. I look back now and realize that my experiences with
the Camino program as a faculty member began when Jim invited me to apply with him. His encouragement was the motivational factor. However, the way that my story evolved to this moment and how I make sense of it is rooted in my finding internal, self-driven inspiration to engage with the program in this way. Returning to Thrash and Elliot’s (2003) construct of inspiration, Jim’s invitation was the motivation that evoked the desire to use the opportunity to find meaning in that phase of my life in a way that pushed me to transcend the ordinary preoccupations regarding my various academic, professional, and personal roles.

**Tragedy and transitions.** I found my inspiration to engage with the Camino as a faculty member through a desire to affirm choices I had made and to begin establishing my identity as a teacher and scholar. While internally driven, I am thankful my decisions did not rise out of personal tragedy. For Scarlett, however, her inspiration to start leading the Camino program derived directly from her husband’s sudden death. As I discussed in Chapter 4, Scarlett developed the study abroad program as an answer to the question of “what now?” after losing her husband. With each iteration of the program, Scarlett returned to that very question. During our interview, I asked Scarlett what drew her to the Camino program. She told me about that first year she led the program. She and her colleague knew that it was just as much about the experience the students had as it was about Scarlett processing her husband’s death. After describing what that experience was like for her, we turned to her second iteration of leading the program, in 2016. Scarlett recalled,

That second time, it was three years after my husband’s death. My family was growing, I was a grandmother at that point. I think the second time really was
about figuring out what my next steps were professionally. I needed that time to come to grips with my retirement, and to pick a date. So now, I have my retirement date.

The second iteration of the program was another way post in Scarlett’s personal journey. The 2018 program had similar purposes for her, and she circled back to those internal, self-derived motivations for leading the program. For Scarlett, inspiration to design and continue leading the Camino study abroad programs came from her need to deal with personal loss and discern her next steps in life. As she talked about her experiences with her students and overall in the program, she returned to these opportunities for discernment and the value of leading the program.

**Discernment along the Way.** Like Scarlett, Jessica described her drive to lead her program in part through the construct of internally-derived inspiration. Jessica’s course that she taught during the program focused on pilgrimage as a vehicle for discernment. But for her, the course was not the only way she engaged discernment while leading the program. She shared, “this was really an opportunity for me to not just lead the program, but also to do something that I feel like will help me personally with my own discernment about my life.” Jessica saw the Camino as an opportunity to engage in personal discernment, which was a factor in her deciding to lead the program. Recall from earlier in this chapter that Jessica’s engagement with the program also was affected by her role as a mother. Jessica talked about how her role as mother shifted, and that allowed her to think about her faculty role in a different light. Part of that reframing for her was the need to engage in discernment; leading the Camino program provided the time and space for her to do just that.
Though Jessica’s faculty role was at a religiously affiliated institution, she did not talk about her discernment through the lens of a particular faith practice. Her inspiration for engaging in the program was a personal discernment rooted in her own perspectives on life. Mark, however, found strong inspiration to engage the Camino on a spiritual level. As a devout practicing Catholic, Mark shared how his decisions to lead the program were heavily influenced by his personal faith. The inspiration his faith provided bolstered his decisions to lead the program. As he made sense of his experiences with the program, Mark reflected on how his faith-driven inspiration overruled the concerns that he had with making the weeks-long commitment. Just as with Jessica, Mark’s inspiration played against the way he made sense of his role as a father and the expectations associated with his role as a tenured faculty member. Faith became the overriding influence that drove Mark to engage the program, and he recognized that at each point of reflection when he contextualized the entire experience within his role as a faculty member. In particular, the phrases, “well, I mean since I’m a Catholic,” or, “given my background as a Catholic,” surfaced frequently when discussing his reasons for leading the program, the sites the students visited, and his connection to the Camino overall.

As I will discuss in Chapter 6, these personal sources of inspiration contributed to the ways that faculty leaders made sense of their experiences leading students on the Camino de Santiago as part of a short-term study abroad program. My own experiences derived from my desire to seek direction and validation in the context of the different roles I had. Scarlett sought out solace as she dealt with significant personal loss when she first started leading her program. From that first iteration onward, each Camino for
Scarlett has been an opportunity to reflect on significant personal transitions. Jessica and Mark found value and inspiration in the opportunities the Camino presented regarding discernment in both personal and faith-based contexts. In each of these stories, personal sources of inspiration guided the way that program leaders reflected on their work and made sense of their experiences on the Camino. In the next section, I highlight how another source of inspiration—the students themselves—emerged as a construct that faculty employed as they shared about their experiences.

**Innovation from students.** “At the end of the day, they [the students] are the reason why I keep doing this, and why, this year in particular, I was willing to compromise so much on the experience.” Charlotte started walking the Camino in 1986 with undergraduate students, and though every year since then may not have included a walk, she has remained dedicated to exposing students to the Camino and Spanish culture. This quotation from Charlotte could have been from any one of my participants—each of the eight whom I interviewed and spent time with referred to gleaning inspiration from their students. In this section, I focus on how students *evoked* inspiration in faculty that influenced their participation in and making sense of experiences related to Camino study abroad programs.

**The real Spain.** I remember getting off the plane in Santiago for the first time. I walked through the airport into the baggage collection area. Bags hailing from non-European Union origins arrived in a different section of the room. That would have been nice to know ahead of time, but after spending half an hour waiting for my bags and seeing everyone who arrived on my plane collecting theirs, I noticed something happening around me. Every person collecting a bag was opening it up and taking out a
coat to put on. This was mid-May, and I had just the day before left an already humid and hot Williamsburg for sunny Spain. I finally got my bag and found my way to the bus terminal. Then it hit me. I stepped outside and felt the rain. The temperature could not have been over 60 degrees. I quickly learned that my summer in Cádiz eight years prior did not prepare me for what I soon came to know as the real Spain.

Yes, I had checked the weather before I left, but the harsh reality of a cold, rainy Galician morning is a stark reminder that the beaches of Andalucía are a world away. Over the years, I have come to know Galicia as a vibrant, even warm, region. Perhaps my favorite part of travelling with students to Santiago is introducing them to the real Spain. Viño, tapas, café con leche, and, of course, polbo á feira. Wine, small plates, coffee with milk, and fair-style octopus. These are all parts of the real Spain. Leading a study abroad program based in Galicia affords me the opportunity to expose students to a different way of living from what they encounter in the U.S. that challenges the perceptions of Spain as a monolithic culture where everyone eats paella and drinks sangria. I am not alone in finding this opportunity inspirational.

Elsie was born and raised in Galicia. What passion and inspiration I find in introducing students to that region pales in comparison to her joy and drive. “Esto es la oportunidad para que descubren mi país, mi hogar” [This is the chance for them to discover my country, my home.] The act of introducing students to her homeland and sharing her culture was simultaneously personal and academic. It was personal because she felt that students frequently view Spain as a Marshall Plan paradise where everyone spoke Spanish; academic because her department offers no courses that explore Galicia and its language—which is not Spanish. As she learned more about students in the U.S.
and their lack of understanding about Galicia and Spain, she was inspired to do what she could to change this. She found that designing the study abroad program in Spain allowed her that opportunity.

**Pedagogical possibilities.** While not originally from Spain, Charlotte and Rachel both reflected on the importance of introducing students to Spanish culture and particularly the idea of an authentic Camino, as well as ways that they could augment their teaching with innovative pedagogical approaches. They both started their engagement with the Camino as students learning abroad themselves and continue that involvement as faculty members. Over the course of my research, I have come to understand that their passion for the Camino is rooted in the notion that it represents an ideal educational environment. Rachel shared how she incorporated different teaching methodologies and learning assessments into her program. These included game-based learning, flipped classroom instruction, and self-directed learning. She was able to incorporate these techniques because she was not bound to a physical classroom or a pre-set curriculum. Connecting this pedagogical freedom to the construct of student-centered inspiration was Rachel’s emphasis on helping her students learn in the most effective and authentic manners. She found inspiration in how she was able to guide students through the learning process. This included the experiential component of walking the Camino, which both she and Charlotte have emphasized was a critical facet of their approach to student learning.

Charlotte was emphatic that her students were at the heart of every pedagogical decision that she made regarding the program. Over their years of teaching on the Camino, both instructors have modified the learning structure and material to meet
student needs and desires. For example, as mobile phone technology seeped and then flooded into the daily experience of the Camino, Rachel and Charlotte had to shift their technology ban in a way that curtailed connection and distraction in favor of tech-based learning. They recognized that they could not manage students’ use of technology, but they could spin it so that the tech became part of the learning experience. This shift was representative of what I have learned from both of them about teaching and about the Camino. When the Camino is involved, you have to be flexible in how you execute your work. That flexibility though, should always turn back to the student. Both Rachel and Charlotte fervently kept the student experience a priority for their programs, and that experience served as a strong inspirational factor in the way they made sense about their own experiences with their programs.

**Access and student centeredness.** I began this dissertation providing context for the boom in study abroad programming across U.S. higher education. The factors that led to this increase are diverse and complex. I also highlighted the emphasis of late on High Impact Practices (HIPs) and the affect those practices have on students’ development. Since the economic crisis, researchers and practitioners have become more aware of issues relating to access and equity within higher education. Study abroad is, for many, an example of how students with financial means may have an advantage over those without. These broad and critical issues are important to understand, but addressing them with proper attention and analysis is outside the scope of this study. I highlight them, however, to contextualize the inspirations that faculty leaders found in creating and leading study abroad programs that incorporate the Camino.
The most costly part of a Camino study abroad program is the flight to Spain. Once on the ground and walking, a pilgrim can subsist on 20€ a day for their food and accommodations. Many of the programs that I researched as I was developing this study emphasized the affordability of the Camino as a means to expand access to the programs. In addition to the relatively affordable on-the-ground costs, many faculty chose to design the program in a way that avoids summer tuition—the courses were spring semester courses for which students received an incomplete grade until completing the summer Camino portion. There were deliberate decisions that faculty program directors made in order to lower socioeconomic barriers to student participation in these programs.

Within this chapter, I have used individual stories with rich, thick descriptions to illustrate the theoretical constructs faculty leaders employed when making sense of their experiences. To use that narrative approach to describe how faculty members alluded to lowering economic barriers to study abroad would mask the ubiquity of this inspirational factor. Every participant I interviewed and every faculty member who I have spoken with over the years shared a commitment to Camino-based study abroad programs that was grounded in part in the desire to increase access to study abroad for students who may not otherwise be able to afford it. The following examples provide snapshots, not detailed portraits, of the ways that each participant referred to the importance of student access in the context of how they decided to implement their study abroad program. This allows me the opportunity to highlight the dedication to student-centeredness that in addition to inspiring each participant to engage the Camino programs also inspired me through this research project.
Charlotte paid out of her pocket for her expenses and recruited two colleagues to come—and pay their own way—in order to reach the number needed for a price break with the tour company her university mandated she use. That way her students would pay less. She cut out programming and guest lectures, taking on the role of tour guide in addition to the other roles she filled while on the trip.

Rachel advocated from the beginning of her program for flexibility regarding university policy so her students would be allowed to stay in the mixed-gender bunk rooms in albergues along the Camino. She shared with me,

Look, they had this policy about group housing and privacy that I totally understand might be necessary for a lot of programs. But that was part of me pushing the Camino thing—this isn’t like other programs and following that policy would make this trip prohibitively expensive.

Staying in the albergues not only offered her students a more authentic experience while walking the Camino, but also saved significant financial resources.

Scarlett pushed back on her department’s leadership regarding the scheduling of the course associated with her program. She understood that paying summer school tuition in addition to associated travel costs would be a significant burden for students. Access was at the front of her mind when she made decisions about how far the students would walk and for how long. “It was clear,” she shared, “that my dean and director wanted a month-long experience. That’s part of why we walk from St. Jean—it takes the whole month but we stay in albergues most of the time.” Extended the walking portion of the program not only allowed students to form deeper Camino family bonds, which as
discussed within the theoretical construct of family above, but also kept costs lower for students.

Alice changed the way she recruited students for her program after the first iteration. She shifted toward advertising the skills and tangible outcomes for students. This, she shared, “showed that students would get something out of it.” Recall that I have discussed how Alice would meet with mothers of her students to assure them the program would be safe and meaningful. Changing her approach in advertising and talking about the program allowed the parents of first-generation students to better understand the outcomes of the study abroad program.

Elsie saw a need for an affordable study abroad program at her institution. The private university offered significant aid for students during the school year, but oftentimes students would struggle to find resources for summer experiences. Like Rachel, Elsie designed the program to take full advantage of the albergue networks to lower costs for lodging. Elsie also began offering independent study credit for students in the fall semester to extend their work from the summer.

Olivia committed to leading her program after the students had signed up and planning was in process. One of the factors that led to her desire to step in when her colleague had to withdraw from the program was that the Camino program offered an experience for students to travel abroad “without bankrupting them.” This was important to her and influenced her decision to commit to the program despite the challenges and potential consequences that I discussed above in relation to her role expectations as a tenured faculty member.
Mark shared about the conflict he felt in being paid for directing the program. “These kids are spending a lot of money to do this,” he reflected, “it just seemed weird that part of what they were paying was my salary for this.” He also questioned the motivations of faculty members who would direct study abroad programs purely for financial benefit. Unlike Rachel, Mark was not successful in seeking exceptions to his university’s policy on housing. To make up for the extra costs associated with staying in hotels as the group walked, he used the program’s activity budget to cover as many meals as possible for the students.

Jessica’s department, from the initial design stages, placed a high value on affordability and access. She shared with me how meaningful it was for her to learn from students while they were in Spain that they were only able to afford this particular summer study abroad program and how appreciative they were of the department keeping costs low.

**Summary.** Over the years, I have spoken with faculty who led programs that included the Camino who referred to access and equity as the primary inspiration for them designing and leading the programs. The Camino offers an opportunity to lift students out of their comfortable surroundings and engage in an international education experience. Faculty leaders who directed these experiences understood the importance of this in a deeply personal way. Each of the eight individuals I spoke with framed his or her experiences and their decisions to lead the programs within the context of creating opportunities for students to travel abroad. Student access as inspiration for directing the programs was a powerful example of how faculty employed this theoretical construct to aid in making sense of their experiences.
Conclusion

When preparing to go on a Camino, you hear from everyone who has journeyed before you universal recommendations: “Practice in your shoes. Pack light.” “Bring only the essentials. Pack light.” “You won’t need as much stuff as you think. Pack light.” “Trust me, the Camino will provide what you need. Really, pack light.” After hiking three Caminos with students, my advice to them is the same. Pack light and trust that the Camino will provide you what you need. As I began the final stages of this research project, preparing for my field work, narrowing my research questions, conducting my interviews, and finally writing everything up, those who came before me reiterated the same Camino mantra. Clear your head (pack light). Immerse yourself in the Camino world (only the essentials). Trust the Camino will provide (trust the process).

This chapter is the result of immersing myself in the Camino world and trusting the process. I listened to the faculty who shared their experiences with me. I jumped right in and walked and taught students. This dissertation has occupied my headspace for years, but especially so in the final year of field work and writing. The process worked. Through the stories of my participants, the observations collected and documented over the past six years, and deep reflection on my own personal experiences with the Camino and William & Mary’s study abroad program, the process worked.

Writing this chapter has been like the final day of the Camino, in particular the portion where you make the final climb of the Camino Francés, up the Monte de Gozo (Hill of Joy), and lay eyes on the three spires of the Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela. The three spires that rise up on the horizon signal to the weary pilgrim that the journey is near its end. The three theoretical constructs I introduce in this chapter are those spires.
The constructs of family, faculty appointment expectations, and sources of inspiration emerged after a long journey. Expectations related to both nuclear family roles and Camino family roles had a structural influence for faculty regarding when and how they would engage with the programs, and specifically with the students while on the Camino. As faculty members reflected on their experiences abroad, the expectations—both internally imposed and externally imagined—associated with their appointment types formed a critical basis for meaning making. Finally, the sources of inspiration that faculty drew upon when making decisions about the programs emerged in two categories—personal contexts from the faculty member, and a drive toward student centeredness in program design and implementation. These constructs emerged as faculty leaders made sense of their experiences leading students in a study abroad program on the Camino de Santiago. In Chapter 6, I map these theoretical constructs to the seven properties of sensemaking (Weick, 1995).
CHAPTER 6: PROVING THE JOURNEY

After climbing to the top of the Monte de Gozo, pilgrims begin the descent into Santiago de Compostela. Even though the Cathedral looms large from the Monte, it quickly disappears from view as trekkers wind their way through the sprawling suburbs. A Porta do Camiño (The Gate of the Camino) at the end of Rúa do San Pedro signals the arrival to the medieval city. The next 10 minutes pass as slowly as the entire walk, no matter how far the journey, as the anticipation builds and reality sets in that the final destination is near. Finally, the bagpipe players in the tunnel under the Archbishop’s house welcome pilgrims to the Praza do Obradoiro. The three spires of the Cathedral loom large over the plaza. After the obligatory selfies and celebrations, travelers find their way to the Pilgrim’s Office. It is inside this office that one stakes claim to a Compostela. Once at the counter, individuals confirm what motivated their pilgrimage and demonstrate the thoroughness of their individual journey through the detailed display of the sellos (stamps) collected on every stop of the Way. Those stamps validate the journey; they prove passage of the route and the pace of travel. They confirm and affirm that the journey mattered and it was real.

Chapter 5, the explication of the three theoretical constructs of the study, represented the pilgrim’s climb to the top of the Monte de Gozo, where one first sees the spires of the cathedral. This chapter tells of arriving in the city and at the Pilgrim’s Office. I use the concept of the journey to lay out my credencial from this ethnography research. This chapter is my credencial. In this chapter, I demonstrate how the
emergence of the three theoretical constructs of family, faculty appointment expectations, and sources of inspiration demonstrates that as faculty leaders reflected on their experiences directing Camino study abroad programs, they engaged in sensemaking. The Chapter concludes with an account of how I engaged in sensemaking throughout the study, highlighting the ways in which ethnographic methods can serve as a catalyst for sensemaking of both the participants and the researcher.

**Sensemaking**

In Chapters 1 and 2, I introduced the theoretical framework of sensemaking and the ways it was used in previous research. Recall that the bulk of the extant research that employed sensemaking focused on topics such as transitions in campus leadership, specific career stages, and academic reorganization. These areas of inquiry related to the ways faculty dealt with the ambiguous or the unknown. This dissertation study extended those approaches to using sensemaking as a framework to include faculty who encountered a new and different role as a director of a short-term study abroad program that incorporated the Camino de Santiago.

**Establishing the case for sensemaking.** The theoretical constructs identified in Chapter 5 emerged from observations and faculty reflections on their role as a study abroad program director along the Camino de Santiago. Those constructs represent the creation of meaning and context of the role as study abroad director within the broader role as a faculty member. Research highlights how the role of a study abroad program director is complex and ambiguous (Goode, 2008). March (1994) explained how ambiguity manifests in various situations, including leading international courses:
Ambiguity refers to a lack of clarity or consistency in reality, causality, or intentionality. Ambiguous situations are situations that cannot be coded precisely into mutually exhaustive and exclusive categories. Ambiguous purposes are intentions that cannot be specified clearly. Ambiguous identities are identities whose rules or occasions for application are imprecise or contradictory. Ambiguous outcomes are outcomes whose characteristics or implications are fuzzy. (p. 178)

Within each of March’s (1994) examples lie connections and similarities within the role of a faculty director in a study abroad program. Participants shared that there was frequently a lack of clarity in expectations and responsibilities associated with directing their study abroad programs. For example, as she was preparing for her program, Jessica noted, “It hit me in the spring that in addition to teaching and leading the walk, I was going to be their (the students’) bank teller and travel agent.” She was surprised by how involved she had to be with the day-to-day logistics of the program. The work and activities that occurred on the programs often blended categories of faculty responsibilities in ways faculty had yet to experiences. In Chapter 5, I discussed at length the ways in which various roles and their accompanying expectations were either unclear or contradictory to preconceived notions of faculty work. Above all, the faculty leaders ultimately viewed leading a Camino study abroad program as an ambiguous situation.

Weick (1995) established situational ambiguity as a source of need for individuals to engage in sensemaking. Weick referred to McCaskey’s (1982) characteristics of situational ambiguity to describe “the many ways in which ambiguity may crop up in organizational life and trigger sensemaking” (Weick, 1995, p. 92). Appendix G
highlights the alignment of faculty experiences on the Camino with McCaskey’s (1982) characteristics of ambiguous situations, establishing the situational ambiguity the faculty members encountered in leading their programs.

The ways in which faculty leaders in this study made meaning out of their experiences represent the invention of a sensemaking process (Weick, 1995). In the sections that follow, I draw connections between the theoretical constructs I discussed in Chapter 5 and the seven characteristics of sensemaking. For each characteristic, I introduce Weick’s working definitions and assertions and then move to connecting the characteristic to the theoretical constructs and faculty experiences.

**Identity construction.** Weick (1995) began his framing of sensemaking with the assertion that “the establishment and maintenance of identity is a core preoccupation” (p. 20) of the sensemaking process. This aligns with the discussion in Chapter 2 that anchored this study within a social constructivist paradigm in which the establishment of a social reality is a dialectical process (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Within Weick’s (1995) elaboration on identity construction is the understanding that “the sensemaker is himself or herself an ongoing puzzle undergoing continual redefinition, coincident with presenting some self to others and trying to decide which self is appropriate” (p. 20). Throughout the interviews and observations that formed the basis for this study, faculty program directors created meaning out of their experiences that demonstrated the various ways that they were negotiating the puzzle pieces of the roles they occupied.

Within each emergent construct discussed in Chapter 5 lies evidence of identity construction. Nuclear family roles created identities for participants that stretched beyond their professional faculty roles. For example, Mark and Jessica shared the
identity of parent and spoke about how the expectations associated with that identity shaped their engagement with the study abroad programs. Rachel embraced her identity as a mother and designed her program in a way that allowed her to fulfill the expectations she set for herself within that role. Camino family roles came in to play as faculty decided what identity they would or would not embrace within the social structure of the group. As Family emerged as a theoretical construct from the study, so too did the various identities associated with notions of family. Faculty leaders engaged the process of establishing these identities as they reflected back on their experiences with the Camino programs.

The various roles and expectations associated with faculty appointments also created space for faculty to engage in identity construction. As I discussed in Chapter 5, the particular expectations associated with non-tenure track and tenured positions and the identities as teacher and researcher loomed large in the psyche of the participants as they made sense of their work with their programs. Tenure eligibility as a marker of identity was salient in each participant’s description of how the faculty members viewed their roles with the program and their relationship with their colleagues on their home campuses. Rachel, Alice, and Elsie constructed their identities within their own departments based on how their workloads and contracts compared to their tenured colleagues. Perhaps the most prescient example of identity construction in relation to faculty appointment expectations was the way tenured participants took deliberate measures in their interviews to establish their identities as serious researchers. Within their professional environments, the identity of a researcher was far more important that other professional identities, and Mark, Olivia, and Jessica felt strongly that in order to
make meaning out of their experiences they needed to clarify that both within themselves and with me during the interview.

Sources of inspiration also aided in the construction of identity for faculty leaders. The internally derived factors of inspiration more strongly aligned with the identity construction process than the externally derived factors. This alignment included my own desires to construct my identity on personal, professional, and academic levels. I found inspiration to teach in William & Mary’s program so that I could begin the process of establishing my identity as an academic. Similarly, Scarlett’s involvement with the program started when her identity as a wife was altered fundamentally with the death of her husband, and she needed to discern how best to construct a version of herself that lived in a world without him. Finally, faith and a longing for discernment led Jessica and Mark to engage with their programs. Their identities that revolved around these characteristics played an important role in how and when they led students abroad.

Identity construction was a fundamental process in how faculty leaders engaged in meaning making around their experiences leading students on the Camino as part of a short-term study abroad program. As Weick (1995) asserted, the process of constructing the identity of self was an important step that enabled faculty directors to contextualize these experiences in the context of their broader professional roles on their home campuses.

**Retrospective.** “The reality that people can know what they are doing only after they have done it” anchors the understanding that sensemaking occurs solely in a retrospective way (Weick, 1995, p. 24). The sensemaker engages the actions of the past from the perspective of the present, which means, “whatever is occurring at the moment
will influence what is discovered when people glance backward” (Weick, 1995, p. 26).
This distinction—that the present moment effects the view of the past—also has implications relating to the distance between the action and the sensemaking process. For this reason, it was important that the design of this study incorporated observations that occurred over many years and interviews with participants who had engaged with Camino-based study abroad programs for varying durations. For example, Charlotte started walking the Camino in an academic context in the 1980s and plans to engage the Camino for her entire career. Olivia, on the other hand, discovered the Camino through her colleagues in the months prior to her leading the program, and she had no intention when we spoke of returning. Despite the differences in the duration of their involvement with the Camino, both Charlotte and Olivia were engaged in reflecting on an experience that happened in the past, just from different levels of engagement with the Camino.

This study inherently grounded reflection in a retrospective manner. Participants who partook in interviews had finished walking the Camino with their students and were preparing to return home. The exception to this was Jessica, who I spoke with in August 2018, after she had been back on her campus for two months following her program. The observations and personal experiences that I reflected on occurred in the past. The description and analysis in this study that resulted in the study’s theoretical constructs was, in its entirety, retrospective.

**Enactive of sensible environments.** The concept of individuals manipulating and framing the social world around them is foundational in the social constructivist paradigm, as I discussed in Chapter 2 (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Creswell & Poth, 2018; Weick, 1995). Within the context of sensemaking, Weick (1995) uses “the word
enactment to preserve the fact that, in organizational life, people often produce part of the environment they face…. They act, and in doing so create the materials that become the constraints and opportunities they face” (pp. 30-31). This frames the relationship between the individual and the social world they engage. Sensemaking is not a passive activity that individuals simply absorb. Instead, individuals are in active dialog with their environment, at times shaping the physical, social, and cultural characteristics of the environment. That environment, in turn, shapes how individuals navigate the world and make sense of their surroundings and experiences.

The theoretical constructs introduced in Chapter 5 provide insight into how faculty leaders enacted and engaged their environments as they made sense of their experiences. One example of this was the way Elsie acted within her environment to mitigate the constraint of filling the role of “Camino mom” for her students. She enacted a new reality in the years following the blister incident in which she managed the constraints and opportunities facing her as a program director by including a graduate student teaching assistant. Scarlett also took control over the environment in which her program operated. She saw value in her students establishing a Camino family. To meet this need, she designed the program around an extended walking experience—more than 30 days—in order to assure that her students would form authentic Camino family bonds. This manipulation of the sensible environment in turn served as a reference point within the theoretical construct of the Camino family as Scarlett reflected on her experiences and made meaning from them.

Faculty leaders enacted sensible environments through purposeful program design rooted in the sources from which they drew inspiration. These actions were particularly
salient in the ubiquitous inspiration to provide an economically accessible program for students. Charlotte, for example, arranged housing and programming along the Camino that aligned with her goal of keeping costs low for her students. In carefully constructing these experiences, she was in fact enacting the sensible environment, which she would later reflect on as she made sense of her experiences. Mark’s experiences provided a contrasting example, though rooted in the same theoretical construct. He was unable to exert the same agency as Charlotte and many other program directors regarding housing. His environment placed constraints on his actions that were counter to his inspirationally driven goal of providing an affordable opportunity for his students. He acted within those constraints to modify other areas of the program. In doing so, he engaged with his environment to enact a change within it. Mark later reflected on reacting to his environmental constraints and made sense of those experiences through the lens of the theoretical construct of his inspirational sources.

**Social.** As I have discussed at various points throughout this dissertation, this study was grounded in a social constructivist research paradigm. Similar to the relationship between the emergent theoretical constructs and the sensemaking characteristic of *retroactive*, the relationship between the constructs and the characteristic that sensemaking is *social* in nature is clear, but merits analysis. Weick (1995) briefly discussed the connections between sensemaking and deeper theories of social constructivism. His principle argument was to forego the tendency to categorize and assign permanent meaning to every social action, as he perceived was the preferred task of constructivists (Weick, 1995). His point of difference with social constructivists is grounded in his understanding that sensemaking, and the social nature of it, is an
ongoing, malleable process—something that I will address in a section below. However, I believe connecting the findings of this study to the process of constructing a social reality is a critical step to answering the principle research question: How do faculty leaders make sense of their experiences leading a study abroad program on the Camino in the context of their broader faculty roles? To do so, I show that the study’s theoretical constructs demonstrate how faculty leaders established a foundational knowledge and understanding of their social world using Berger and Luckmann’s (1966) discussions on the reality, social interactions, and use of language and knowledge in everyday life.

**Reality of everyday life.** Berger and Luckmann (1966) argued that the best approach to understanding how individuals construct reality out of their day-to-day experiences was through a systematic and empirical phenomenological study. My study evolved from a phenomenological examination of one experience (leading a study abroad program on the Camino) into an ethnographic study to understand the broader experiences and cultural traits of a specific group (U.S.-based faculty who led study abroad programs on the Camino). Even though I departed from a phenomenological methodology, Berger and Luckmann’s (1966) construct of how individuals establish reality is still important to the discussion of my findings. They noted that in a world consisting of multiple realities, “the reality of everyday life is organized around the ‘here’ of my body and the ‘now’ of my present” (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 22). In this perspective, the here referred to the spatial and the now to the temporal. The constructs that emerged in my study addressed both aspects and serve as examples of how faculty leaders used the reality of their everyday life prior to leading a study abroad program to make sense of their experiences while leading the programs.
Recognizing the most intimate understanding of reality dealt with “the world within [one’s] reach, the world in which [one] act[s] so as to modify its reality, or the world in which [one] work[s]” (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 22), my participants grounded their reflections in their physical environments. For example, when Olivia engaged the idea of social interactions with students vis-à-vis the construct of the Camino family, she shared about the physical spaces where specific events took place: “So there I was, lecturing about social mobility and inequality one night. We were all sitting in a circle the living room area after walking all day, and I was lecturing in my boxers.” This quote referred to an experience she had in her role as a faculty member—lecturing—while simultaneously embracing a more relaxed social relationship with students. The physical space and the social context dramatically shifted the power dynamics of teaching as she had known it prior to the Camino program. The experience, and her reflections, were grounded in not only the physical location, but also the way Olivia was physically present in the moment.

Relating back to the retrospective nature of sensemaking, the idea that reality grows from the temporal present emerged in a particularly acute way when I interviewed participants who had walked the Camino with students before. The now became a point of comparison when they discussed the ways they experienced their faculty appointments and role expectations. This differentiation was salient especially for Rachel and Elsie. Both women compared their first few years running the programs with the way they experience running them now. As discussed earlier, Elsie, a non-tenure track faculty member, had autonomy to direct the program over the summer, but faced skepticism in her initial years. She compared that skepticism to her present reality in which she
enjoyed support and encouragement from her departmental colleagues. Rachel shared similar experiences. The reality of the present (at the time of the interview) grew from an understanding of the past in relation to the temporal now, and this growth contributed to a richer reflection for the participants.

**Social interaction in everyday life.** Quite simply, Weick (1995) noted, “sensemaking is never solitary because what a person does internally is contingent on others” (p. 40). This social perspective aligns with Berger and Luckmann (1966) as they declared, “The reality of everyday life is shared with others” (p. 27). This relationship with the other serves as the central tenant to Weick’s (1995) discussion on the social characteristic of sensemaking. These interactions occur along a continuum of relations ranging from intimate face-to-face exchanges to highly anonymous engagements with contemporary figures (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Examples of face-to-face interactions within the context of this study included those with students, fellow pilgrims along the Camino, and colleagues or family members at home. Contemporary figures in this context may refer not only to those examples Berger and Luckmann (1966) provided such as the founding fathers, but also to the pilgrims of centuries past. When sharing their reflections on experiences leading a Camino study abroad program, interactions with others were central to how they made sense of everything. For example, the expectations associated with nuclear families played an integral role in shaping how, when, and if faculty directed study abroad programs on the Camino. The opinions of colleagues weighed on Mark and Olivia as they reconciled their experiences on the Camino with the perceived consequences they would face regarding how they spent their summers not highly engaged in research and writing. Most importantly, relationships
with students played a central role in how faculty designed and implemented their programs. All of these relationships were, to some degree, face-to-face interactions that sparked the sensemaking process. Berger and Luckmann (1966) indicated that these interactions that expose the characteristics of the other people or groups in our lives could assist in better understanding ourselves. In order for that to happen, an individual must:

Stop, arrest the continuous spontaneity of [one’s] experience, and deliberately turn [one’s] attention back upon [oneself]. What is more, such reflection about [oneself] is typically occasioned by the attitude toward [the individual] that the other exhibits. It is typically a ‘mirror’ response to attitudes of the other. (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 28)

What Berger and Luckmann (1966) described was the antecedent to Weick’s (1995) model of sensemaking. In order for faculty participants to understand their experiences and contextualize them within their social reality, they needed to make sense of their social interactions with the individuals with whom they shared that reality.

Language and knowledge in everyday life. As an undergraduate student in Hispanic Studies, I developed a deep appreciation for the power of language. Language manifests in daily life through our basic communication with each other. Language also acts as a powerful weapon in maintaining power structures, controlling populations, and establishing roles within society (B. Anderson, 1983). Language is a vocal expression of meaning. That meaning creates a common understanding of our interpretation of the world, the interpretations of others, and the way we make sense of it all (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). As we build understanding, “language builds up semantic fields or zones of meaning” (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 39), which in turns establishes the
social knowledge of our reality. The theoretical constructs in my study emerged from the employ, analysis, and interpretation of the language faculty leaders used to make sense of their experiences.

Faculty contextualized their experiences using the language of their social realities. When speaking about her family obligations, Jessica’s language focused on the role expectations associated with motherhood. For example, she mentioned that her husband has a “real job” and that she “couldn’t just up and leave for an entire summer.” Those phrases and sentiments were laden with values and perceptions that affected how Jessica made sense of her reality and how society enforces particular gendered realities. In a similar fashion, Jessica, Mark, and Olivia each shared about the expectations they perceive given their roles as tenured faculty. Each referred to the relationship between the study abroad program and perceived research expectations using deficit-oriented language. Examples included phrases like “wasting time” (Mark), “wouldn’t do this unless you were economically desperate” (Olivia), and “even though I did this I’m still a serious researcher” (Jessica). The shared language these three faculty had as tenured faculty at high research institutions shaped the way they made sense of their experiences leading study abroad programs.

Summary. The social nature of sensemaking does not allude only to the fact that sensemakers interact with other people. The social characteristic is fundamental to the theoretically grounding of sensemaking within the social constructivist paradigm. Berger and Luckmann (1966) provided three foundational tenets to establishing social knowledge. These tenets, establishing reality, social interactions, and language in everyday life, were evident in the reflections of faculty leaders as they were making sense
of their experiences. The connections between the emergent themes in my study and Berger and Luckmann’s (1966) foundations of social knowledge demonstrate the social constructivist nature of sensemaking (Weick, 1995) as both an activity and a theoretical framework.

**Ongoing.** As noted, sensemaking is a retrospective activity. The participants in my study had all completed their Camino study abroad programs at the time that I interviewed them, and in five cases, this was not their first time leading a program. In the cases in which the faculty had done Camino before, the faculty leaders were not only making sense of the experiences they had in the weeks immediately preceding our interviews, but they were also reflecting on and making sense of years’ worth of experiences. For Charlotte in particular, the shadow of her Camino experiences reached back nearly three decades.

According to Weick (1995), “sensemaking never starts. The reason it never starts is that pure duration never stops. People are always in the middle of things, which become things only when those same people focus on the past from some point beyond it” (p. 43). No matter if this was the first Camino for a faculty member or their 20th, sensemaking began when the program finished, and will continue into the future. The participants are always in the middle of making sense of the experiences in the context of their professional roles. This characteristic of sensemaking as an ongoing process emerged through the study’s three theoretical constructs. Regarding her experiences with students and expectations for caretaking, Elsie reflected on her experiences over time. First, she reflected on how she felt in the moment when she was asked to tend to the student’s blisters, next on her experiences when she first brought a teaching assistant, and
finally, through the most recent trip year when she was looking back at the whole of her experiences. Scarlett provides a particularly appropriate example of the ongoing nature of sensemaking. Since her husband’s death, she has returned to the Camino to process and ponder her life. The iterative processing also effected how she engaged the Camino in the context of her professional role. She built the case for departmental support through continued emphasis on meeting needs her school identified as high priority. Finally, each faculty leader in my study shared about the constant navigation of implementing a program that was student-centered. As faculty reflected on how their students inspired them to lead the programs, they would circle back to the decisions they made and strategies they employed to ensure student-centeredness. The process of sensemaking across the all the study’s theoretical constructs was an ongoing behavior. This circular sensemaking was particularly true, as mentioned above, for faculty who had led multiple programs over the span of their careers.

Focused on and by extracted cues. This characteristic of sensemaking focuses on the process itself. In particular, how the sensemaker knows that there is something about which sense should be made. In general, “sensemaking tends to be swift, which means we are more like to see products than process” (Weick, 1995, p. 49). Thus, to further understand sensemaking as a process, Weick (1995) advocates a “need to watch how people deal with prolonged puzzles that defy sensemaking, puzzles such as paradoxes, dilemmas, and inconceivable events. We also need to pay close attention to ways people notice, extract cues, and embellish that which they extract” (p. 49). Here, Weick is calling on researchers to examine the process of sensemaking, not the sense that has been made. My study did precisely that. Over the years, I observed, interviewed,
and personally engaged a prolonged puzzle fraught with dilemmas and complex events. An ethnographic approach meant that I paid close attention to the cultural group in which I immersed myself and studied.

The theoretical constructs that emerged through my study were some of the extracted cues that Weick (1995) refers to as “simple, familiar structures that are seeds from which people develop a larger sense of what may be occurring” (p. 50). Indeed, other cues existed for individuals, but the three constructs that emerged were salient across my participants’ and my own experiences. The familiar structures such as family status, faculty appointment, and sources of inspiration were the simple seeds that faculty members then placed into context, a critical point in the sensemaking process (Shotter, 1983; Weick, 1995). For my study, the central context in which faculty members made sense of their experiences was their faculty role on campus. This context shaped the way they extracted the cues and in turn interpreted them (Weick, 1995). As faculty reflected on their experiences, the questions and prompts in the interviews helped to focus the study in a way that slowed down the process of sensemaking. For example, follow up questions encouraged faculty to pause and revisit the topic they had just discussed. Not only did this cause participants to more carefully reflect on experiences, it also allowed me to observe closely the process they engaged to make sense of those experiences. This iterative reflection accomplished one of Weick’s (1995) aims of paying close attention and emphasizing process over product.

The cues that sensemakers extract “tie elements together cognitively. These presumed ties are then given more substance when people act as if they are real” (Weick, 1995, p. 54). This tying together was an important process that played out during my
interviews with participants. Through our conversations, faculty members themselves began tying together their experiences leading the Camino programs in ways that affirmed the importance of the cues—in this case the theoretical constructs—as they made sense of things in the context of their faculty roles. One example of this was the way that Alice pulled a string through her experiences over time that showed the interconnectedness of the study’s theoretical constructs. Alice spoke at length about her role as a mother and the way that affected her career. Recall, she was proud to claim she “took the mommy track, not the tenure track.” The caretaking expectations surfaced in her embrace of the role of Camino mom while leading the study abroad program. That role of Camino mom allowed her to maintain her focus on student-centeredness and providing a top-notch experience for her students. All of these tied to her teaching on the Camino, which involved teaching ethnographic field methods and encouraging students to write reflective field notes. The cues that she highlighted as she reflected on her experiences tied together and became clear as she contextualized them within her roles as a faculty member on her campus.

**Driven by plausibility rather than accuracy.** The final property of sensemaking speaks to the heart of ethnographic research—creating an authentic representation of a group’s experiences (Wolcott, 1999). Weick (1995) iterated that, “the strength of sensemaking as a perspective derives from the fact that it does not rely on accuracy and its model is not object perception” (p. 57). Sensemaking captures how individuals experience their social world, put those experiences into context, and make meaning from them. In this process, individuals have to “distort and filter, to separate signal from noise given their current projects, if they are not to be overwhelmed” (Weick,
1995, p. 57). Through distortion and filtering, the emphasis should not be on the accuracy or factual basis for how they make sense, rather on the context and meaning behind their motives.

The participants in my study, and even myself as I taught in a Camino program, engaged in distortion and filtering of their experiences in order to manage the expectations associated with the various roles they occupied. In turn, this effected how they contextualized their experiences. The theoretical constructs that emerged as they made sense of their experiences offered lenses through which the distorted and filtered realities took shape and were contextualized. As I interviewed faculty, I made the effort not to question participants’ experiences or the ways they contextualized them. Thus, it may be possible that a participant did not represent an experience in a wholly accurate way. This possibility, as discussed in Chapter 3, was a limitation of my study. However, the experiences and the constructs that emerged as participants made sense of their experiences are plausible. There may be ways to prove accuracy, however Weick (1995) pointed out that, “in an equivocal, postmodern world, infused with the politics of interpretation and conflicting interests and inhabited by people with multiple shifting identities, an obsession with accuracy seems fruitless, and not of much practical help, either” (p. 61). The aim of this study was not to adopt an obsession with accuracy, rather to tell the story of faculty who led students on the Camino as part of a study abroad program, and how they made sense of those experiences in the context of their faculty role.
Ethnography as Catalyst for Sensemaking

Throughout this study, my use of ethnographic methodologies in many ways created the time and space for sensemaking to occur. Even though some participants have repeated the Camino programs and may have engaged in some degree of sensemaking before I interviewed them, their participation in my study created a discrete opportunity to do so. Writing up my research for this dissertation also provides me a unique opportunity to reflect on my experiences and engage in my own sensemaking. This section provides a brief account of how my methodology encouraged sensemaking for me and my participants.

I discussed above how the content of the interviews with my participants demonstrated that they engaged in sensemaking about their experiences leading study abroad programs on the Camino. It is important to highlight here how the act of interviewing itself also contributed to their sensemaking. The structure of my interview guide (Appendix B) set the stage for the reflection and meaning making that occurred in the interviews. Each interview began with participants telling me about their professional identities. As the interview progressed, participants began to uncover various layers of their identity in response to my questions. This contributed to the identity construction that I referred to above. The reflection that occurred throughout the interview resulting from clarifying questions or probes contributed to their sensemaking through the seven properties discussed above. Thus, the interview was both a mechanism to document sensemaking as well as a part of the sensemaking process.

From my own perspectives as a researcher, the ethnographic process served as a catalyst for sensemaking throughout the study. Throughout my research, and throughout
this dissertation process, I found that I was engaged in my own journey of identity development. I have discussed this development at various points in this dissertation, but the crux of the matter regarding sensemaking is the fact that through my ethnographic methods, I had to develop a deep understanding of my own identity and incorporate that understanding into my interpretation of the cultural group I was studying. This identity construction was also retrospective in many ways. I spent six years thinking about this project, and as I progressed through my degree program, I had the opportunity to look back and reflect on my previous experiences. This retrospective and ongoing reflection was critical for my ethnographic approach in immersing myself in this research. The methodological approach that I chose also created opportunities to make sense of my research through the establishment and analysis of various extracted cues that surfaced over the course of the project. These cues included various paradoxes, dilemmas, and inconceivable events—all types of cues that Weick (1995) established as meaningful for sensemaking. In sum, the characteristics of ethnography that I elaborated on in Chapter 3 contributed to my own sensemaking throughout my study in ways that allowed me to develop a deeper understanding of my participants’ experiences and my own growth and learning over the course of my research.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I showed how the theoretical constructs that emerged in my ethnographic study through the reflections and observations of my participants laid the groundwork for sensemaking. The ambiguous situations in which faculty found themselves created an ideal environment for sensemaking (McCaskey, 1982; Weick, 1995). I then connected my methodology and the resulting theoretical constructs from
the study to the seven properties of sensemaking. The constructs allowed us to see that faculty members engaged in sensemaking to contextualize their experiences on the Camino with students within their roles as faculty members on their home campuses. While each of the characteristics was evident in the findings of my study, the analysis of participants’ sensemaking activities as identity construction and a social process was particularly salient. The study showed that faculty indeed were enactive of their environment, and extended Weick’s (1995) discussion of environment to include not only the spatially and temporally close, but also the far. During the interviews, faculty had to stretch beyond their immediate world to make sense of their experiences with the study abroad program within their regular work and home environments—both of which were physically distant from the activities about which they were making sense. In the final chapter of this dissertation, I will discuss the theoretical constructs and the sensemaking processes they represent within the framework of faculty growth. This discussion will demonstrate how my participants engaged in faculty growth activities and build the case for the recommendations I make for both researchers and practitioners.
CHAPTER 7: E ULTREIA, E SUSEIA

“¡Buen Camino!” From the moment a pilgrim sets foot out of the albergue on the first morning of your journey until your last day walking into the city of Santiago, the pilgrim’s greeting rings in your ears. On the first walk through the city as walkers make their way to the Praza do Obradoiro, a fixation on the final destination drives motivations to continue. At this point, the yellow arrows designating the walk disappear, the buildings loom large, and there is a strange overabundance of ice cream shops lining the path to the final destination. Individuals celebrate, get a Compostela, and step out of the Pilgrim’s Office onto Rúa das Carretas. As individuals wander to their lodgings, some window shop, a particular phrase seems to have replaced “buen Camino” in its ubiquity. “Ultreia.” I have seen that word for years now—in store windows, on signs, jewelry, and souvenirs. Not until I began to write this final chapter did I truly understand its meaning. A blend of Latin, old French, and German, e ultreia, e suseia serves as a rallying cry along the lines of “and beyond and higher” (George Greenia, personal communication, Feb. 24, 2019). This final chapter is my e ultreia, e suseia.

In this concluding chapter, I highlight how my study on faculty sensemaking after leading a Camino-based study abroad program contributes to the counternarrative of faculty growth (O’Meara et al., 2008). The theoretical constructs that emerged from my study as cues for sensemaking demonstrated that faculty leaders were engaged in learning, enacting agency, establishing professional relationships, and forming commitments—all fundamental aspects of the faculty growth framework—as they
designed and implemented their respective study abroad programs. First, I offer a brief review of the faculty growth framework and counternarrative. I then discuss the three theoretical constructs of family roles, faculty appointment expectations, and inspirational sources in the context of the faculty growth narrative. Within this contextualization, I align my findings with the framework and counternarrative, as well as provide recommendations for further research within the context of my study. The chapter ends with recommendations regarding faculty growth and study abroad more broadly and my concluding thoughts.

A Counternarrative about Faculty Growth

As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, the conceptual framework and new narrative of faculty growth emerged from O’Meara et al.’s (2008) dissatisfaction with the current research approach to faculty work. Recall from Chapter 2 that the principle aspects of the faculty growth framework are faculty learning, agency, professional relationships, and commitments (O’Meara et al., 2008). The authors found that the majority of research on faculty perpetuates a narrative of constraint that “assumes a limiting view of the faculty career while obscuring, no doubt unintentionally, other possible stories about accomplishment of goals, actions, and professional growth” (O’Meara et al., 2008, p. 16). Recounting two decades’ worth of research used to establish the dominant narrative of constraint regarding faculty work, O’Meara and colleagues (2018) found frequent use of terms such as “decline, imperiled, and invisible… barrier, prevent, and survival” (p. 16, emphasis in original). After establishing the narrative of faculty life as one of constraint, these authors set forth to craft a framework for a new narrative focused instead on growth.
In establishing a narrative of growth, O’Meara and colleagues (2008) first established the components of narrative that would guide their work:

The way in which narrative shapes our expectations and the very questions we ask, the way in which narrative provides a context for interpreting study findings and how narrative helps to contextualize study findings in practice, and the extent to which the narrative represents unfinished work, that is, texts in progress. (p. 153)

These narrative components are similar to the characteristics of sensemaking. As noted in Chapter 6, my study showed that faculty leaders of Camino study abroad programs actively engaged in sensemaking. In fact, through my study I created a space where faculty leaders reflected on their experiences and crafted a narrative of their professional lives in general, and in particular in relation to their role as study abroad program directors along the Camino. O’Meara and colleagues (2008) viewed the power of narrative as an opportunity to shift the nature of higher education research toward a focus on faculty growth. This counternarrative has at its core five principles:

(a) Learning is at the center of faculty work and their contributions.  
(b) Faculty have and can develop a sense of agency to navigate barriers and put effort, will, intent, and talent into their work.  
(c) Faculty learn, grow, and make contributions through professional relationships embedded in communities.  
(d) Who a faculty member is—her history, identity, and experiences—shapes what and how she learns, the types and quality of contributions she makes to academe, and the ways in which she makes them.  
(e) Faculty are professionals with capacities for deep commitment and vocation.  

(Strong. 2008, pp. 165-166)
Note how the language in the central tenets of the counternarrative for faculty growth is markedly different from that found within the narrative of constraint. O’Meara and colleagues (2008) focused on positive language use that places faculty at the center of inquiry and practice. I wrote this dissertation with the same focus on faculty and their experiences.

I learned that faculty leaders of Camino study abroad programs made sense of their experiences in ways that supported the counternarrative of faculty growth. Leading study abroad programs that incorporate the Camino de Santiago contributed to a counternarrative for faculty growth for the participants. The following sections use the headings extracted from O’Meara and colleagues’ (2008) work. Here, I discuss the results of my study into the three characteristics counternarrative of faculty growth to which my study contributed and make recommendations for individual faculty members, academic leaders, and administrators to identify ways to support these experiences. I structure these sections in parallel fashion to the Faculty Careers and Work Lives (O’Meara et al., 2008) concluding chapter, using a slight modification. O’Meara and colleagues (2008) adopted a three-pronged format including “new directions for research on faculty, new directions for faculty development and organizational support, and new approaches to presenting faculty work to the public” (p. 166). I offer a similar outline with responses to the three thematic areas of the counternarrative–examples of how my study answered the called for new directions of research and recommendations for future research. Recommendations for practice come in the concluding section of this chapter. I do not include the prong of public presentations as examining public perceptions of study abroad and faculty work fell well outside the scope of my study.
Learning Is at the Center of Faculty Work and Their Contributions

The aspect of learning is central to the framework of faculty growth. Neumann (2009) discussed the centrality of the assumption that faculty are master learners who have developed expertise but who also continue to learn and develop as professionals. O’Meara and colleagues (2008) built on this concept and emphasize a need to understand what faculty are learning in order to support that endeavor. They highlight that we know “little about how social context, demographics, career stage, and organizational contexts influence faculty learning” (O’Meara et al., 2008, p. 166). They also called for research on the effect of faculty appointments on faculty growth, among other areas (O’Meara et al., 2008). Most importantly, O’Meara and colleagues (2008) called for “faculty to demonstrate what they learn and also to reflect on how they arrived there, then to translate those processes for colleagues and students as colleagues” (p. 168). Essentially, they called for faculty to engage in sensemaking, which aligns well with my ethnographic study that explored the process of sensemaking among faculty leaders of Camino study abroad programs. In the sections that follow, I highlight how the theoretical constructs from my study addressed the gaps in research mentioned above and offer recommendations for further research.

Linking to the counternarrative. The theoretical constructs that emerged from my study offered insight into several of the areas of inquiry that O’Meara and colleagues (2008) highlighted as directions for future research. As I discussed in Chapter 6, the sensemaking characteristic of identity construction manifested strongly in each of my study’s theoretical constructs. Recall also the social characteristic, and in particular the discussion in Chapter 6 linking the sensemaking activities of my participants to Berger
and Luckmann’s (1966) theory on establishing foundational understanding and knowledge of their social world. The faculty participants in my study made sense of their experiences by grounding the experiences in the context of their individual social worlds. This grounding effort spoke to the work that O’Meara and colleagues (2008) called for in exposing how demographics and contexts affect faculty learning, which I now illustrate across each of the three theoretical constructs that emerged from my study.

My study’s construct of Family, for example, addressed three of these aspects, namely demographics, social context, and organizational context. First, when faculty leaders reflected on the nature of nuclear and Camino family roles and expectations, they made connections based on their experiences with gendered parenting roles. Jessica and Mark, for example, served as examples of how the gendered expectation for mothers to remain at home as caretakers influenced how they approached engaging in their programs, albeit through different lenses. Recall that Mark understood his wife would carry an extra burden for caretaking while he was away, and that Jessica chose not to engage in the study abroad program while her children were at home because she felt a responsibility to be there for them during the summer months. Within the traditional narrative of constraint, one would perceive Jessica as missing a professional opportunity due to her gendered role expectations, while Mark would be taking advantage of opportunities at the cost of his wife taking on full parenting responsibilities. However, the counternarrative for faculty growth inverts these assumptions. Jessica and Mark both engaged in leading the study abroad program at a time that worked for them. Recall that Jessica understood that she needed to wait to lead the program not just for her children’s sake, but also for when the “time was right” for her personally. Thus, Jessica’s role as
mother, and the associated expectations of that role, contributed to her understanding and engaging her work in a way that contributed to her growth and learning.

Second, their interactions with their students in relation to Camino family roles/expectations served as cues for sensemaking around issues of social context, demographics, and career stage. Recall the experiences of Jessica and Olivia as they navigated their roles as faculty members and pilgrims. Both felt that the social context in which they were leading the program required different skillsets than they had learned through their work as a traditional faculty member on campus. Through leading their programs, they developed an understanding as to how they should interact socially with the students while maintaining the positional authority of program director. Elsie also reflected on her experiences maintaining appropriate social boundaries with her students. Her story about the blister incident and her need to bring a teaching assistant illustrated how she learned from her experiences and continued to manage expectations around the Camino family construct.

Finally, faculty leaders reflected on their organizational contexts in which policy implications interacted with their implementation of the program and relationships with students. Recall how Mark and Rachel navigated their institutions’ policies related to housing. Mark had to forgo traditional pilgrim housing, which raised a concern for him related to how his students would interact with each other and with other pilgrims. He reflected that the housing policy likely stunted the development of close Camino family relationships among his students. Rachel, on the other hand, navigated the organizational context of her institution to earn permission to stay in albergues, and as a result reflected on the development of Camino family structures throughout her program. The construct
of *Family* emphasized that faculty members grounded their learning in the context of these study abroad programs in their own identity construction and their social world, thus providing insight into how these aspects affected the learning and sensemaking process. This contributes to the counternarrative on faculty growth as it focuses on these aspects—demographics, social contexts, and organizational contexts—as key cues for sensemaking about faculty learning experiences while leading study abroad programs on the Camino.

While unexpected, the emergence of *faculty appointments* as a theoretical construct aligned nicely with O’Meara and colleagues’ (2008) discrete use of the topic as an example of needed research in the counternarrative on faculty growth. Specifically, the authors called for future work to investigate how appointments and the expectations associated with them, “enrich or hinder a faculty member’s growth in teaching or research or foster or discourage a faculty member’s capacity to make long-term commitments to specific areas of higher education—commitments that provide for deep learning” (O’Meara et al., 2008, p. 167). I found, in the context of the faculty members who led students on short-term study abroad programs that incorporated the Camino, faculty appointments and role expectations played a significant role in how participants engaged in sensemaking about their experiences.

The findings indicated non-tenure track faculty experienced their roles and perceived expectations for those roles—again, in the context of leading these specific programs—as professionally enriching, pedagogically liberating, and affirming of their autonomy as academics. Recall from Chapter 5 that Rachel, Elsie, and Alice found their experiences leading their programs in Santiago represented significant professional
opportunities. For Elsie and Rachel, teaching on the Camino allowed them to broaden their course material beyond language instruction. Alice was able to teach methodologies and frameworks unlike those she taught in the classroom on campus. All found that teaching over the summer also allowed them the opportunity to establish themselves as experts in nuanced academic areas, similar to how they perceived their tenured and tenure-track colleagues’ ability to do so by offering niche courses and seminars during the semesters on campus. We know that this demonstration and refining of content knowledge and pedagogical practice is an important element of continued learning for faculty members (Neumann, 2009). Thus, these experiences abroad supported faculty learning by providing the opportunity to develop and demonstrate this expertise.

Conversely, the tenured faculty participants who worked at high research universities felt their roles limited their options. Their constraint-oriented reflections centered on research expectations, tenure and promotion processes, and damage to professional identities related to their decisions to lead study abroad programs. I provided examples from William & Mary of a pre-tenure colleague who was discouraged from engaging in study abroad before promotion, and as a result had no further involvement beyond her initial visit to Santiago. Likewise, many colleagues discouraged Jim when he elected to direct a program in Prague, but structural support from individuals in his program and a strong publication record allowed him to take that risk. This action provided a counternarrative to the expectations of a tenure track faculty trajectory. Jessica, Mark, and Olivia, however, all found that their identity as content-experts and researchers was a risk because of their participation in the summer programs. Olivia and Mark, in particular, reflected on how they expected their colleagues to react
negatively, perhaps to the extent of influencing merit evaluations. Thus, engaging in these programs countered role expectations, and came at a cost for the individual faculty leaders.

These findings related to appointment type help address O’Meara and colleagues’ (2008) areas for future research. Faculty appointments and role expectations played a structural role in how my participants made sense of their activities related to leading Camino study abroad programs. Additionally, faculty relied on the social contexts and demographic factors such as gender that O’Meara and colleagues noted as they contextualized their experiences. The insights that emerged from my study through the theoretical constructs extend and complicate the counternarrative for faculty growth. Faculty learning was indeed at the heart of the sensemaking that occurred, however factors such as gender and appointment type proved to have a differential effect on how faculty leaders experienced the programs. Ultimately, these experiences supported faculty learning, but some faculty leaders experienced different consequences for their work. These findings provide a starting point for further investigations, as well as recommendations for policy and practice.

**Next steps in research.** Even though my study serves as a contribution to the counternarrative on faculty growth through the explication of the sensemaking process enacted by faculty leaders of study abroad programs on the Camino, there is still much we do not understand about these experiences and how they contribute to faculty growth. This section provides recommendations for further research on faculty who lead study abroad programs on the Camino that can further examine the role of sensemaking on faculty roles and the building of a counternarrative for faculty work.
One of the aspects of faculty learning and growth that O’Meara and colleagues (2008) highlighted as critical for the counternarrative is to understand better the role of student learning in connection with faculty learning. My study presented an in-depth ethnographic analysis of faculty experiences and sensemaking but did not engage any student perceptions. As discussed in Chapter 2, much research has explored the outcomes and experiences associated with student study abroad. This study filled a gap in the literature regarding faculty experiences associated with a particular kind of study abroad program. Future research should explore more deeply the perceptions and experiences faculty leaders have of student learning in study abroad programs that incorporate the Camino. These studies should address how faculty members perceive student learning as well as how they view the connections between faculty learning and student learning. Studies could also examine ways students perceive faculty leaders in these programs, with an eye to comparing perceptions and expectations. These types of studies would provide us with a better understanding of how my study’s theoretical constructs come into play when applied to different populations from different perspectives. For example, understanding student perceptions of faculty roles within the Camino family construct would shed light on gaps in role expectations, which may contribute to different outcomes of sensemaking for faculty leaders. Studies that incorporate student learning and faculty learning would also serve to weave faculty interests and growth into the already well-documented research literature on study abroad in U.S. higher education.

An additional call for future research centers on Neumann’s (2009) and Alexander’s (2008) work on faculty learning as a continuous process. In particular, there
is a need to understand precisely what faculty members learn as they engage their faculty roles (Neumann, 2009). My study showed that faculty reflected and made sense of their experiences on the Camino within the context of their faculty roles on campus. During my interviews and observations, I found that faculty discussed things they were learning as they engaged in sensemaking. These learning outcomes included logistics and planning ideas, pedagogical techniques, and insights into navigation organizational structures, among others. For example, in my interview with Mark, he shared that he was learning more about technology, big data, and the digital humanities through his experiences with the Camino program. He was the only participant who shared a reflection like this. Future studies should observe and document faculty leaders’ learning outcomes that extend beyond sensemaking. These studies may include longitudinal efforts to understand how Camino experiences integrate into faculty roles in the semesters or years following the programs. While my study introduced the experiences of leading programs on the Camino into the broader scholarly conversation, more work is needed to understand how faculty learning manifests in these experiences.

**Faculty Possess and can Develop a Sense of Agency to Sustain their Work**

O’Meara and colleagues (2008) “envision faculty pushing their campuses to expand notions of legitimate professional contributions, to navigate barriers, and put effort, will, and talent toward their work” (p. 169). The vision they put forward counters the narrative that faculty careers are dominated by various influences outside the individual’s locus of control. The narrative of constraint emphasizes similar issues as above, with a focus on aspects such as gender, organizational context, and appointment type (O’Meara et al., 2008). Ultimately, O’Meara and colleagues (2008) call for research
that emphasizes how individual faculty members can enact agency in their professional careers. My study provided many examples of faculty members enacting agency, particularly through the lenses of the three theoretical constructs that emerged.

**Linking to the counternarrative.** The constructs that emerged from my study show faculty agency in action. This is a direct response to O’Meara and colleagues’ (2008) call for research that illustrates how faculty exert agency in pursuing their work. In particular, the constructs of faculty appointments and inspirational sources served as lenses through which we gain a better understanding of how faculty members exert agency over their work, and in turn over their growth.

As discussed in the previous section, my study’s construct of faculty appointments and role expectations uncovered different sensemaking and interpretation of experiences between tenured faculty at high research institutions and non-tenure track faculty while leading study abroad along the Camino. Recall that non-tenure track faculty found freedoms leading the program that they perceive they did not have on campus. Counter to this, tenured faculty felt restrained and judged for their work with summer Camino programs. After establishing the clear connection between the expectations associated with my theoretical construct and the counternarrative of faculty growth’s focus on faculty learning, it became clear that connections also surfaced between the construct and faculty developing a sense of agency.

For example, Rachel, Elsie, and Scarlett—all non-tenure track faculty—reflected on their experiences establishing their programs. Each faced certain types of pushback from their departments, and in Scarlett’s case from her supervisor. After establishing the program and leading it more than once, however, they all found support from their
department. Charlotte, though a tenured faculty member, faced a similar situation at her institution. Recall from previous chapters that she had to convince her administrators to support the program, and at times recruited other faculty or staff to go on the program in order to meet enrollment requirements. Each of these four women developed agency to create new opportunities for themselves and exerted some degree of agency over their faculty roles in a way that allowed them to engage in work that they found meaningful.

The tenured participants who worked at high research institutions engaged the theoretical construct of faculty appointments and role expectations differently as it relates to the development of agency. In particular, they embodied the findings in the literature that O’Meara and colleagues (2008) identified as anchors in the narrative of constraint. Mark and Olivia made sense of their experiences with the Camino program in part through discussing role expectations related to career stage (Neumann et al., 2006). They came to understand through their sensemaking that the research expectations for associate professors at their institutions were incompatible with faculty leading summer study abroad programs, and thus found that in exerting agency and pursuing meaningful work they faced pressure that had the potential for a negative effect on their career. This also connected to concerns regarding reward systems that “value work that is different from what they want to pursue (O’Meara & Rice, 2005)” (O’Meara et al., 2008, p. 169). Mark and Olivia understood that the reward system within their organizational context did not align with their desire to engage in leading study abroad. Recall too that the faculty member I discussed in Chapter 5 from William & Mary, as well as Jim, encountered this misalignment between expectations for tenure and pursuing work that they found to be meaningful and valued.
Even though participants in my study coalesced into two groupings regarding faculty appointment and role expectations in relation to developing agency, my study’s theoretical construct of inspirational sources provided a universal lens through which each participant found a degree of control and agency in enacting the work he or she found meaningful. O’Meara and colleagues (2008) call for research that examines faculty members’ potential for agency in taking on work that benefits others. The examples they call for include public service, university-community partnership development, and mentoring female faculty and faculty of color (O’Meara et al., 2008). My study extends this call for benevolent enactment of agency.

Recall that each participant in my study discussed the ways he or she approached the design, marketing, and implementation of the study abroad programs in relation to the student experience. This student-centered approach not only represented a significant source of inspiration through which my participants engaged in sensemaking about their experiences, it also signaled that the participants enacted agency in carrying out their work as program directors with the express goal of benefitting others. The faculty leaders I interviewed and observed all took strides to ensure that they were making decisions and carrying out their work in a way that focused on the student experience. My theoretical construct, and the analysis that mapped the construct to sensemaking in Chapter 6, showed that faculty leaders indeed worked “to expand notions of legitimate professional contributions, to navigate barriers, and to put effort, will, and talent toward their work” (O’Meara et al., 2008, p. 169), just as O’Meara and colleagues called for as a central part of the counternarrative on faculty growth.
**Next steps in research.** Even though my study discussed the relationship between the emergent theoretical constructs, sensemaking, and the development of agency, much remains unknown about the ways in which faculty leaders of Camino study abroad programs sustain their work through enacting agency. Future research should address other aspects of agency that O’Meara and colleagues (2008) highlight to construct a robust counternarrative of faculty growth. In particular, I point to two areas that would benefit significantly from further study—demographic factors and organizational contexts.

The participants in my study were demographically quite similar. They were all white; they were all over the age of 40; they all were well established in their positions/careers. I purposefully describe my non-tenure track participants as well established in their positions because they had each been promoted at least once and had worked at their institutions for significant periods. Future research should address populations that are more diverse. This diversity needs to encompass as many demographic variables as possible. Studies should attempt to identify faculty leaders of Camino study abroad programs who are male, non-white, younger than 40 years of age, and in the early stages of their career. We know from extant literature that faculty demographics affect faculty work and faculty growth (see Chapter 2 for a fuller discussion). Moreover, within the context of faculty recruitment for study abroad, we know there are fewer minorities on study abroad to begin with and if faculty become interested given their own experiences abroad, we may need to focus there too. Therefore, there is a need to understand better how these factors may affect sensemaking after leading students on the Camino as part of study abroad.
In addition to participant diversity, future research should investigate how faculty participants engage within their organizational contexts following their experiences leading the Camino. Given how saturated the theoretical construct of faculty appointments and role expectations was in the findings of my study, I believe there is much to learn about how faculty members communicate their experiences within their organizational contexts following their Camino programs. Studies should investigate how faculty members perceive reentry into their organizations, as well as follow up on the perceptions from participants like Mark and Olivia regarding the effect of leading the programs on their research productivity and merit evaluations. Because one of the key characteristics of sensemaking is enacting social environments, understanding how faculty leaders transition back into their traditional faculty roles on campus would be an important contribution to the counternarrative on faculty growth via developing agency. My study addressed some of the topics that O’Meara and colleagues (2008) raised as integral to establishing a counternarrative of faculty growth, however more research on faculty who lead study abroad programs along the Camino would strengthen our understanding.

Faculty are Professionals with the Capacity for Deep Commitment

On the surface, a strong argument exists that any faculty member who leads a Camino study abroad program exhibits a capacity for deep commitment. These leaders travelled to Spain with students, walked between 200 and 500 miles with them, and enacted roles that presented significant situational ambiguity in the context of the regular faculty roles. O’Meara and colleagues (2008) view commitment as a broad and deep approach to all aspects of a faculty member’s roll. They lament that the narrative of
constraint focuses on faculty members as detached and self-interested in their tenured roles (O’Meara et al., 2008). Instead, they encourage research that “envisions faculty as professionals who can be rooted and competent, rigorous and systematic while focused on the needs of specific groups for whom they are also advocates” (O’Meara et al., 2008, p. 175). My study focused on the ways that faculty made sense out of their experiences leading students on a study abroad program on the Camino, and experience that required significant personal and professional investment, execution of logistics, and teaching an academic course in the process. Each of the theoretical constructs that emerged from my study connected to O’Meara and colleagues’ (2008) call for work that illustrates faculty commitment.

**Linking to the counternarrative.** Aside from the physical and temporal commitments, that faculty made to lead students on the Camino, additional commitments emerged from the theoretical constructs in my study through analysis and interpretation of how faculty made sense of their experiences. Commitments included those to teaching as shaped by personal history, those to students, and those to institutions—all types of commitments that O’Meara and colleagues (2008) highlighted as in need of further research.

The theoretical construct of family that emerged from my study showed that faculty leaders made sense of their experiences leading students as part of a Camino study abroad program in part through reflecting on their deep commitment to integrating their personal history into their professional work. Within the study’s construct of nuclear family roles and expectations, what emerged was a connection between commitment to family and commitment to teaching in the study abroad program. Mark
reflected on how the expectations associated with fatherhood weighed on him while he was leading the program. Mitigating this weight was the perceived benefits to his family—he felt he would be a better father and husband if he completed the Camino. Thus, he aligned his professional work—teaching in the Camino program—with his personal commitments and background—expectations associated with his family role.

In ways different from Mark, Rachel also grounded her sensemaking regarding her family role and expectation in her commitment to her son and the program. Rachel found that her commitment to providing international experiences for her son fueled her commitment to designing and implementing her study abroad program. Finally, Alice fully intertwined her commitment to family roles and expectations with her commitment to the program. She wanted to be the Camino mom of the trip and linked that to her experiences and relationships with her biological children. Upon reflection, Alice described how her close relationship with her children enhanced her ability to be a better professor for the Camino program. Through their sensemaking of family roles and expectations, participants reflected on their various familial identities, the expectations associated with those identities, and how their commitments to those roles enhanced their commitments to their programs.

Throughout this chapter, faculty appointment and role expectations has loomed large as a rich backdrop through which one can examine and discuss implications for faculty growth. The counternarrative aspect of commitment is no different. Faculty members’ commitment to their institutions surfaced as a powerful sensemaking tool. Jessica reflected on how deeply her personal values and beliefs resonate with those of her institution. At the time of our conversation, she had been at her institution for decades...
and she spoke with me about how she viewed leading the program as a commitment to her department since she was a full professor. She reflected a great deal on the expectations of her role as a full professor and that it was her “turn” to lead the program for the department. Jessica’s commitment to her department and discipline aligns with the types of commitment that O’Meara and colleagues (2008) highlight as examples of faculty growth. However, her commitment to her institution’s values and mission extends the counternarrative for faculty growth. O’Meara and colleagues (2008) do not discuss commitments of this nature. Jessica showed that institutional values and mission can indeed have an effect on the level of commitment that faculty leaders feel to their work.

Likewise, Scarlett, Rachel, and Elsie embraced a commitment to their institutions through their role as program directors in a way that emerged during their reflections of their faculty appointments and role expectations. Each of these professors felt a sense of gratitude for the institution’s endorsement of their program. As discussed in earlier chapters and in the section above on faculty agency, their participation—especially Rachel and Elsie—was a source of great professional satisfaction. Having the support of the institution within the context of their occupying non-tenure track roles was significant for these participants. Recall that Elsie commented that she and another non-tenure track colleague were the only two faculty members who ran study abroad programs for quite some time. Rachel’s department has multiple study abroad programs, nearly all of which are directed by non-tenure track faculty. On the surface, this may be perceived as the non-tenure track faculty taking on additional responsibilities over the summer so that tenure eligible faculty can focus on research. However, in each of the cases in my study,
the non-tenure track faculty approached their departments and administrations with a desire to create these programs. In the case of Rachel and Elsie in particular, there were no departmentally administered study abroad programs until these two women proposed the Camino programs. These institutions’ commitment to non-tenure track faculty to have the autonomy and support to design and direct study abroad programs on the Camino strengthened the faculty leaders’ commitment to both the institution and the work they did with the programs.

The sources from which faculty members drew inspiration contributed to their commitments both to students and to their teaching. As mentioned above, Mark connected his faith-based commitments to his teaching on the Camino in strong ways. This personal connection to his professional work was one aspect of his commitments that he reflected on while making sense of his experiences. Likewise, other faculty drew inspiration from personal sources that deepened their commitment to teaching in the programs. Recall that Elsie is from Galicia, and her desire to introduce students to her homeland is a driving factor in her decision to design and implement her program. Her personal sources of inspiration strengthened her commitment to teaching material related to Galicia in the program. As O’Meara and colleagues (2008) highlighted, scholarly background can provide fertile ground for establishing commitment to teaching. So was the case for many of the participants in my study. In the case of each of these participants, internal sources of inspiration created opportunities for establishing and deepening their commitment to teaching in Camino-based study abroad programs.

Recall that the other significant source of inspiration was a universal commitment to student-centeredness. This approach to program design and implementation
represented a commitment in the strongest sense to the student experience. Regarding the call for further research from O’Meara and colleagues (2008), the discussion in Chapter 5 related to student-centeredness represented how research could approach faculty commitment to students as it related to the faculty member’s broader sensemaking of their professional role. One particular example of the connection between student-centeredness and commitment to student success was the marketing and communications efforts of the faculty leaders. Of the eight participants in my study, seven had blogs or Facebook pages that communicated regular updates during the program. These media were also integral to the marketing of the programs. For example, Alice would refer parents and students to her blogsite, which, she reflected, “let them see what the students had to say for themselves.” Elsie and Rachel had social media accounts for their programs that they used to communicate with students throughout the year. These media examples also served as important connections to family and the public. This outward communication of faculty work, particularly the commitment to students it represents, is an element of the public outreach and discussion O’Meara and colleagues (2008) call for in discussing faculty growth. The efforts do not rise to the level that O’Meara and colleagues (2008) call for, in particular as the communications do not offer calls for action or public involvement. However, they represent a type of public outreach that communicates how faculty are engaging students through their work, and how the public can be more aware of this engagement. These types of public-facing activities are important aspects of the counternarrative for faculty growth.

The theoretical constructs that emerged from my study showed that faculty leaders of Camino study abroad programs engaged in sensemaking about their
experiences in ways that established or deepened commitments they held in the context of their professional faculty roles. Each of my study’s constructs contributed to an understanding that faculty were not only capable of forming such commitments, but that those commitments emerged through the sensemaking process and contributed to growth in their faculty roles.

Next steps in research. My study examined faculty sensemaking in the context of their roles on campus following their experiences leading a study abroad program on the Camino and highlighted the commitments faculty formed in relation to their faculty roles and their work on the Camino. O’Meara and colleagues (2008) called for further research on faculty commitments to encompass the aspects I discussed above, but also to interrogate other aspects of commitments that were beyond the scope of my study. Within the context of faculty leaders of Camino study abroad programs, I offer these recommendations for further research on faculty commitments as part of the counternarrative on faculty growth. I focus these recommendations on three of O’Meara and colleagues’ (2008) areas for research – communication, professionalism, and disciplinary influence.

O’Meara and colleagues (2008) place great emphasis throughout their elaboration of the counternarrative on faculty growth on the idea that research needs to highlight how faculty members communicate their work with others and ways that communication effects their growth. Future research in the context of my study would benefit from examining post-Camino communications between faculty members and their colleagues, students, and the public. Such examples could include university news departments creating stories and articles on the programs and the faculty leaders themselves. Studies
should address how faculty represent externally their experiences. This would provide insight into how they continue to engage in sensemaking. Subsequently, we would learn more about how faculty members enact social environments where their commitments are valued and rewarded while simultaneously addressing expectations associated with their faculty roles. Additional work could involve examining social media, publications following the Camino experience, or course syllabi to determine if faculty are communicating about their experiences, and if so, how.

The concept of professionalism draws much of the public ire regarding faculty work, and the abuse of the autonomy that supposedly comes with professionalism is a source of much discussion in the narrative of constraint (O’Meara et al., 2008). Instead, research that constructs the counternarrative on faculty growth should demonstrate the complexity of professional roles and expectations that faculty leaders of Camino study abroad programs must fulfill. Studies could examine various viewpoints and perceptions regarding faculty roles on the Camino, such as those of students and other pilgrims, in order to gain a thorough understanding of faculty experiences. Future work may also include interview prompts for faculty leaders that deal directly with perceptions of professionalism. This would work well with the suggestions in other sections of this chapter that call for a deeper understanding of the actual experiences of faculty leaders, not just the sensemaking process they engage.

Finally, we need to explore further the influences of academic disciplines in the commitments that faculty members make in their professional roles. O’Meara and colleagues (2008) noted disciplinary background as a factor in how commitments formed, and thus knowing more about the ways they interact with other sources of commitments
as discussed above would be important. Studies could evolve to examine specific disciplinary groups in isolation to distill the essence of how members of that discipline experience the Camino programs. An additional point of understanding may emerge from more detailed and structured interview guides that specifically target disciplinary approaches and perspectives.

**Recommendations for Practice**

Throughout O’Meara and colleagues’ (2008) explication of the counternarrative for faculty research, they call for shifts in professional development opportunities that would encourage faculty growth. They argue that research alone will not shift the national narrative toward faculty growth, rather support and programming for faculty development must also occur (O’Meara et al., 2008). In this section, I offer three recommendations for practice that build on supporting a counternarrative for faculty growth that aligns with the theoretical constructs that emerged from my study. These recommendations deal with *institutional support to align with priorities*, *reward structures*, and *faculty appointment expectations*.

**Institutional support to align with priorities.** As mentioned previously, each university represented in this study highlighted internationalization and study abroad on their institution’s landing webpage. We know that U.S. higher education has increased internationalization efforts in the sector (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). This focus on internationalization effort has increased administrative structures and created a more complex approach to faculty work abroad (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). Camino-based study abroad programs serve as examples of international education faculty engagement. However, as the participants in my study discussed, institutional support for this
engagement is lacking. Study abroad is growing increasingly complex (Chieffo & Spaeth, 2017), which influences needs for faculty preparation for leading study abroad (Goode, 2008). Institutions need to support faculty as they embark on designing and implementing Camino-based study abroad programs. Recall Jessica’s lament that she felt she had assumed a new role as travel agent and receipt carrier, roles not typical as a campus faculty member but needed on study abroad trips. Her institution did not provide the kind of administrative support that would have allowed her to focus more energy before the program on the areas of her role that we know encourage faculty growth, including forming relationships with students, developing a strong commitment to the program, and spending time connecting her passions with her teaching while abroad. Institutions need to provide administrative support for faculty that alleviates pressure in the pre-planning phases of designing and leading these programs.

In addition to providing logistical support, institutions should invest in developing faculty’s skills and competencies for leading students abroad. This includes providing support for faculty to learn how to encourage intercultural development among their students (Festervand & Tillery, 2001; Goode, 2008; Highum, 2014). Faculty participants in my study reflected on their commitment to student-centeredness as a source of inspiration for leading their programs. They also reflected, however, that at times during their programs they felt as if they were unprepared to deal with student development issues that arose. For example, Olivia reflected on a conflict between the conservative and liberal students in her group. She felt that she was unprepared to handle fully the situation in that she did not have previous training on how to work with students to improve their intercultural competency. If faculty members are engaging in programs
that encourage faculty growth, institutions need to support faculty development in areas that they may have received inadequate training.

Clearly, institutions need to support faculty in their endeavors to implement international education opportunities. Administrative support and professional development are two mechanisms that senior-level administrators can use to enact an environment in which faculty feel supported. Without adequate training or support, faculty may feel they are unable to enact the agency to manage international programs or fully form commitments to their students while implementing the various roles necessary to serve as program director.

**Reward structures.** The strongest recommendation I have as I end this dissertation is to reevaluate and realign reward structures for various faculty appointments and roles. This recommendation is not novel. In relation to study abroad, many researchers have highlighted the gap between institutional expectations for internationalization and departmental/institutional expectations for tenure and promotion (Bodycott & Walker, 2000; Chieffo & Spaeth, 2018; Highum, 2014; Moseley, 2009). More broadly, O’Meara and colleagues (2008) argue for alignment of reward structures with values and expectations at each level—individual faculty member, departmental, and institutional. The authors also provide a thorough review of extant research calling for a restructuring of reward structures (O’Meara et al., 2008).

Each of the participants in my study reflected on how the reward structures at their home institutions influenced their sensemaking of their experiences leading up to a Camino-based study abroad program. As noted in previous chapters, the tenured participants in my study shared nuanced concerns about the pressure from their
departments to produce research over the summer and not participate in study abroad programming. If institutions value international education, they must value the faculty time and effort that implementing study abroad programs require. At each level of evaluation, acknowledgement of participation in study abroad should occur. Minimally, faculty participation in leading study abroad should not count against metrics of productivity. Because research productivity is the coin of the realm in rewarding faculty work (Fairweather, 1996), incorporating measures of faculty productivity becomes critical. Ideally, participation in study abroad should carry equal weight to other expectations of faculty as appropriate with their appointment and role expectations.

**Faculty appointment expectations.** I close my recommendations with a reflection on the expectations and perceptions associated with the diverse array of faculty appointments in U.S. higher education. The most intriguing finding of my study was the notion that non-tenure track faculty felt freedom, support, and autonomy in designing and implementing their Camino-based study abroad programs, whereas the tenured faculty felt they would face negative consequences related to expectations associated with their faculty appointments. This inversion of the typical perspective on tenure track and non-tenure track appointments highlights the need for establishing the counternarrative of faculty growth for tenure-track faculty. Kezar (Holcombe & Kezar, 2018; Kezar 2012, 2013a, 2013b, 2018; Kezar & Sam, 2010) has published widely on the state of the professoriate, and her perspectives align with O’Meara and colleagues (2008) descriptions of the narrative of constraint. In particular, Kezar (2012) created a model for non-tenure track and contingent faculty management. This model focuses on incorporating these marginalized faculty members into institutional culture through
establishing policies, practices, and principles that are inclusive and supportive of non-tenure track faculty (Kezar, 2012). The key assumption in this model is that non-tenure track faculty are constrained by their faculty appointment types (Kezar, 2012). Yet, in my study, I have found that the non-tenure track faculty leaders I interviewed and observed reflected on their faculty appointments and related expectations with an outlook that more closely aligns with a counternarrative of faculty growth.

My recommendation to department chairs, deans, and provosts is to embrace non-tenure track faculty as integral members of the academic community. I extend this recommendation beyond Kezar’s (2012) model for non-tenure track faculty management to include O’Meara and colleagues’ (2008) framework and counternarrative for faculty growth. Thus, institutions should not just aim for the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty members, as Kezar’s (2012) model implies, rather institutions should strive to eliminate structural differences between the work lives of tenure eligible and non-tenure eligible faculty in ways that support growth for all faculty members regardless of appointment type.

Non-tenure track faculty members are not a monolithic group. Clearly, contingent faculty and part-time faculty—those faculty who are not only ineligible for tenure but who also occupy roles that are part-time, term-specific, and tenuous at best—have a more urgent need for advocacy and changes in their work structure (Kezar 2012, 2013a, 2013b, 2018). Full-time non-tenure track faculty with continuing appointments, such as those individuals in my study, are different in that their roles are more secure. My study did not address adjunct or contingent faculty participation in study abroad or their work in general. Therefore, the recommendations I offer may not be applicable to
that specific category of faculty. I recommend that institutions invest in and provide support for full-time continuing non-tenure track faculty to pursue opportunities such as leading study abroad programs on the Camino that provide for faculty growth. If higher education in the U.S. is shifting toward a new faculty majority that will consist of full-time non-tenure track faculty, institutions need to demonstrate the value of these individuals and the services they provide as central to the institutional mission.

Conclusion

This dissertation examined the sensemaking processes for faculty who led students on a study abroad program that incorporated the Camino de Santiago. Through this ethnographic study, I learned that faculty members engaged in sensemaking via three theoretical constructs that emerged across my participants’ experiences. These constructs included family, faculty appointments and role expectations, and sources of inspiration. Through these lenses, faculty members contextualized their experiences on the Camino with their faculty roles on campus, and in doing such demonstrated characteristics of faculty growth.

Faculty who lead students on the Camino undertake a complex and demanding role. Unlike many other study abroad programs, Camino-based programs are multi-sited, carry significant physical demands, and place faculty in social and professional contexts they would rarely encounter in their roles on campus or in most types of study abroad programs. Despite the demands of leading a Camino study abroad, the participants in my study reflected on their experiences with positivity, though not all would continue their engagement with the Camino in the future.
Faculty leaders in this research took risks in directing their programs. For some, implications for annual merit reviews may occur, whereas for others there are potential implications for leaving their families for an extended period. All study participants experienced a degree of vulnerability and selflessness in walking more than 200 miles, staying in hostels and sharing in meals with their students, and showing students that faculty members are also real people. I deeply admire their commitment to their students, their families, and their institutions. I also am grateful they shared their stories with me.

This dissertation showed faculty members engaged in sensemaking that constructs the counternarrative that rebuked the traditional narrative of constraint. Specifically, my study found that faculty who led students on the international pilgrimage route of the Camino as part of study abroad engaged in continuous learning, formed strong commitments, and enacted agency to bring to life the work that meant most to them. My study also showed that non-tenure track faculty also were capable of establishing a counternarrative of faculty growth—an extension of the original counternarrative proposed by O’Meara and colleagues (2008), which only focused on tenure track faculty.

I conclude with two final points about my study and the future of both research on faculty growth and work in the field of academic and faculty affairs. First, my hope is that my study serves as a catalyst for discussion on the ways that institutions, administrators, and faculty leaders approach faculty socialization. Faculty roles in U.S. higher education are more complex than ever before and this complexity merits a reimagining of how faculty members navigate these roles. This includes recognizing that the current ways faculty socialize into their roles perpetuate outdated power structures and role expectations that are no longer universally applicable, as well as limit
faculty members’ potential for professional growth. The differences between the tenure track faculty and those off the tenure track have the potential to create further division among the professoriate. These differences, however, also have great potential to enhance the academic enterprise in the United States. Faculty who focus primarily on teaching can hone the expertise to deal with complex course content and the needs of students, which grow more varied and sensitive. Faculty who blend teaching and research have different skills to offer to the university community. These are not wholly separate endeavors, and the ways we develop and socialize faculty to their work should focus on the priorities of institutions, not on an individual’s eligibility for academic tenure.

While there is much work to be done regarding equity and respect for all faculty regardless of appointment type, I want to close with a note of optimism for the future of the U.S. professoriate. Through this dissertation, I have had the privilege to get to know many faculty leaders and share some of their stories. Faculty who lead Camino-based study abroad programs are dedicated to their work. They care deeply about their students’ learning both inside and outside the classroom. My hope is that scholars and practitioners can begin to understand how to cultivate this kind of dedication, commitment, and agency among the diverse professoriate. While impossible to achieve overnight, I do believe that if we embrace a counternarrative of faculty growth we have the potential to significantly shift the way U.S. faculty approach their work. Policies and practices will need to change in ways that O’Meara and colleagues (2008) have laid the foundation for, and that scholars and practitioners have begun to implement. As my dissertation shows, faculty identities are complex and nuanced. As we support faculty to
engage in meaningful work, we need to better understand the different opportunities faculty need to have available to grow and flourish in their roles. The counter-narrative for faculty growth is a starting point, but we must continue to advance this framework and implement policies and practices that support faculty success.
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Map of the Caminos de Santiago Across France and Spain

Image retrieved from www.csj.org.uk/planning-your-pilgrimage/routes-to-santiago
Appendix B

Interview Guide

I. General Background Information

1. Tell me about your academic background and the pathway on how you arrived at your institution.

2. How would you describe the expectations for faculty members at your institution?
   a. What are the expectations for scholarship/research?
   b. What are the teaching/student engagement expectations?
   c. Tell me about your experiences with students outside the classroom

3. Were there any experiences you had as an undergraduate student that you feel were seminal in how you approach faculty work?

4. Do you have any prior experience(s) leading programs like the Camino program?
   a. Can you tell me more about that experience?
   b. How did you become engaged in these programs?

II. Faculty Role

5. What academic rank or appointment type do you hold?

6. How do you see your role as a [appointment type] faculty member on campus?

7. How does your work leading a study abroad trip on the Camino fit into the expectations of your faculty role?
8. What in your prior professional experiences on campus made you a good fit for this program?

9. Describe the moments during the program where you felt particularly satisfied with your role as a faculty member.

10. Describe the moments during the program that felt outside normal expectations for your faculty role.

III. Motivations for Camino program

11. How did you hear about the Camino program opportunity at your institution?

12. Describe the process for selection/approval to do the Camino program.
   a. Why were you interested in pursuing it?

13. Do you have any religious or spiritual motivations for doing the Camino?

14. Do you speak Spanish or any other language that might be useful on the Camino?

15. How does study abroad fit into expectations for faculty roles at your institution?

16. Are there any particular family circumstances that affected your decision to participate in this program?
   a. Probe— if there aren’t any family circumstances now, were there any in the past that may have kept you from doing a program like this? Or, are there circumstances you foresee in your future that may prevent you from engaging a program like this?
17. What did you anticipate the most about leading the trip? What concerned you the most?

18. Tell me about the process for getting the program off the ground
   a. Do you remember any conversations you might have had with other faculty about the program?
   b. What was the reaction like from your department? Your colleagues?
   c. Tell me about the conversations you had with your chair.

19. Tell me about your relationship with your study abroad office.
   a. What type of offer does this office provide?
   b. What was their role in arranging the program?

20. What are your biggest take aways from the program?
   a. Describe for me the value you saw/feel in doing the program.
      What was most rewarding? Least?
   b. What surprised you about your take aways?

21. You mention that X was the most rewarding part. Did that come about right away? How so?

IV. Strategies in the Program

22. Can you tell me about how you came up with the topic for the program?
   a. What were campus requirements regarding the topic?
   b. How did the popularity of the topic among students influence your planning?
23. What was your approach to selecting and using readings or other traditional assignments?

24. How did you decide on what site visits you would incorporate?

25. How was designing this course different than/similar to other courses you’ve designed?

26. Have you ever interacted with students in this way outside of a classroom before?
   a. If so, can you tell me about those?
   b. If not, how did you think this would go?

27. How did you first meet the students who are participating in the program?

28. Were there any expectations that you set for the students with regards to how they would interact with you throughout the program?

29. Did you set any expectations for yourself about how you would approach your relationship with the students?

30. Did those expectations hold throughout the program?
   a. If not, can you talk about how they shifted? In particular, when and why did they shift?

V. Future Plans/Wrap Up

31. Do you see yourself engaging in programs like this in the future?
   a. If so, why? If not, why not?

32. Pretend that I am a faculty colleague in a similar role who is debating engaging in this type of program. How would you describe your experience to me?
a. Would you include any drawbacks to the program? If so, what?

b. Would you encourage me to engage in programs like this? If so, why?

Given what you know about my research interests and this project, is there anything we haven’t talked about that you feel would be significant to share?
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Email Request for Participation

Email: Interview Request for Dissertation Research in Santiago de Compostela

Dear Professor_______:

I am a doctoral candidate at William & Mary researching faculty experiences as study abroad directors along the Camino de Santiago. I came across the program that you will be directing this summer and would like to request the opportunity to interview you for my dissertation research. I am researching faculty experiences and perceptions of your role as a faculty member as part of a study abroad program on the Camino. There is much literature regarding experiences of students who study abroad, but we still have much to learn about faculty experiences leading programs. Please consider contacting me to participate in this timely and important research.

This research study is qualitative in nature and grounded in phenomenological methods. The unit of analysis will be your perceptions of your work and role as a faculty study abroad director. The interview should take no more than 60-90 minutes and will be audio recorded. Ideally, we would be able to meet in Santiago when your group arrives. I will be in residence there from May 29-July 2.

My research prospectus is going through the approval process of my institution’s IRB, and I expect that it will be exempted from full review. Should the study not be approved, I will notify you to officially withdraw my request for an interview.

Questions or concerns regarding participation in this research should be directed to: Ben Boone, PI of the research, at (001-757-434-4346) or biboon@wm.edu. Alternatively, you may contact my dissertation advisor, Pamela L. Eddy, Professor of Higher Education, at peddy@wm.edu.

I hope to hear from you and hope you will be willing to lend your voice to the academic literature.

Sincerely,

Ben Boone
PhD candidate
William & Mary
biboon@wm.edu
From: GOEFRSS Compliance

Sent: Thursday, May 17, 2018 7:25 AM

To: Boone, Ben; Eddy, Pamela L; [sympa]edirc-l

Subject: STATUS OF PROTOCOL EDIRC-2018-05-16-12990-biboon set to active

This is to notify you on behalf of the Education Internal Review Committee (EDIRC) that protocol EDIRC-2018-05-16-12990-biboon titled Dissertation Research in Santiago de Compostela has been EXEMPTED from formal review because it falls under the following category(ies) defined by DHHS Federal Regulations: 45CFR46.101.b.2.

Work on this protocol may begin on 2018-05-18 and must be discontinued on 2019-05-18.

Should there be any changes to this protocol, please submit these changes to the committee for determination of continuing exemption using the Protocol and Compliance Management application (https://compliance.wm.edu).

Please add the following statement to the footer of all consent forms, cover letters, etc.:

THIS PROJECT WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2018-05-18 AND EXPIRES ON 2019-05-18.

You are required to notify Dr. Ward, chair of the EDIRC, at 757-221-2358 (EDIRC-L@wm.edu) and Dr. Jennifer Stevens, Chair of the PHSC at 757-221-3862 (jastev@wm.edu) if any issues arise during this study.

Good luck with your study.

-------------------------
COMMENTS
-------------------------
No comments available
-------------------------
BASIC INFO
-------------------------
Title: Dissertation Research in Santiago de Compostela
Start Date: 2018-05-18
Year Number: 1
Years Total: 1
Campus: Main
Committee(s): EDIRC
Cc: Emails:

PI INFO

W&M UserID: biboon
Full Name: Boone, Ben
Role: Graduate Student
Department: EPPL
Day/Work Phone: +1 757 221 1808
Ext:
Alternate Phone:

W&M UserID: peddy
Full Name: Eddy, Pamela
Role: Faculty
Department: EPPL
Day/Work Phone: 757-221-2349
Ext:
Alternate Phone:

Protocol modified by tjward on 2018-05-17 07:24:34
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Revised EDIRC Approval

From: GOEFRSS Compliance

Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 7:23 AM

To: Boone, Ben; Eddy, Pamela L; [sympa]edirc-l

Subject: STATUS OF PROTOCOL EDIRC-2018-05-16-12990-biboon set to active

This is to notify you on behalf of the Education Internal Review Committee (EDIRC) that protocol EDIRC-2018-05-16-12990-biboon titled Dissertation Research in Santiago de Compostela has been EXEMPTED from formal review because it falls under the following category(ies) defined by DHHS Federal Regulations: 45CFR46.101.b.2.

Work on this protocol may begin on 2018-05-18 and must be discontinued on 2019-05-18.

Should there be any changes to this protocol, please submit these changes to the committee for determination of continuing exemption using the Protocol and Compliance Management application (https://compliance.wm.edu).

Please add the following statement to the footer of all consent forms, cover letters, etc.:

THIS PROJECT WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2018-05-18 AND EXPIRES ON 2019-05-18. You are required to notify Dr. Ward, chair of the EDIRC, at 757-221-2358 (EDIRC-L@wm.edu) and Dr. Jennifer Stevens, Chair of the PHSC at 757-221-3862 (jastev@wm.edu) if any issues arise during this study.

Good luck with your study.

-------------------------
COMMENTS
-------------------------
No comments available
-------------------------
BASIC INFO
-------------------------
Title: Dissertation Research in Santiago de Compostela
Start Date: 2018-05-18
Year Number: 1
Years Total: 1
Existing Protocol Info: Current Year Modification (view previous)
Campus: Main
Committee(s): EDIRC
Cc: Emails:

-------------------------
PI INFO
-------------------------
W&M UserID: biboon
Full Name: Boone, Ben
Role: Graduate Student
Department: EPPL
Day/Work Phone: +1 757 221 1808
Ext:
Alternate Phone:

------------
W&M UserID: peddy
Full Name: Eddy, Pamela
Role: Faculty
Department: EPPL
Day/Work Phone: 757-221-2349
Ext:
Alternate Phone:
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Appendix F

Participant Informed Consent

Protocol # EDIRC-2018-05-16-12990-biboon

Title: Faculty Experiences and Sensemaking After Leading a Study Abroad Program on the Camino de Santiago

Principal Investigator: Benjamin Boone

This is to certify that I, ____________________________ have been given the following information with respect to my participation in this study:

1. Purpose of the research: To explore faculty perceptions and sensemaking of their roles after leading undergraduate students on a study abroad program that incorporated the Camino de Santiago.

2. Procedure to be followed: As a participant in this study, Mr. Boone will be interviewing you to explore how your experiences as a faculty member leading students on the Camino, and more broadly on your perceptions of your role as a faculty member at an American institution of higher education. The interview will be voice recorded.

3. Discomforts and risks: There are no known risks associated with this research.

4. Duration of participation: Participation in this study will take approximately 1-1.5 hours.

5. Statement of confidentiality: Your data will be anonymous. Your data will not be associated with your name or any code so that your responses cannot be linked to your name in any way.
6. Voluntary participation: Participation is voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any
time without penalty or loss of benefits. You may choose to skip any question or activity.

7. Incentive for participation: Participants will not be compensated for their participation.

8. Potential benefits: There are no known benefits of participating in the study. However,
your participation in this research will contribute to the development of our
understanding about the nature of the study.

9. Termination of participation: Participation may be terminated by the researcher if it is
deemed that the participant is unable to perform the tasks presented.

10. Questions or concerns regarding participation in this research should be directed to:
Tom Ward, Ph. D., chair of the Education Internal Review Committee (EDIRC), at 001-
757-221-2358 (EDIRC-L@wm.edu).

I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this project.

I am aware that I may report dissatisfactions with any aspect of this study to Jennifer
Stevens, Ph.D., the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee by telephone
(001-757-221-3862) or email (jastev@wm.edu).

I agree to participate in this study and have read all the information provided on this
form. My signature below confirms that my participation in this project is voluntary, and
that I have received a copy of this consent form.

______________________________________________
______________________________
Signature
date____________________

Witness

THIS PROJECT WAS APPROVED BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone: 757-221-3966) ON
Appendix G

Situational Characteristics

*Characteristics of ambiguous, changing situations and alignment with study (McCaskey, 1982).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic of situation</th>
<th>Description and Comment</th>
<th>Connection to study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of problem is itself in question</td>
<td>“What the problem is” is unclear and shifting. Managers have only vague or competing definitions of the problem. Often, any one problem is intertwined with other messy problems.</td>
<td>Lack of standard approaches to leading study abroad programs on the Camino; Need for understanding how to approach the role of program director in context of faculty role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (amount and reliability) is problematical</td>
<td>Because the definition of the problem is in doubt, collecting and categorizing information becomes a problem. The information flow threatens either to become overwhelming or to be seriously insufficient. Data may be incomplete and of dubious reliability.</td>
<td>Awareness of other programs may be minimal; Tension between role expectations associate with faculty appointments and personal inspirations for leading the program or expectations for family roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple, conflicting interpretations</td>
<td>For those data that do exist, players develop multiple, and sometimes conflicting, interpretations. The facts and their significance can be read several different ways.</td>
<td>Interactions with students can be rewarding on a personal level in ways that conflict with expectations for professional roles; Colleagues may value experiences differently than program leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different value orientations, political/emotional clashes</td>
<td>Without objective criteria, players rely more on personal and/or professional values to make sense of the situation. The clash of different values often</td>
<td>Tension between inspirational sources and faculty role expectations may be present; Faculty leaders may see intrinsic value in leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Politically and emotionally charges the situation.</td>
<td>Dealing with the religious nature of the Camino may present a challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals are unclear, or multiple and conflicting</td>
<td>Managers do not enjoy the guidance of clearly defined, coherent goals. Either the goals are vague, or they are clearly defined and contradictory.</td>
<td>Unclear expectations for learning outcomes of study abroad on individual campuses; Conflicting institutional values of international education and faculty reward system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time, money, or attention are lacking</td>
<td>A difficult situation is made chaotic by severe shortages of one or more of these items.</td>
<td>Stresses related to program finances may arise; Perceived impact of reallocating summer months for leading a program instead of doing research creates a difficult situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictions and paradoxes appear</td>
<td>Situation has seemingly inconsistent features, relationships, or demands.</td>
<td>Filling multiple roles can be difficult and confusing; Expectations for faculty leaders to fill roles they are not trained for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles are vague, responsibilities are unclear</td>
<td>Players do not have a clearly defined set of activities they are expected to perform. On important issues, the locus of decision making and other responsibilities is vague or in dispute.</td>
<td>Filling multiple roles can be difficult and confusing; Co-leading programs can create power struggles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success measures are lacking</td>
<td>People are unsure what success in resolving the situation would mean,</td>
<td>Unclear metrics for success for students and faculty lead to ambiguity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and/or they have no way of assessing the degree to which they have been successful.

| Poor understanding of cause-effect relationships | Players do not understand what causes what in the situation. Even if sure of the effects they desire, they are uncertain how to obtain them. | For first-time program leaders, there is a potential for misunderstanding the logistics or ethos of the Camino |
| Symbols and metaphors used | In place of precise definitions or logical arguments, players use symbols or metaphors to express their points of view. | Reflecting on experiences leading Camino programs using language and symbols from traditional roles on campus may lead to confusion or misinterpretation |
| Participation in decision-making fluid | Who the key decision makers and influence holders are changes as players enter and leave the decision arena. | Faculty leaders are in charge of their programs but unclear as to what extent or when institutional policies come into play |
References


International Education, 10(2), 185-201.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499915571707


https://doi.org/10.2307/1982194


https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2002.8509345


Childress, L. K. (2009). Internationalization plans for higher education institutions.


https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315308329804


transformation: Theory, research, and application in international education (pp. 32-52). Sterling, VA: Stylus.


https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452218397.n3


https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2012.701852


https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306291944


Integrating study abroad into the undergraduate curriculum: Theory and practice across the disciplines (pp. 121-136). Sterling, VA: Stylus.


Knight, J. (1999). Internationalization of higher education. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.). *Quality and internationalization in higher education* (pp. 13-28). Paris, France: IMHE/OECD.


Vagle, M. D. (2014). *Crafting phenomenological research*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.


VITA

Benjamin I. Boone

Birthdate: August 6, 1985

Birthplace: Norfolk, Virginia

Education:

2019: Doctor of Philosophy: Educational Policy, Planning, and Leadership, William & Mary


2007: Bachelor of Arts: Hispanic Studies, William & Mary

Experience:

January 2017-Present: Associate Director, Center for the Liberal Arts, Faculty of the Arts & Sciences, William & Mary