

Interculturalizing the Internationalized Curriculum: A Faculty Development Approach

by

Todd Douglas Odgers

Nanaimo, British Columbia, Canada

March 2006

This thesis is submitted to Antioch University McGregor in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Master of Arts in Intercultural Relations

Janet Bennett
Degree Committee Chair

Kent Warren
Degree Committee Member

Linda Ziegahn
Faculty Advisor

Copyright, 2006
Todd Douglas Odgers
All Rights Reserved

THESIS ABSTRACT

Interculturalizing the Internationalized Curriculum: A Faculty Development Approach

Todd Douglas Odgers

March 2006

This project was undertaken as a response to Knight's (2004) call for an investigation of the intersection of the intercultural and the international in higher education internationalizing initiatives, and concentrates on faculty and the curriculum. It sought to contribute to this investigation by identifying what design, content, facilitation approach, and institutional considerations were required in faculty development to build intercultural competence as part of an integrated effort to create an internationalized curriculum and instructional approach.

Research from the fields of internationalization and intercultural training were synthesized with data collected in interviews with four leading scholars. An analysis of findings produced a rationale and set of guidelines that placed intercultural development at the center of this initiative.

Guidelines point to the importance of grounding the training in an institutional context and linking it to the faculty's experiences and needs. As a result, the design and

detailed plans were produced with a specific institutional context in mind to demonstrate how the guidelines can be applied to specific settings.

This study is unique in combining the development of intercultural competence using Bennett's (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity with interdisciplinary groups, concept mapping, and a transformative orientation to produce internationalized curricula that incorporate intercultural and international learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This has been a long process and I would like to thank the many people who have taught, inspired, and supported me over the five years it took to get to completion.

Foremost, my wife Lone has been a constant source of love and encouragement as well as a companion along what is proving to be an ever expanding intercultural journey.

I would like to thank all of my classmates and instructors in the program, and in particular my committee, Drs. Janet Bennett, Kent Warren, and Linda Ziegahn for their guidance, support, and patience as we made our way to the final product.

I also want to express my appreciation for my colleagues, friends, and students at Malaspina University-College, who have provided me with a place to learn about and experiment with new approaches to applying an intercultural perspective to the process of internationalizing our institution.

Finally, I would like to say a hearty thank you to Betty Leask, Joseph Mestenhauser, Michael Paige, and Tom Whalley for their important contributions to making this a successful project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Definitions	2
Study Goals	4
Groups the Research Serves	6
Significance of the Study	6
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	8
Overview	8
Internationalization Definition and Perspectives	9
Definition	9
Conceptions of Internationalization	10
Components of Internationalization.....	14
The Curriculum	15
Central Role of Curriculum	15
Definitions of an Internationalized Curriculum	16
Integrating the Intercultural and the International	17
Models of the Internationalized Curriculum	20
Faculty, Curriculum and Instruction	22
Faculty's Central Role	22
Content and Instruction	23

Need for Faculty Development	24
Faculty Resistance to Change	26
Developing Faculty's Intercultural Competence	27
Training Design Considerations for Faculty	27
Designing Training for Developing Faculty Intercultural Competence ...	29
Methods of Training	30
Redesigning Curricula	31
CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODS	32
Overview	32
Expert Interviews	33
Interview Questions and Process	33
Data Analysis	34
CHAPTER 4. REPORT ON INTERVIEW FINDINGS	36
Overview	36
Faculty Readiness	37
From the Literature	39
Disciplinary Perspectives	40
From the Literature	41
Institutional Commitment	43
From the Literature	44
The Workshop Facilitator	45
From the Literature	46
Shifting Faculty Perspectives on Teaching	47
From the Literature	50
Workshop Design Considerations	52
From the Literature	57
Reflection's Role	58
From the Literature	58

Grounding Intercultural Theory in Faculty Experiences	59
From the Literature	61
CHAPTER 5. DESIGN AND GUIDELINES.....	63
Overview	63
Design Outline	64
Overview	64
Session Profile	66
Teaching in the Intercultural Classroom	66
The Retreat	67
Day 1.	67
Day 2.	68
Day 3.	69
Follow-up session.	69
Guidelines	69
Place the Development of Intercultural Competence at the Core.....	70
Guideline One as Used in the Design.....	72
Employ a Transformative Design.....	73
Guideline Two as Used in the Design.....	74
Ensure Facilitator's Credibility and Competence.....	76
Guideline Three as Used in the Design.....	76
Make Participation Voluntary.....	77
Guideline Four as Used in the Design.....	77
Incorporate Faculty Experiences and Disciplinary Perspectives.....	79
Guideline Five as Used in the Design.....	80
Make the Sessions Part of a Larger Institutional Plan.....	80
Guideline Six as Used in the Design.....	81
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION	83
Study Outcomes	83
Recommendations	84
REFERENCES	87
APPENDICES	94
Appendix A Interview Questions	95
Appendix B Design Considerations	99
Appendix C Frameworks and Theories	101

Appendix D Teacher/Facilitator Guidelines	104
Appendix E Overview of Complete Program	109
Appendix F Detailed Workshop Lesson Plans	111

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

Developing faculty intercultural competence is a crucial component in redesigning curriculum and instruction to better prepare students for an internationally and domestically diverse world. This research seeks to contribute to the improvement of student learning outcomes in higher education through faculty development. Since the 1980s, the internationalization of higher education has grown in prominence and importance as increasing numbers of universities and colleges undertake this process. This movement seeks to create an internationalized curriculum that integrates intercultural competence and the perspective it provides with international knowledge in the curriculum and delivery of its programs. Institutionally, it is a complex undertaking, and instructors' creation of internationalized curricula and instructional approaches is an essential component (Bond, 2003).

This effort is not merely an act of adding more content to a course. It involves faculty in the transformation of the ways in which they conceive their disciplines, and the methods they employ to help their students learn. Jane Knight (2004), one of the internationalization field's most prominent thinkers, recently gave voice to a challenge commonly faced by institutions when she suggested more research needs to be conducted on how to "deal with the intersection of international and intercultural" (p. 49). This research was undertaken as one response to Knight's appeal.

Researchers in Europe (Teekens, 2003; Otten, 2000, 2003), in the United States (Paige, 2003; Mestenhauser, 1998), in Canada (Whalley, 1997; Knight, 2004; Maidstone, 1996), and in Australia (Crichton, Paige, Papademetre, and Scarino, 2004) have all observed how an internationalized curriculum must have the development of intercultural competence as a central component. This project synthesizes these perspectives and provides a model for faculty development that universities can use to develop the kinds of competencies that internationalization literature and rhetoric say are required.

The design of the faculty development sessions produced in this project is unique in how it combines the development of intercultural competence over stages, incorporating Bennett's (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) in its design, employing interdisciplinary teams of faculty, using mind mapping for aiding the curricular redesign process, and adopting a facilitation approach that emphasizes transformation. Each of these dimensions has been applied in other contexts, but they have not been combined in the way in which they are in this research.

Definitions

A number of definitions need to be clarified to ensure understanding. The first is *internationalization*, a word which has come to be broadly used and interpreted. While some variation exists, Knight (1994) defines it as “the process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service function of the institution” (p.7) is the most widely applied internationally, and in Canada, where this project was conceived.

This project focuses on helping faculty redesign course curricula so that they can better integrate the international and intercultural. Nilsson (2000) defines an *internationalized curriculum* as one that “gives international and intercultural knowledge and abilities, aimed at preparing students for performing (professionally, socially, emotionally) in an international and multicultural context” (p. 22). This definition links international and intercultural, and incorporates the development of knowledge, skills, and attitudes as part of the function of this kind of curriculum. This definition also recognizes that an internationalized curriculum serves both international and domestic students in diverse contexts.

Bennett and Bennett (2004) provide a definition and conceptualization of intercultural competence that integrates well with Nilsson’s linking of the international and domestic. They take an intercultural relations perspective and define intercultural competence in terms of a mindset and a skillset. Beginning with the mindset that

refers to one’s awareness of operating in a cultural context. This usually entails some conscious knowledge of one’s own culture (cultural self-awareness), some frameworks for creating useful cultural contrasts (e.g., communication styles, cultural values), and a clear understanding about how to use cultural generalizations without stereotyping. The mindset (or, better, “heartset”) also includes the maintenance of attitudes such as curiosity and tolerance of ambiguity, which act as motivators for seeking out cultural differences (p. 149)

They then continue with a description of the intercultural skillset, which

includes the ability to analyze interaction, predict misunderstanding, and fashion adaptive behavior. The skillset can be thought of as the expanded repertoire of

behavior—a repertoire that includes behavior appropriate to one’s own culture but does not thereby exclude alternative behavior that might be more appropriate in another culture. (p. 149)

This mindset and skillset definition of competencies is comprehensive and serves as a means for designing a program that will promote the development of these outcomes.

Integral to this definition is Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) because of how it helps in understanding an individual’s experience of cultural difference along a six-stage developmental scale moving from ethnocentric to ethnorelative. Bennett and Bennett (2004) state that part of the usefulness of the DMIS is in how it helps in understanding that “as one’s *experience of cultural difference* becomes more sophisticated, one’s competence in intercultural relations increases” (p. 152). This model maps how individuals at different stages of intercultural sensitivity possess certain attitudes, which have behaviors that are associated with them. The DMIS was used as one of the essential frameworks in the final workshop design.

Study Goals

Researchers Paige (2003) and Mestenhauser (2000) have observed that faculty are often expecting their students to learn and exhibit knowledge and skills that faculty themselves often do not possess. These researchers ask who is teaching the teachers, particularly in the development of intercultural competence. This project placed the development of intercultural competence as the central feature of a multi-session workshop created to help instructors design an internationalized curriculum.

The intention of this research was to integrate some of the most current and leading edge perspectives on internationalization and intercultural development into a faculty development effort that institutions could adapt to their own contexts. This study will help teach teachers by seeking out the best practices and experiences of experts. It answers the question of what considerations in design, content, and facilitation need to be made to ensure that training intended to build faculty members' intercultural competence will contribute to an internationalized curriculum and instructional approach that integrates intercultural development with international content.

The goals of this study are to produce the following:

1. An analysis linking literature in the field with interview data from the perspectives and practices of experts who design and deliver workshops created to help faculty integrate international knowledge and intercultural competence and perspectives into their curriculum and instruction.
2. A rationale supporting intercultural competencies as particularly salient in faculty development efforts for internationalizing the curriculum and instruction.
3. A set of guidelines that can be used to help faculty develop their intercultural competence and theoretical expertise as an integral part of creating an internationalized curriculum and instructional orientation.
4. A design for a multi-session "Internationalizing your Curriculum and Instruction" program for faculty.

Groups the Research Serves

The four research goals should serve the four following groups in particular: intercultural trainers and educators, faculty developers, curriculum designers, and higher education administrators playing strategic roles in the internationalization of their institutions. Intercultural educators and trainers will no doubt be familiar with many aspects of the workshop design. For them, this research will provide context and a link between their expertise and internationalization theory. It will help them to integrate the intercultural with the international as part of curriculum redesign. Faculty developers and curriculum designers may gain an insight into how intercultural competence building can be integrated into this kind of program. Administrators will increase their expertise and appreciation of current thinking and design when they are planning a similar initiative at their institution.

It is important to note that this study was conceptualized for a Canadian institution. The interviews and literature reviewed for this project came predominantly from international sources, but Canadian perspectives were incorporated where appropriate. Given this, Canadian readers should find this particularly relevant to their context. For readers outside of Canada, I encourage you to think about how you can creatively integrate the characteristics unique to your local and national context with the international as I have attempted to do in this project.

Significance of the Study

This study provides a current analysis of the intersection of the intercultural and international in the internationalization of higher education curricula and instruction. The

analysis of interviews with experts who bring together international and intercultural dimensions in higher education through the lens of corresponding theory provides the reader with a unique up-to-date approach to conducting internationalizing the curriculum faculty development sessions. This project takes the perspective that ultimately it is faculty's goal for students to master the intercultural competencies that teaching embodies.

This study is divided into six chapters. Chapter 2 will provide a review of current literature relevant to this research. Chapter 3 will outline the research methods used in this project. Chapter 4 provides a report and analysis that integrates the perspectives drawn out from the interviews with views and themes uncovered in the literature. Chapter 5 outlines how findings from the interviews can be combined with the literature to create a multi-session faculty development program. Chapter 6 draws some final conclusions and makes a number of recommendations for future research in his area. The appendices provide examples of the interview questions, templates used to organize data, and detailed workshop lesson plans.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

Literature selected for this review dates from the early 1990s up to 2005, and comes from European, American, Australian and Canadian sources. It will have four sections:

- 1) Internationalization Definition and Perspectives
- 2) The Curriculum
- 3) Faculty, Curriculum, and Instruction
- 4) Developing Faculty's Intercultural Competence

The sequencing of the first two sections is intended to provide the reader with an understanding of the field of internationalization of higher education so that the more specific issues related to integration can be placed within a context. In this way, faculty's central role as curriculum developers and teachers can be better understood. In the final sections, a rationale for faculty development, particularly in the area of intercultural communication, is followed by intercultural research that can be used to design faculty development sessions that will facilitate inclusive teaching and learning.

Internationalization Definition and Perspectives

Definition

Internationalization is a term that has been broadly used and interpreted with a resulting lack of a single shared understanding (Bond, 2003). The most widely used definition has come from Knight (2004) who acknowledged the confusion regarding a definition stating that it “is interpreted and used in different ways in different countries and by different stakeholders” (p. 6). As noted earlier in chapter one, Knight defined internationalization as “the process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service function of the institution” (1994, p. 7). By describing this as an integration process for these two aspects, she is referring to an extended and deliberate effort that infuses these dimensions into the policies and programs of an institution. She refers to this on-going effort as a process to demonstrate her belief that it is not a single effort, but rather that it is an “ongoing and continuing effort” (p. 11).

Knight’s (2004) most recent work adds *global* to the mix defining internationalization as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 11). Knight adds this new dimension to contrast with the international in that global “refers to worldwide in scope and substance and does not highlight the concept of nation” (p. 8) in the way international does.

What the Knight definition provided was a clearly stated notion of the central importance that an on-going integration effort plays. Knight’s (2004) most recent work

closed with some issues that she saw as important to promoting efforts in this arena. The first asked how institutions will “deal with the intersection of international and intercultural” (p. 49). These two aspects are closely related, but as a recent study out of the University of Southern Australia by Crichton et al. (2004) observed after a thorough review of current literature, “it is clearly discernable that the two bodies of scholarship remain quite separate” (p. 3). The University of Southern Australia study attempted to bridge these two areas.

The conception of Crichton et al. was that the two dimensions can be integrated, but that the intercultural was more inclusive and influential to student learning. They stated that

Intercultural education, as opposed to *international* education, is a more inclusive formulation, in that interculturality includes both international and domestic students. All students, regardless of their location, need to develop the capability to contribute in the intercultural construction, exchange and use of knowledge. (p. 11)

This adds dimension to Knight’s conceptualization and illustrates that intercultural development should occupy the central place in this approach to education.

Conceptions of Internationalization

A conceptualization of internationalization as an on-going process was proposed by Knight (1993) and supported by de Wit (1993). The two later collaborated (Knight and de Wit, 1995), and further developed their thinking by dividing it into two categories: program strategies and organizational strategies. These were further broken down into

sub-groups of activities that need to be undertaken during the implementation of an internationalization effort. Jenkins (2001), in a study of quality assurance in internationalization efforts in Canada, observed that the conception of internationalization as an on-going process has been widely adopted. Knight (1997, 1999) and de Wit (2002) also proposed four categories of rationales for the internationalization of higher education. The categories were first defined by Knight (1999) to be political, economic, academic, and cultural and social. These were later elaborated on by de Wit (2002), who created a number of sub-categories for each. These categories provide a useful framework to study, plan, and evaluate initiatives so that various motivations and actions can be better recognized and coordinated.

For Harari (1992) the rationale and purpose for internationalization was to promote the belief that acquiring “global awareness and an understanding of the diversity of cultures and societies on our planet has to be considered an integral part of liberal education” (p. 53). The Canadian, Maidstone (1996), while acknowledging these initiatives were a response to global economic, social, environmental and political factors, as Knight (1999) and de Wit (2002) outline, also noted the changing demographics of Western nations resulting from changes in immigration patterns. Mestenhauser (1998, 2000), Paige (1993, 2003) and Wachter (2000) would find common ground with Harari, who linked the values and purpose of a liberal education to the new global educational context. Another rationale for internationalization comes from Mestenhauser (1998), who observed that it was a means to reform higher education curricula and teaching practices. He noted, however, that this reform-oriented approach has experienced setbacks and has been, as yet, poorly conceptualized.

The early and influential work of Francis (1993) served as a useful document for helping those in Canadian higher education working on internationalizing. Francis provided a snapshot of the state of internationalization in the province of British Columbia, Canada, and served an important contextualizing function for later research by Whalley (1997) and Maidstone (1996). These two researchers also adopted a transformative inter-disciplinary and learner-oriented approach to internationalizing higher education and its curricula, instruction, and administration.

The conception of internationalization was built upon by Wachter (2000) who was concerned that there was a lack of explicitness in how it was being conceived. He argued that the discussion of the on-going process “assumes the existence of a consensus” among practitioners that does not exist (p. 5). Steiner (2000) supported Wachter’s (2000) position and argued that internationalization requires and promotes the development of a new consciousness that includes the intercultural as a central component. Steiner (2000) discussed Mestenhauser’s thinking on internationalization as a “learning-oriented cultural understanding model” (p. 73).

The learning orientation of Mestenhauser was one that treats internationalization as complex, multidimensional, and interdisciplinary (Mestenhauser, 1998, 2000, Paige and Mestenhauser, 1999). This orientation was epistemological and transformative in how it attempted to create a new consciousness on campuses that Paige and Mestenhauser (1999), and Paige (2003) referred to as an internationalized mindset. They defined this mindset as “a way of constructing knowledge that recognizes the significance of cultural variables and understands education itself as a cultural phenomenon” that uses “interdisciplinary thinking” (Paige and Mestenhauser, 1999, p. 501) to understand the

global forces at work in shaping the world. Bond (2003) defined what she termed a “transformational approach” as one that “produces reform, which requires a shift in the ways in which we understand the world” (p. 8). Maidstone (1996) used this kind of perspective and vocabulary when he produced a transformative model for administrators, faculty, and students involved in internationalization of the campus in Canada.

The complexities of a transformative approach were picked up by Otten (2003) in addressing the importance of making a conscious effort in building intercultural competence as a core element of higher education. He noted that the desired outcomes for students “are not self-evident and self-fulfilling” (p. 13), but that intercultural learning needs to be introduced as a key element in a conscious way.

The internationalization of higher education is an ideal that challenges campuses to implement the kind of complex approach written about by Mestenhauser (1998, 2000), Paige (2003), Maidstone (1995), Otten (2000, 2003) and Wachter (2000). Schoorman’s (2000) study, which adopted a critical perspective in looking into the pervasiveness of these values and practices at an American university, uncovered considerable gaps between the rhetoric and reality of that institution’s effort.

Recent work at the University of Southern Australia provided examples of how an institution can undertake an on-going internationalization effort that has an interdisciplinary, intercultural, and transformative approach. Leask (1999, 2001) reported on a process that was undertaken to bring about convergence of both the administrative and the academic practices of that university. In this conceptualization, intercultural competence played an important role. In the words of Liddicoat (2004), a researcher from that institution, internationalization

needs not only deal with newly arriving students from other places, but also with local students who bring their own language, culture and identity to the learning context and who equally need to be able to respond productively to the cultural contexts in which they now find themselves. (p. 71)

This approach placed intercultural competence as the central outcome for all participants, whether international or domestic students, faculty or staff.

Components of Internationalization

Harari (1992), Francis (1993), Knight (1994, 1999), de Wit (2002), and Ellingboe (1998) each provided useful outlines of the various components of internationalization. These help put into perspective how curriculum, instruction, and other faculty-related issues play into the overall institutional plan. Ellingboe's six components included college leadership; faculty members' international involvement in activities with colleagues, research sites, and institutions worldwide; the curriculum; the availability, affordability, accessibility, and transferability of study abroad programs for students; the presence and integration of international students, scholars, and visiting faculty into campus life; and international co-curricular units. An earlier Canadian perspective broadly used by researchers, faculty, and administrators of Canadian higher education was provided by Francis (1993), who listed the components as: internationalization of the curriculum; faculty and staff development; international student program; study/work abroad and exchange programs; international projects; institutional linkages; and community linkages.

Sheryl Bond's (2003) findings from her survey of Canadian institutions suggested, that, of these components, curriculum was the most essential. She observed that the development of intercultural competence was central to how effectively internationalization of curriculum and instruction could be realized.

The Curriculum

As Bond (2003) noted above, curriculum plays a central role when an institution embarks on this kind of effort. The section to follow outlines different ways of defining an internationalized curriculum, and then looks at how different researchers are approaching its design. The place of intercultural development is investigated in relation to how faculty create and teach this kind of curriculum.

Central Role of Curriculum

Researchers place the curriculum at the center of internationalization efforts. Bond (2003) cited Knight's (1995) opinion that there are nearly 20 elements to internationalizing higher education. Bond argues that all of these various elements are not equal to the status and centrality of curriculum for actualizing the kinds of changes to higher education desired. This position is supported by the earlier work of Maidstone (1996), who identified curriculum as being "the primary vehicle for accomplishing internationalization" (p. 7). Paige (2003) developed this perspective further when he noted how integration is the means for "developing international and intercultural knowledge, skills, and worldviews" (p. 56).

Definitions of an Internationalized Curriculum

The curriculum is where the development of the clear link between the international and intercultural takes place. Earlier conceptualizations, such as the one by Francis' (1993), represent an internationalized curriculum that is international but limited in how it incorporates the intercultural dimension. Later definitions, such as that by McKellin (1998), continued the line of thinking of Francis, focusing merely on international content and perspectives. These two researchers' viewpoints are reminiscent of earlier writing in that they lack the integration of intercultural competence as a core element in educational outcomes.

Development of the conceptualization of an internationalized curriculum is reflected in a definition that is shared by Whalley (1997), a Canadian, and Bell (2004), an Australian, which has its roots in an earlier work by Bremer and van der Wende (1995). The definition proposes that the curriculum must have “an international orientation in content, aimed at preparing students for performing (professionally/socially) in an international and multicultural context, and designed for domestic students and/or foreign students” (Whalley, p. 10). This definition incorporated the international and multicultural, professional, and social dimensions of the role of education, and links the benefits that this kind of learning provides to both domestic students and those from abroad.

Nilsson (2000) produced a further sophisticated definition describing it as “a curriculum which gives international and intercultural knowledge and abilities, aimed at preparing students for performing (professionally, socially, emotionally) in an international and multicultural context” (p. 21). This definition incorporated the

international and intercultural and the development of knowledge and skills. Importantly, it included performance objectives beyond the professional and social dimensions outlined in the earlier definitions to include the emotional. Nilsson's curriculum also serves learners in domestic and global diversity contexts.

The development of an increasingly complex conceptualization of curriculum as demonstrated through the earlier discussion on the works from Francis to Nilsson indicates that intercultural competence is an essential dimension of the student outcomes that curricula are designed to produce. Wachter (2000) argued that "part of the qualifications and skills passed by universities to the next generation will not only be 'international' but also 'intercultural'" (p. 10). Arguments that support placing intercultural learning at the center of this kind of curriculum are becoming an increasingly common feature of recent scholarship.

Integrating the Intercultural and the International

Mestenhauser's (1998) model of an internationalized curriculum as one that promotes the development of complex, critical, comparative, interdisciplinary, and intercultural ways of thinking and being represents one of the most comprehensive and provocative views in the field. This metacognitive and epistemological view is further developed in the collaboration of Paige and Mestenhauser (1999), and later in Paige (2003). These scholars pointed out that curricula need to incorporate the intercultural in order to move beyond merely teaching facts toward the promotion of new ways of recognizing how cultural variables influence how and what we know. Yershova, DeJaegere, and Mestenhauser (2000) took this analysis a step further to integrate

intercultural analysis, critical thinking, and comparative thinking. Mestenhauser (1998) noted that the importance of the development of intercultural understanding and perspectives, writing “Virtually every task and function of international education eventually confront the concept of culture” (p. 31).

How to best develop intercultural competence is problematic. Teekens (2003) argued that curricula need clearly defined objectives to develop intercultural learning. She has been critical of past practices that simply placed diverse groups of learners together with hopes of some intercultural learning emerging from the contact. This view was echoed by Otten (2003), who acknowledged the centrality of the intercultural to international education, and who argued that intercultural competence does not simply occur as a result of placing students in diverse or international educational contexts, but must be consciously prepared for and delivered.

Gordon Allport (1954) creator of the concept of the Contact Hypothesis researched about how contact with dissimilar others does not necessarily lead to intercultural learning and outlined conditions that need to be present for reducing intergroup prejudice. This has been modified by recent research by Pettigrew and Tropp (2000), who investigated the elements of how “optimal contact situations” (p. 111) should look and be created. The fact that contact between individuals or groups coming from different cultures does not necessarily lead to culture learning or appreciation was also discussed by Bennett (1993) who explained that it is not merely enough to be in the vicinity of intercultural experience, but that one must have a consciousness of the experience. Well-planned curricula provide the constructs for such a consciousness to develop.

Recently, Crichton, Paige, Papademetre, and Scarino (2004) produced a comprehensive work that integrated intercultural perspectives into curriculum and pedagogy. The research was linked to internationalization activities conducted at the University of Southern Australia, and represented a considerable contribution to helping faculty and curriculum designers to integrate the intercultural into the internationalized context of higher education. The work outlined intercultural development as an essential learning outcome and benefit for both domestic and international diversity. They argued that all students (and faculty) need to develop the intercultural mindset and skillset as part of their experience at the university.

The work of Crichton and his collaborators had three purposes: to stimulate self-reflection, to provide support for staff, and to contribute a systematic approach to examining intercultural perspectives in domestic and offshore teaching and learning. The combination of this systematic approach and engaging in self-reflection are curricular and pedagogical innovations in the field.

Finally, the Crichton study presented a set of five principles that could be used in the design of curriculum and pedagogical approaches. The five principles are:

- 1) Connecting the intracultural with the intercultural
- 2) Constructing intercultural 'knowing' as social action
- 3) Interacting and communicating
- 4) Reflecting and introspecting
- 5) Assuming responsibility (p. 5)

The University of Southern Australia authors then elaborated on how these principles could be integrated into curriculum, instruction, and evaluation. This work moved beyond

the earlier work of Paige (1993) and the later contribution of Whalley (1997) in how it incorporated intercultural learning into the authors' goals.

Models of the Internationalized Curriculum

A variety of models have been conceptualized to help designers plan and evaluate internationalized curricula. A recent work by Bell (2004) studied how faculty attitudes towards culture were reflected in how they designed and spoke about curricula. Bell's "Spectrum of Acceptance of Internationalizing Curriculum" is a four-stage model that adapts Ellingboe's (1998) six-stage measure of attitudes toward this sort of initiative. Both of the models by Ellingboe and Bell were heavily influenced by Bennett's (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). They incorporate Bennett's conception the range of perspectives between an ethnocentric and ethnorelative worldview into their designs. Ellingboe's six stages were more strictly tied to the six stages of the DMIS than the four stages proposed by Bell. In addition, similar to the DMIS, the final stages of both models represented a state of integration.

Bell also noted that some disciplines were more receptive and can more easily incorporate the kind of intercultural, integrated, complex, comparative, and critical perspectives that internationalization promotes. She found disciplines with epistemologies that emphasize contextual, discursive, experiential, inclusive, and critical thinking were more likely to initiate this kind of change to their teaching and curriculum sooner.

Morey (2000) incorporated a multicultural education model developed by Kitano as a way of viewing the curricular change process in the context of international

education. She conceptualizes this process “in terms of levels of transformation rather than as a static outcome” (p. 28). The model developed by Kitano had three stages or categories, moving from a status quo perspective referred to as “Exclusive” to a second “Inclusive” stage and finally a “Transformed” stage (p. 30). These categories were broken down into four overlapping components: content; institutional strategies and activities; assessment of student knowledge; and classroom dynamics. The model effectively focuses on both international and domestic diversity as important components of the curriculum.

A model that complements Morey’s is Bond’s (2003) “Approaches to Internationalizing the Curricula” (p. 8). Bond based her design on the thinking of Mestenhauser (1998) and Banks (1999), proposing a three-stage model that described curricular reform approaches on a scale from *Add-on* to *Infusion* to *Transformation*. *Add-on* referred to a curriculum that simply added new international content “from a culture other than one’s own” (p. 7). This approach is the least complex. Bond explained that an infused curriculum is more systematic, begins to change content and assignments, and integrates more diverse content into the core fabric of the course. This is the most common approach. Finally, she observed that a transformational approach is less common because of how it works to change faculty and students in “fundamental ways” in how they “think about the world and their place in it” (p. 8).

Faculty, Curriculum and Instruction

Faculty's Central Role

Faculty is acknowledged in the literature as the group most responsible for internationalizing the curriculum. Bond (2003), after reviewing the literature and conducting surveys of Canadian higher education, concluded that there was consensus among faculty that curriculum falls into their domain of responsibility. This is echoed by Teekens (2000), concluded that it was not just the content of curriculum, but also the act of teaching that was the central feature. She said, "It is the lecturer who is the core player in the process. It is her or his teaching that ultimately determines the results in the international classroom" (p. 30).

Paige (2003) wrote that faculty can model the kind of knowledge, values, and behaviors that the "international mindset" (p. 58) promotes, but that "parochialism, ethnocentrism and disinterest in international learning" (p. 58) are also possible. Paige's observation regarding faculty preparation raises the issue of who is teaching the teachers to embody and do the work required. Mestenhauser (2000) noted that faculty often expect students to experience and be capable of skills faculty do not possess. He asked the linked questions of "how to teach the teachers" and how can international and intercultural knowledge "be integrated with the disciplinary knowledge" (p. 33). Faculty create this curricular content and teach the courses, and so their development is central to the success of these efforts.

Two works, those of Cogan (1998) and Whalley (1997), serve as useful starting points for faculty and curriculum designers who are undertaking the internationalization

of their curricula. Of particular use is Whalley's (1997) work that presented a pragmatic and detailed set of guidelines faculty could use to approach the complex task of planning and evaluating an internationalized curriculum.

Content and Instruction

As the above discussion indicates, internationalizing the curriculum incorporates both content and pedagogy. Paige and Mestenhauser (1999) referred to this approach as one that emphasizes the learning process and is reflected in various ways in the work of Paige (2004a), Crichton (2004), Bell (2004), Teekens (2003), Morey (2000) and Maidstone (1996). All noted the integration of content and pedagogy as central to the success of this sort of education.

Four researchers, Liddicoat (2004), Paige (1993, 2004a), Leask (1999) and McKellin (1998) took the above discussion a step further and discussed the importance of sequencing in course design. McKellin discussed how transformation demands fundamental changes in teaching and Liddicoat, in particular, discussed the implications that decisions about teaching and learning have on faculty and learners. Paige (2004a) elaborated on his earlier work (Paige, 1993) and presented a way for faculty to integrate Bennett's (1993) DMIS as a way to identify learner characteristics and needs, and then plan and sequence learning activities based on the developmental needs of learners. This will be discussed in relation to training design in greater depth later in this review.

The approach to curriculum and instruction discussed in the research reflects a learning process orientation that moves beyond the didactic content-oriented lecturing that has traditionally been associated with higher education. Researchers such as Teekens

(2003) and Nilsson (2003) described the importance of developing outcomes for learners that are both cognitive and attitudinal (affective). This was developed further in works by Otten (2000) and Paige (1993), who emphasized that integrated intercultural and international learning outcomes need to develop the cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains of learners.

Need for Faculty Development

Universities and the activities of faculty reflect the values of the culture in which they are located. Teekens (2003) wrote that “a country’s educational system is an expression of a national cultural code” and that “in spite of the fact that teaching is universal in nature, it tends to be very national in character” (pp. 113-114). Teekens pointed out the erroneous assumption often made by faculty that their approach to teaching represents a standard of all higher education around the world. She outlined seven characteristics of the ideal lecturer in the international era that included issues related to faculty teaching in their non-native language, knowledge of foreign education systems and the international labor market, a number of competencies related to how culture plays out in the classroom, disciplinary expertise, and what she calls “personal qualities.” Her list was comprehensive and laid out that to which faculty might aspire.

Maidstone’s (1996) transformative orientation is less specific than Teekens’, but Maidstone argued that “Faculty cannot develop and teach an internationalized curriculum if they are not themselves ‘internationalized’” (p. 59). It is not entirely clear if Maidstone was intending a transformative experience for faculty akin to that described by Mezirow (2000) and Cranton (1994, 2002). To these researchers, transformation represents a shift

in how learners make meaning involving the questioning and reforming of previously held frames of reference. Mezirow (2004), likely the best known of the transformative learning theorists, defined transformative learning as the

process by which we transform our taken-for-granted frames of reference (meaning perspectives, habits of mind, mindsets) to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, emotionally capable of change, and reflective so that they may generate beliefs and opinions that will prove more true or justified to guide action. (pp. 7-8)

Cranton (1994, 2002) outlined how instructors could promote this kind of learning through a set of carefully planned steps that incorporate individual and group activities including reflection, journaling, and dialogue. While Maidestone may not have explicitly referenced these kinds of theorists, his promotion of changes in consciousness shared some of the characteristics of the transformative theorists.

Leask (1999) agreed that faculty need to develop their abilities when she wrote that teaching staff need “to develop new knowledge, skills, attitudes and values” (p. 2) in order to create and deliver an internationalized curriculum. Leask invited faculty to reflect on how they think about teaching and learning. A perspective influenced by the thinking of Schon (1987). Otten (2003) also noted that internationalizing content and teaching demands faculty to reflect on “the implicit cultural patterns of the entire didactic interaction” and that this included “the selection of course content and material, design of classroom setting and teaching material, communication with students, and the role of teachers” (p. 20).

Faculty Resistance to Change

As noted earlier, faculty play the central role in the redesign of the curriculum. Morey (2000) wrote of the importance that motivation plays in developing the changes in expertise and values that a faculty need to develop. The national cultures of institutions as well as their disciplinary cultures are contexts that faculty are challenged to become aware of and transform.

Maidstone (1996) acknowledged the resistance of faculty to the kinds of changes discussed above when he wrote, “Faculty typically understand their discipline or field, and teach it the way they themselves were taught. Transformations of consciousness do not, therefore, come about easily” (p. 37). This kind of shift in consciousness may not be for all, or occur to all faculty members at the same time. Mestenhauser (1998) noted this pessimistically, observing that these kinds of transformations of national and disciplinary thinking were “unlikely to be taken into account by the mainstream” (p. 21). Still, he holds out hope that the changes are possible and that they will eventually take place as a result of ongoing well-planned and executed efforts.

Paige (2003) and Leask (1999, 2001) presented cases of universities that are engaging faculty in a process of internationalization. Paige presented the broad range of activities undertaken at the University of Minnesota, which included a discussion of faculty development activities. Leask presented how the University of Southern Australia has produced clear graduate outcomes, known as “Graduate Quality 7,” and a Code of Good Practice for faculty in order to provide clarity for faculty and students about what

needs to be done. These documents encouraged faculty to undertake professional development to ensure that they meet the standards set by the university.

Developing Faculty's Intercultural Competence

The following section will review research into the design and facilitation of training that will develop intercultural competence in faculty so that they can apply this learning to their curriculum design and instructional approach. Considerations regarding the transformative nature of intercultural learning are addressed and placed in a developmental framework. Methods of training are also discussed.

Training Design Considerations for Faculty

The earlier discussion of the nature of internationalized curriculum incorporated the idea that integrating the intercultural and international in curriculum and instruction can be transformative. Paige (1993, 1996), and Paige and Martin (1996) discussed the decidedly transformative nature of intercultural learning and the implications for the leaders (facilitators, teachers, trainers) responsible for the design, planning, and delivery of this kind of learning. Paige (1993, 1996) provided a comprehensive set of trainer competencies that cover the knowledge, skills, and program design and execution dimensions for anyone leading a group of learners through an intercultural learning program. This was considered from the perspective of ethics in intercultural development by Paige and Martin (1996), who argued that because of the risks involved in intercultural learning, trainers or teachers must be highly skilled in dealing with what comes up for learners in the process of a lesson or an activity. Paige and Martin wrote

that intercultural learning is “potentially threatening to the learner because it challenges existing and preferred beliefs, values, and patterns of behavior” (p. 46). They argued that a trainer or teacher who has the knowledge, skills, and experience necessary can better design and conduct programs that will result in positive intercultural learning outcomes.

The above researchers placed emphasis on the importance of appropriate selection and sequencing of materials, concepts, and activities to realize the best outcome for learners. This was also emphasized in J. M. Bennett’s (1993) framework for assisting trainers and teachers to conceptualize appropriate levels of challenge and support in both the content and process dimensions of their programs. As noted earlier, the intercultural sensitivity framework conceptualized by M. J. Bennett (1993) can be used to assess learners and design intercultural programs appropriate to their developmental stage. Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) is a six-stage scheme that identifies where individuals fall along a scale moving from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism. Individual stages of intercultural sensitivity on the DMIS can now be assessed using an instrument known as the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). Paige (2004b), in his analysis of thirty-five instruments used in intercultural training, discussed the application of the IDI to training design, the assessment of personal development of participants, overcoming participant resistance, and bridging theory to practice. He found the IDI to be an effective instrument to integrate into intercultural training programs.

Designing Training for Developing Faculty Intercultural Competence

Recent scholarship by Bennett and Bennett (2004) integrated international and domestic approaches to designing and conducting intercultural training using frameworks such as the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) to explain how this can be achieved. This work resembles the approach discussed earlier, regarding work at the University of Southern Australia, which integrates intercultural learning in a way that develops intercultural competence for both internationally and domestically diverse contexts (Crichton et al., 2004). Bennett and Bennett use a “constructivist approach to the definition of culture to a related developmental approach to understanding cultural identity and intercultural competence” (p. 147). They explained how the DMIS could be used with current research into identity development to design training that promotes the development of intercultural competence in international and domestic contexts.

Ting-Toomey’s (1999) Identity Negotiation Perspective is a model that acknowledges the role that identity plays in intercultural contexts. This identity perspective integrates well with the Bennett and Bennett scheme above, and also with notions of risk associated with the transformative potential of intercultural learning discussed earlier by Paige (1993, 1996), and Paige and Martin (1996).

Bhawuk and Triandis (1996) produced a model of Intercultural Expertise Development, which suggests an uncomplicated scheme for mapping how theory and experience could be combined in an intentional way to bring about intercultural expertise. They describe a progression through four stages including: Lay, Novice, Expert, and Advanced Expert. Individuals progress as a result of lived experience, the study of intercultural theory, and participation in behavioral training. The model represents an

acknowledgement of the importance of lived experience in helping learners develop intercultural competence by incorporating the cognitive dimensions of intercultural learning into affective and behavioral learning domains.

Methods of Training

Fowler and Blohm (2004) produced a comprehensive analysis of current trends and methods in intercultural training. Their review of eighteen different methods was contextualized by a discussion of what they referred to as an integrated program that includes content that is culture-general and culture-specific, and methods that are didactic and experiential. The intention of such a program is the development of cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of intercultural competence.

The work of Fowler and Blohm builds on earlier work by Gudykunst, Guzley, and Hammer (1996), who presented a similar framework for program design that balanced culture-general and culture-specific content with didactic and experiential methods. This earlier work was less detailed, however, in its analysis and presentation of the strengths, weaknesses, adaptability, and applicability of each method than the work by Fowler and Blohm.

Fowler and Blohm also discussed how Kolb's (1984) experiential learning approach could be used as part of the planning of an integrated intercultural training program. Their analysis of the various training methodologies was, therefore, placed within a larger context of the design of a program, with an eye to helping intercultural trainers select methods that are most appropriate to the learning styles and cultures of participants.

Fowler and Mumford (1995, 1999) also provided a useful overview of training design and the various methods available to trainers. The work provided both generic and specific advice written by well-known practitioners on the use of role play, contrast culture, simulation games, critical incidents, culture assimilator, and case studies.

Redesigning Curricula

A flexible model for faculty curriculum redesign that will facilitate faculty efforts to integrate newly developed intercultural perspectives into a redesigned curriculum may be found in a successful example produced at McGill University. The workshops are intended to help faculty redesign their course curricula and instructional approaches. The design was refined over a period of ten years and was published by Saroyan and Amundsen (2004). This approach is interdisciplinary and consistent with the integrative, comparative, and interdisciplinary thinking proposed in the internationalizing the curriculum literature by Mestenhauser (1998). It integrates an innovative use of concept mapping with interdisciplinary groups of faculty as a central dimension of its design. The structure is flexible and has the potential to be combined with a program that develops intercultural sensitivity so that intercultural dimensions can be incorporated into a faculty member's curriculum redesign.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS

Overview

This study employed a qualitative research methodology that used data collected from recorded telephone interviews with experts, and analyzed how their practices, perspectives, and experiences related to that found in the literature since the 1990s. The internationalization of higher education is widespread and these interviews were designed to uncover both where leading edge practitioners and scholars are innovating, and how their thinking relates to established norms and perspectives found in the literature. Interviews with the field's senior practitioners or "elites" is considered to be an excellent method for identifying the complex interplay of theory and practice in an attempt to uncover as yet unrecognized or undocumented innovations (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). It was intended that this research approach would uncover emerging best practices that could then be shared and incorporated into the faculty development workshop guidelines and design that this project proposes.

Expert Interviews

Early in the research, the review of the literature was used to identify senior professionals who would agree to an interview. These individuals demonstrated a commitment to the field, have developed appropriate curriculum, and trained faculty to integrate intercultural and international concepts. They were located working around the world in Australia, the United States, Canada, and Europe.

Interview Questions and Process

Interviews were chosen because they provided the most flexible means of investigating the many complex dimensions of internationalizing curriculum and instruction (Bailey, 1994). The interviews consisted of eight open-ended questions designed to probe experts' experience and insights (Appendix A). The first two questions elicited specific examples of faculty internationalization efforts that could be referred to in later questions that investigated specific dimensions such as facilitation approaches, theoretical content, outcomes, areas needing more attention, individuals doing good work, and advice to new facilitators.

Email was used to contact potential participants, to arrange telephone interview times, and to send interview questions prior to the recorded telephone interviews. Initial emails to potential participants outlined the purpose of the research and the interviews. Participants were requested to respond with times when they preferred to be contacted for the interview. Prior to the interview date, participants were sent an email containing the questions to be discussed in order allow them time to reflect and prepare. To

accommodate their schedules, interviewees were given a range of thirty to sixty minutes for their interviews.

The four participants in this project were Betty Leask, Joseph Mestenhauser, Michael Paige, and Tom Whalley. Each provided a unique and authoritative perspective, which helped me to clarify how to best approach planning and designing the training this project was created to make. I owe each of these participants a great deal of thanks and appreciation for their generosity with their time and in sharing their experiences.

Data Analysis

The recorded interviews were transcribed and data were categorized into four charts (Appendix B, C and D). The literature review and discussions with my thesis advisor provided the basis for the first three categories and their sub-categories. The fourth is an open-ended category, which was included to serve as a holding area for any significant, unanticipated trends that could be dealt with, and where appropriate, incorporated into the findings. The four categories included: frameworks and theories, design guidelines, facilitation advice, and unanticipated findings. The initial coding system was designed to provide structure to the data collection, particularly in the early stages, and was flexible in order to accommodate unforeseen findings that might emerge from the interviews. It was anticipated that the coding system would evolve throughout the research process to accommodate new insights and relationships brought forth in the interviews.

Using the charts to organize the data, results could be processed in two ways. First, results could be compared for similarities, differences, and any general shared

tendencies. The data could then be compared and integrated with findings gleaned from the literature. These findings could be presented in two ways: first, as guidelines that contextualize and provide a rationale for this particular approach; and second, the integrated data from the interviews and the literature could be used to create the training design.

CHAPTER 4

REPORT ON INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Overview

Interviews played the central role in this study's undertaking to identify the design, content, facilitation, and other considerations needed for faculty development that emphasizes intercultural learning as a core component of an internationalized curriculum and instructional approach. This chapter will outline the interview findings and integrate them with perspectives taken from the literature. In the process of conducting the interviews it became clear that a number of common themes were emerging and that these were representative of the larger debate taking place in the literature. What was exciting about the interviews was that the decades of lived/worked experience of these senior practitioners was extending out of their considerable collective scholarship as well. Each interviewee was able to provide examples of successful and unsuccessful programs and an analysis of what needed to be in place or done to ensure the success of such an effort.

The seven themes that emerged from the interview data were as follows:

1. Faculty readiness and commitment are necessary to overcome the challenges of this kind of effort.
2. Disciplinary perspectives and characteristics need to be addressed.

3. Faculty intercultural development as part of internationalization represents an institutional commitment.
4. Facilitator competencies and characteristics needed.
5. Faculty perspectives need to shift to a learner-oriented approach to teaching.
6. Workshop design and content issues that need to be incorporated.
7. Faculty experiences need to be incorporated with intercultural theory.

Each of these points is dealt with in the discussion below. Each Section will start with a discussion of the interview findings and then be followed by selected relevant perspectives taken from the literature on that topic.

Faculty Readiness

The first theme relates to the importance of faculty's commitment to integrating intercultural with international learning in their curricula and instructional approaches. Three of the interviewees stated that voluntary participation in these faculty development sessions is most common and desirable. Realizations by teachers of their role in their students' success, such as those referred to earlier, lead teachers to ask themselves, as one interviewee noted, "am I competent, am I not competent?" Another interviewee spoke of the importance of faculty recognizing "that really fundamental positioning of the self in terms of constructing the curriculum" when they engage in redesigning their teaching and curriculum. This kind of self-investigation can produce instructors who are highly motivated to undertake the challenges that curriculum redesign demands. The same interviewee noted how faculty who volunteered to partake in development sessions

because of the reasons discussed above contributed to make the training meaningful because they recognize that "everybody has a stake in the success of these workshops."

There was no clear consensus in the interview data regarding how to help faculty become more self-aware and motivated to undertake the internationalization of their curriculum and instruction. Experiences teaching in foreign cultures or diverse domestic contexts were observed by interviewees to be important because of how they challenge educators to deal with different learner expectations and characteristics. These teaching contexts provide an opportunity for faculty to conceptualize their role and teaching approach in new ways. One interviewee described how faculty reported on the impact of teaching abroad experiences, saying it "changes the whole way you think about yourself as a teacher" continuing to explain that this was "because you have to incorporate different content, and you have to present that content differently." This same interviewee pointed out that this kind of experience motivated many of the participants in that university to become involved in faculty development sessions related to intercultural and international issues.

In one interview, a more domestic perspective was taken regarding what led faculty to seek help with internationalizing their curricula. In the classroom, faculty often encounter an internationally and domestically diverse student population. The diversity of expectations, experiences, learning styles, and other dimensions create contexts that challenge faculty to re-conceptualize their discipline, their teaching approach, and themselves. This interviewee observed that faculty will often initially blame students for not being well-prepared or well-suited to the area of study. Over time, however, this evaluation can become less satisfying and faculty may start to identify themselves both as

part of the problem and the solution to these kinds of challenges. It is at this point, sometimes called a teachable moment, that faculty members are ready to look for assistance through faculty development opportunities like the one that this project is creating.

From the Literature

The literature supports the observations of the interviewees that transformation requires commitment by faculty to change from the traditional approach. Teekens (2000) observed the extra demands of the intercultural perspective because “it asks for a specific attitude in a lecturer. You cannot expect the lecturer to implement an internationalised curriculum when he or she does not adhere to the principles that underlie the objectives of such a curriculum” (p. 30). The approach described by Teekens requires faculty to move beyond a transmission teaching style to which they had been socialized during their own schooling.

Internationalization requires a commitment from faculty to undergo a process of self-inquiry and to put what they have traditionally assumed to be normal, uninvestigated, or common sense under the microscope. This new approach to curriculum and instruction requires changes to how they teach and to how they understand themselves, their field, and their students. Morey (2000) discussed this and observed that it is critical to the success of an internationalization effort that faculty be committed and well-informed in this regard.

The earlier discussion of interview accounts noted that faculty who have had overseas experiences or who have embraced the local diversity of their institution can

embody this commitment. Those who have not turned this corner may say they are interested, but when the new teaching context demands more time, energy, and patience, enthusiasm can quickly dwindle (Otten, 2003). There is a danger that faculty who are unmotivated will perceive this new approach as a threat to their professional identity (Steiner, 2000), and consequently, could model the parochialism, ethnocentrism, and disinterest that the institution's internationalization effort is designed to replace (Paige, 2003).

Disciplinary Perspectives

Each of the interviewees emphasized the importance of identifying and addressing the epistemologies of different disciplines. One stated that "one of the most difficult things for academics is understanding what internationalization does mean at the discipline level." Another interviewee noted that disciplines have "strong sub-cultures" and that it is important to work with faculty on their terms to establish what internationalization means for the curriculum and instruction within that discipline. Professionally, faculty are often acknowledged for their content expertise and they therefore have a tendency to emphasize this in the classroom. Interviewees argued that it was the purpose of the faculty development on which this study is focused to expand interdisciplinary perspectives on intercultural competence.

The educational institution reflects multiple cultures. First, each discipline has traditions that represent the values of that individual field. Second, the academic institution itself has a culture. Finally, the culture of the society where the institution is located is reflected in the institution. Internationalization challenges faculty to confront

this often unrecognized and uninvestigated cultural perspective. One interviewee described how this kind of training needs to help faculty to appreciate how “the discipline that they're working in has a tradition and that they're teaching from within” their particular disciplinary tradition. Further, students may not come from, or may, in the future, be living and working in societies that do not share that tradition. The interviewee continued by arguing that faculty need to be able to design and deliver instruction to prepare students for this new internationally and domestically diverse context.

It was noted in three of the interviews that an important challenge of faculty development is to make participants aware of the cultural assumptions of their discipline. This is in addition to the cultural assumptions that they carry from their own culture. This self-awareness was viewed by the experts interviewed as an important condition to helping instructors move from ethnocentrism and begin the process of developing a more sophisticated intercultural mindset and skillset. Just as ethnocentrism and resistance to change can occur on the institutional level, it also exists within the disciplines. One interviewee in particular acknowledged that some disciplines, such as those in the social sciences, lend themselves more readily to the process of integrating intercultural and international learning outcomes.

From the Literature

The perspective that disciplines and their epistemologies can be understood as cultures was clearly represented in the interviews and this helps us to appreciate how challenging it is for some faculty to become less ethnocentric about how any particular discipline should be taught. A perspective related to this kind of disciplinary

ethnocentrism and resistance to incorporating intercultural or international perspectives in the classroom was put forward in research by Bell (2004) and Morey (2000) who found that some disciplines, such as those in the social sciences and humanities, tend to embrace intercultural and internationalization reforms to teaching and learning more readily than fields included in the physical and applied sciences. Bell noted that the earlier adoption by some groups may be because their more discursive and critical orientation. These early adopters may already incorporate many of the kinds of complex, constructivist, intercultural, critical, and comparative learning approaches required for integrating the intercultural and the international into the curriculum requires.

Faculty often assume that the knowledge and approaches to the learning of their disciplines are universal. It is therefore surprising and, perhaps, frustrating when they encounter individuals who have other perspectives and approaches to their field. Otten (2003) argued that teachers from all subject areas in an internationalizing institution "should be sensitive to different cultural styles of learning and teaching" (p. 19). Sensitivity to different teaching and learning styles is one dimension in which faculty need to engage. More fundamentally, educators should also make their own cultural and disciplinary assumptions clear to their students (Otten, 2003; Paige and Mestenhauser, 1999). By identifying their own assumptions, faculty can better engage and work with the diverse perspectives and values that come up when integrating the intercultural and international.

Institutional Commitment

Faculty training that promotes the integration of the intercultural and international in the curriculum and instruction needs to be part of a long-term, institution-wide effort. All interviewees commented that this not be treated as what one participant referred to "as a one-shot kind of thing," but that it should be part of an ongoing effort in educational and instructional reform and improvement. The interviewee continued arguing that if this kind of session was not integrated with an institutional strategy, the benefits would be isolated efforts that could only result in a marginal degree of success.

One example of how a university can institutionalize intercultural and international dimensions in the curriculum was highlighted by two of the interviewees, who noted the example of University of Southern Australia and its Graduate Quality #7. According to one interviewee, all graduates at this university are expected to exhibit "international perspectives as professionals and as citizens" and to demonstrate a number of skills and characteristics related to intercultural and international issues. It was highlighted that one result of institutionalizing this kind of objective for all graduates is that it provides a centerpiece for faculty development, reinforcing the idea that this kind of faculty development should not simply be left to the isolated efforts of individual instructors, but should be part of an integrated institution-wide effort.

Internationalizing the curriculum was regarded as a kind of higher educational reform by two of the interviewees. Perspectives varied between interviewees regarding its form and current success, but one dimension that stood out was the benefit of integrating intercultural communication across disciplines. Integrating the intercultural and

international across the curriculum was seen to be something that had the potential to transform classroom interactions and ultimately student learning outcomes.

From the Literature

The perspectives shared in the interviews that emphasized the importance of developing faculty as part of an institutional effort were shared by Otten (2000), who observed that for internationalization to be sustainable, it required the development of intercultural sensitivity at both an individual and organizational level. Otten noted that an institution of higher education is “an expression of a national cultural code: it reinforces and enhances cultural notions” (pp. 113-114) held by that society about itself. Changing the curriculum to incorporate more diverse intercultural and international values confronts institutions and those that work in them with their own ethnocentrism. They are challenged to conceive of education, the institution, and society in new ways. This is because as Mestenhauser (1998) wrote that “culture is a major variable that influences not only how people from other countries organize their knowledge, but also how we organize knowledge in various disciplines” (p. 25).

Interviews did not elicit a clear statement regarding how to introduce the multivaried perspectives, values, and ways of interpretation that an institution needs to adopt. However, the literature provides some perspective on how intercultural consciousness can influence that institution over time, and why a long term commitment to this kind of change is important. Bennett and Bennett (2004) described a "circular, self-referential process"... whereby... "the institutions of culture are constantly recreated by people acting out their experiences of those institutions" (p. 150). This cycle may

initially be unconscious, but the introduction of intercultural competence brings it into awareness. This consciousness contributes to the deepening of the integration of intercultural and international learning in the curriculum of an institution. Institutional changes such as those embodied in the University of South Australia's Graduate Quality #7 work on an institution-wide basis to reform a previously ethnocentric and domestic focus into one that incorporates intercultural and international perspectives. This approach is aligned with the view of Otten (2003) who stated that when an institution implements its internationalization strategy, the top levels must lend their support, but at the implementation level, it is the instructor, the program chairs, and the students who put it into daily practice.

The Workshop Facilitator

Interview data pointed to the importance of facilitators of this kind of faculty development being highly qualified in terms of their own intercultural competence, and training expertise, as well as their expertise in instruction and educational practice. The former is necessary to the design and execution of these kinds of workshops because the most essential content is intercultural. If the facilitator of intercultural development lacked theoretical, instructional design, or developmental knowledge, then it was observed that participants' development of competence was hindered.

Regarding the dimension of intercultural expertise, one interviewee noted how professionally unprepared or undeveloped intercultural trainers could create situations that inhibit the development of intercultural understanding and competence. Poor facilitation skills contributed to faculty avoidance of subsequent training sessions. In this

kind of situation, interviewees noted that the intercultural trainer did not create the conditions for the successful transformation of participant perspectives. Under-qualified or poorly prepared trainers were observed to create contexts that could promote alienation and frustration in workshop participants. These kinds of experiences, when not handled properly inside the training session, spilled out into the general faculty population. The result was that few were willing to sign up to participate in future sessions. Another example was shared where too much emphasis on culture-specific examples led to faculty confusion and eventual disinterest in similar future training opportunities.

The designer and trainer also must be skilled as a teacher and possess expertise in educational theory. In one interview, it was stated that a faculty developer should "spend two-thirds of [his or her] reading in the literature of teaching and learning" with the other third in intercultural. The interviewee emphasized that this kind of curriculum redesign training required that facilitators possess a complex interdisciplinary set of skills and expertise if they hoped to succeed in their work. This is because the intercultural learning created a need in instructors to also investigate, and learn, and adopt new instructional perspectives and methodologies. In this interview, it was asserted that sometimes the biggest challenge is "rebuilding" teachers' instructional methodologies. Therefore, the workshop facilitator should serve as a model of good instructional method and a source of expertise in current research on teaching and learning theory.

From the Literature

The intercultural literature is very clear about the importance of the appropriate preparation of trainers facilitating intercultural development. Trainers need to be familiar

with and be able to use the major theories and research in conjunction with the methodologies sequenced in a way that leads to the best outcome for the learner (Paige, 1996; Gudykunst, Guzley and Hammer 1996; Bennett and Bennett, 2004). These authors pointed out how poorly qualified and/or under-prepared facilitators run more than the danger of wasting time; they may alienate participants, or worse, reinforce stereotypes or racist attitudes and beliefs.

It is important that the facilitator of this kind of training have expertise in intercultural communication, training design, and facilitation. Paige and Martin (1996) observed that intercultural training is potentially transformative because it “requires learners to assume new modes of thinking, valuing, and behaving” (p. 46). They observed that doing this can be “potentially threatening to the learner because it challenges existing and preferred beliefs, values and patterns of behavior” (p. 46). To ensure that faculty participants’ experiences result in more developed intercultural competence, trainers must be able to anticipate, plan for, and work with the needs and characteristics of these participants incorporating their experiences and perspectives.

Shifting Faculty Perspectives on Teaching

Interviewees spoke of a shift or transformation that occurs in faculty as they move away from emphasizing cognitive outcomes from one particular cultural and/or disciplinary perspective, to one that incorporates the cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of learning. The newly adopted approach by faculty that make this change cultivates not only content expertise in learners, but also attends to developing skills and attitudes to promote a successful life in a diverse world. One interviewee described how

"it takes a very, very sophisticated practitioner who's already made the transition from teaching to learning" that can "meaningfully undertake the process of integrating the intercultural and international into their curriculum and instruction." The same interviewee noted that "Internationalization and intercultural communication in the classroom means nothing at all to the instructors who do not teach in a way that is interactive, who use a transmission model." Another referred to this shift away from the transmission model as a move from a shallow to a deep approach to teaching.

Intercultural competence in particular was identified as a significant component for improving instruction and, ultimately, student learning. One interviewee observed that for participants in these kinds of faculty development efforts,

one of the challenges for us has been to get them to think how they can modify their teaching approach so that students actually develop quite a deep understanding of how culture influences the way we think and the way we construct the world.

This interviewee described how if faculty members have not experienced the shift to questioning their personal and disciplinary assumptions, or to conceiving of themselves as other than transmitters of information, then it was unlikely they would undertake anything but a shallow approach to internationalizing—one that "might incorporate international research or incorporate international case studies," but "tend not to go beyond that. Clearly a shallow approach." In another interview, it was observed that for a deep approach to develop, faculty have to be ready, stating that "unless that readiness agenda is attended to, what teachers wind up picking up is something they can't be generative with." Ensuring faculty were ready was a challenge acknowledged in the

interviews, and it was suggested that volunteer participation ensured that faculty who self-select for these kinds of development opportunities are ready.

One interviewee emphasized how the intercultural has both a content and relational dimension, and that it was the objective of this kind of training to make faculty content experts and to help teach them how to embody the values and skills that this new curriculum promotes. Intercultural competence was viewed as essential to achieving this. It was observed "that in the balance between the content dimension and the relational dimension, the most powerful dimension we had to work with was the relational dimension." In the diverse classrooms this interviewee encountered, it was important to teach and model good intercultural communication skills so that students could better relate to one another. Developing this relational dimension was seen as particularly beneficial for improving interpersonal dynamics and learning outcomes in group and pair discussions and projects. The development of this relational dimension reflects a learner-orientation and makes a significant impact on the instructional process in the classroom.

Once faculty decide to undertake the process of developing themselves interculturally and professionally, they encounter challenges along the way. One interviewee described the growth of faculty in this kind of effort as a "change that keeps changing." Faculty's transformation after the initial shift was described as "cognitive revolution" and a "turning point." One interviewee commented that intercultural development could produce a fundamental shift "between ethnocentric and ethnorelative stages," in a reference to the kinds of transformative intercultural development outlined by Bennett's (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. Another interviewee speaking in relation to the above shift argued that because this so-called

"cognitive revolution" is a slow process, a commitment to a longer process by faculty and the institution was needed.

From the Literature

The necessity for faculty readiness was also found in the literature where it was argued that instructors volunteering to take part in this kind of training may do so because of experiences at home or abroad that triggered a desire to expand their perspective and expertise in this area. Crichton et al. (2004) described how intercultural development “requires a decentering from one’s own knowledge, culture and discourse and developing the capability to move across different ways of thinking, knowing, and doing” (p. 11).

This decentering is reminiscent of the shift from an ethnocentric to an ethnorelative worldview as described by Bennett (1993) in relation to the DMIS. This is also reminiscent of the earlier discussion of the works of Bell (2004) and Ellingboe (1998), whose internationalization of the curriculum models also mapped a kind of decentering shift in faculty’s attitudes and approaches to designing and adopting internationalized curricula. The interviews and the research point to the importance of building intercultural competence, and more specifically, an ethnorelative perspective to ensure the successful integration of intercultural and international dimensions in the curriculum and classroom. This is important because, as Maidstone (1995) observed, "faculty cannot develop and teach an internationalized curriculum if they are not themselves 'internationalized'"(p. 59) and if they have not transcended an ethnocentric worldview.

This kind of personal transformation can come about suddenly or over an extended period of time. Mezirow (2000) described how these events can be “epochal” or “incremental, involving a progressive series of transformations in related points of view that culminate in a transformation in habit of mind” (p. 21). Because intercultural learning involves reflection and observation to gain insights about oneself and others, this can resemble the long-unfolding process Mezirow and the interviewees describe.

The literature supports the interview findings that point out how experiences that lead instructors to seek out this kind of training often come from events in their professional lives when they realize that their old frames of reference no longer meet their needs. This phenomenon is what Cranton (2002) described as “an activating event” that can start the process of transformative learning. Following Cranton’s thinking the workshops need to help take participants through the individual and collective process of investigating and reconstituting how they experience and understand the world. In the context of this project, this will relate to how they change the content, structure, and delivery of the curriculum so that it integrates the intercultural and the international.

The intercultural competence faculty develop will be passed on to students through the curriculum and instruction. Freedman (1998) echoed perspectives of three of the interviewees who argued that incorporating the development of intercultural competence into the internationalized curriculum influences not only what we know, but how we come to know it. Crichton et al. (2004) wrote that intercultural learning encourages self-investigation and reflection on how we as individuals respond to other ways of experiencing the world. They concluded that by investigating our own intracultural complexity, we can better appreciate and learn about the complexity of

others. Attending to the relational in addition to the content dimension of learning creates an opportunity for an involving, real-life learning experience that can result in successful intercultural development (Otten, 2000).

Integrating intercultural and international learning outcomes asks that instructors intentionally incorporate affective, behavioral, as well as cognitive dimensions of student learning into their lessons. Through their developmental process, instructors must come to recognize the need to incorporate “pre-arranged settings and clearly defined aims” (Teekens, 2003, p. 110) in their curricula for intercultural learning to take place. Training that is well-designed develops these three dimensions of learning simultaneously to promote intercultural development (Bennett and Bennett, 2004).

Workshop Design Considerations

Interviews did not elicit detailed workshop designs, but rather, a number of important planning considerations. Some specific intercultural and training components of content and design were shared although with a number of cautions and qualifications. In particular, interviewees passed on advice on training and design considerations that were useful for planning and facilitating this kind of potentially transformative training program.

Intercultural communication trainers will be familiar with the kinds of theoretical content the experts recommended. Interviewees emphasized a developmental structure that starts with knowledge and awareness of oneself as a cultural being. The approach begins by helping participants create an understanding of subjective culture and how it

shapes who we are and how we see the world. Stereotyping and generalizations are also addressed in the early stage of the training.

Later, the role of values and their influence on communication, understanding, and perception are introduced. Interviewees recommended a variety of intercultural models and perspectives that included those on values provided by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, Stewart, Hofstede, and Trompenaars. The work of Ting-Toomey was suggested as a useful approach to investigating identity in intercultural contexts. Following on from values and identity, it was recommended that faculty need to be familiar with various communication styles. The work of Hall on this topic was recommended. Two of the interviewees suggested that learning styles also be addressed and Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory was recommended as effective particularly when working with North American instructors. Other topics related to learning approaches shared in the interviews included the development of critical thinking skills across cultures, and issues related to deep and surface learning approaches.

The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) was identified by three participants as a model with which they had worked. Although some difference of opinion existed between interviewees about whether it should be used, one participant in particular described it as central because of how it can inform training design, and for what it teaches us about the development of intercultural competence. According to this interviewee, the DMIS helps faculty deepen their self-knowledge as well as their ability to interpret course materials, instructional approaches, and classroom experiences. In one interview it was argued that they "need to understand the concept of intercultural competence and the foundation for intercultural competence is the level of intercultural

development.” The interviewee continued added that “competence ultimately is the enactment of understandings that we have in the world.” From this perspective, the DMIS has the capacity to promote increasingly complex understandings of the world, and therefore, increasingly interculturally competent individuals.

The interviews also provided some warnings and criticism of intercultural theory in designing and running this kind of training. The first warning was related to the danger of overemphasizing either culture-general or culture-specific theory in sessions. Experiences were related where culture-general training approaches were emphasized without sufficient grounding in the concrete experiences of participants, and as a result, were ineffective. Too much emphasis on the culture-specific was seen to result in what one interviewee referred to as a “cultural tourism” approach. This kind of training was described as leaving those in the workshop with long lists of culture-specific characteristics of cultural groups, lacking integration. While the information may be interesting, it does not necessarily mean that faculty learning the characteristics will be able to apply the information to increase their intercultural competence.

Two interviewees were critical of the overuse of what one referred to as the “canon” of intercultural theories of certain researchers. The position was supported by the belief that many of the theories are becoming quite dated stating that this canon has “been our stock in trade for a very long time. Not very sophisticated way to teach and ironically, far less sophisticated than a lot of the other kinds of teaching we do.” This particular interviewee was critical of how many intercultural dynamics, such as individualism and collectivism, are arranged along oppositional categories that in this interviewee’s opinion are not necessarily oppositional. The interviewee continued, stating a belief that these

models stem from “a tradition that had a notion of culture as more fixed and more homogeneous than we know it is.” The explanation was followed with the observation that “It’s possible to be both highly individualistic and highly collectivistic.” This position emphasized that these intercultural theories should be included in intercultural training for faculty, but that facilitators need to emphasize a heuristic application rather than a simply explanatory application of these models. This heuristic orientation was not gone into detail, but was suggested to be particularly useful in modern diverse classroom contexts where we can observe newly emerging cultural styles such as those influenced by globalization and multiculturalism.

The interviews suggested different approaches that have been used to organize and select groups of faculty for this kind of development. They described successful examples that took place in both relatively homogenous, same-discipline groups, and those with diverse groups. One interviewee described how faculty from the same discipline were supported through the introduction of external experts in curriculum, evaluation, and web-based instruction to help instructors develop an interculturally and internationally integrated curriculum. Another interviewee described how groups of faculty from different departments attended workshops designed to help them prepare for a year teaching at affiliate universities in various countries. Another interviewee described sessions with faculty from various disciplines who voluntarily attended out of personal or professional interest or as a result of past experiences and a desire to know more. All interviewees commented that smaller groups of faculty and the introduction of interdisciplinary perspectives should be included where possible.

It was unclear from interview data how long this type of faculty development should be. Formats ranging from one or two days to regular meetings over a six month period were described. What was common to all, however, was the importance of working with these groups using faculty members' individual experiences, cases, courses, and problems as core components of the workshop design. One interviewee noted that “I find that if you get faculty together, you don't have to do much of a workshop because if they start talking about what's worked for them, you will watch emerge out there, quite nicely, solutions to these problems.”

Along with the above perspective, which highlights the wisdom of the group, is another interviewee's perspective, namely, that when changes in curriculum or policy are being decided, faculty must be in control and ultimately choose the solutions. Returning to the earlier point regarding group membership, another interviewee observed that when these kinds of complex issues are being discussed and decided, the diverse disciplinary perspectives in groups promote different ways of seeing that can bring about new insights and approaches to curriculum and instruction.

One dimension that two of the interview participants discussed was the issue of financial rewards. Both had participated in projects that rewarded faculty for curricula, materials, and published research that had come out of the workshops. In one example, participants in an internationalizing the curriculum and instruction project were encouraged to publish their collective findings and end products, and received a salary bonus for their contribution.

From the Literature

Faculty that participate in the kind of workshops discussed in the interviews will ultimately redesign and teach curricula that are intended to promote the development of more interculturally aware and competent students. The DMIS has been suggested in the literature as well to be a useful model to help trainers plan and facilitate training that is appropriate for the participants' level of development (Bennett and Bennett, 2004). It can serve as a rigorous developmental scheme for planning the theoretical content, activities, and sequencing of the training. It can be supported by using the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) with participants as part of a training plan to accurately identify individual and group characteristics. It can also serve as a useful means to promote participant self-awareness and reflection as part of a training program (Paige, 2004).

Creating and facilitating the kind of program interviewees described requires trainers to avoid the kinds of pitfalls outlined above by careful planning. Fowler and Blohm (2004) built on the perspectives of Gudykunst, Guzley, and Hammer (1996) and Bennett (1986) in their conceptualization of an "integrated program" (p. 39). In Fowler and Blohm's (2004) view, it is important to strike a balance between didactic and experiential methods, between culture-general and culture-specific content, and to keep an eye on promoting cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning. Not following these guidelines could lead to unanticipated and undesired training outcomes such as those related in the interviews.

Reflection's Role

Building in time and activities that promote reflection was described in interviews as an essential part of intercultural development for faculty. Reflection was linked to the transformation of perspective that intercultural development can promote. One participant noted that because the dominant North American orientation is toward “doing” building reflection into a program is particularly appropriate when working with faculty.

Once again, the DMIS was described as a useful model, and the Intercultural Development Inventory, an instrument individuals can take that is based on the DMIS, was suggested as a powerful tool for helping people reflect on their intercultural development. In one interview, it was asserted that the DMIS helps individuals place themselves along the continuum, and that this is “a model they can use to track themselves and to think about where they’re at and do some deep reflection. It takes a lot of work; you can’t just do a quickie on this.” According to the experiences of those interviewed, this kind of development takes time and reflection during and after the workshops is a powerful means of personal transformative development. As one interviewee stated, “Things seem to need to be recycled and recycled and recycled” before transformations of perspective can occur.

From the Literature

Reflection plays an important part in developing intercultural competence. Ting-Toomey (1999) uses the concept of mindfulness that she defines as “the readiness to shift one’s frame of reference, the motivation to use new categories to understand cultural and ethnic differences, and the preparedness to experiment with creative avenues of decision

making and problem solving” (p. 46). Ting-Toomey points out that without reflection we merely react to intercultural challenges and do not act mindfully to engage and be creative working with or learning from them.

Reflection also plays an important role in the set of teaching and learning principles developed by Crichton et al. (2004). This group of researchers produced a set of five educational principles that faculty can use to promote intercultural education across disciplines. The fourth principle relates to reflection and introspection. They argue that reflection is “integral” to intercultural development and that “teachers and learners need opportunities as part of their interactions in education to continue developing their capability for reflecting on their successes, failures, uncertainties, future developments, and further extensions and applications of ‘knowledge’ on intercultural communication and interaction” (Crichton et al., p. 66). Developing a reflective approach is an integral part of the development of intercultural competence as well as an important tool practiced by people engaging in intercultural contexts.

Grounding Intercultural Theory in Faculty Experiences

Intercultural theory provides useful frameworks that instructors can use to understand and direct their own as well as their students’ efforts. It was pointed out that faculty are accustomed to living and working in the world of theories and models in their own fields and that a training program needs to include the presentation of intercultural theory. It was also noted in all interviews that intercultural theory needs to be grounded in the lived experiences of workshop participants through the use of cases and examples related to and where possible generated from their world. It was explained that this is

because although faculty may appreciate the theory, it is through a careful grounding that they will more likely to apply it. It is likely that all those interviewed would agree with the one who stated, “I really caution you to be careful, just talking about competencies without grounding it in something.”

Approaches to how to ground theory differed among those interviewed. One approach involved teams of instructors bringing a shared departmental problem to the sessions, while others had engaged groups from across departments and with individual concerns and challenges. One interviewee stated that the reason for a grounded approach was closely tied to the abstract nature of the topic commenting that

it’s an interesting topic and people say “oh that’s interesting,” but there’s a link missing in the learning which is the connection to real situations. There’s a different quality of conversation that happens when you build out of a case study.

Linking theory to the lives and work of instructors through the use of cases and faculty experiences was seen to contribute to the ultimate outcome where intercultural is linked into new curricula and instructional approaches. One interviewee noted that this case approach is potentially more successful because intercultural, curriculum, and instructional dimensions have “been connected to making tasks that people want to succeed at easier to succeed at.” Some unsuccessful examples of this kind of session related in the interviews were described as workshops where “people just don’t get it because they haven’t been able to connect it [intercultural theory] to their experience.”

One other observation related to working with faculty using a grounded approach, was that overall satisfaction with training sessions was observed as being higher when this approach was employed. One interviewee observed that “if you set it up right you

can actually create it as an occasion for people to kind of talk about their best work as well as talk about their work that is not very satisfying.” This same expert noted that the result of this approach was that faculty participants were more satisfied with the training and more likely to integrate their new knowledge and skills into their work.

From the Literature

The literature points out that intercultural theory should be linked to the experiences of faculty who want to gain a measure of expertise and learn how to apply the training to their curriculum design and teaching. This is consistent with the interviews. Intercultural training should be theory driven (Bhawuk and Triandis, 1996; Gudykunst, Guzley and Hammer, 1996; Fowler and Blohm, 2004). In the views of these researchers, the theory then needs to be applied to the local context and trainee needs. Kolb’s (1984) Experiential Learning Model was discussed in Fowler and Blohm (2004) in relation to how training should be designed so that it meets all four learning styles identified by Kolb. From this perspective, training should integrate the concrete experiences and realities of participants with the development of their theoretical expertise.

The interviewees perspectives on how intercultural theory and faculty’s concrete experiences should be combined in training situations comes out clearly in the following perspective presented by Levy (1995), who when writing on training design noted that even after you have designed your entire training program, it is not complete unless you attend to the question of how participants will apply what they have

learned. The best knowledge, understanding, and skills are useless if they are not tied to everyday realities. (p. 14)

This is good advice to guide all stages of planning, facilitation, and evaluation.

CHAPTER 5

DESIGN AND GUIDELINES

Overview

This chapter will present guidelines that can be used when planning and conducting internationalizing the curriculum faculty development. The guidelines were developed by synthesizing findings from the interviews and literature and applied to the training design outlined below and in the accompanying detailed lesson plans (Appendix F). The lesson plans were made with a particular institution in mind to serve as an example of how the guidelines could be used to design a program. It is expected that facilitators designing internationalizing the curriculum workshops at other institutions will benefit from these guidelines and the sample plans, but will produce programs that serve the unique characteristics of their own institutions.

This chapter is divided into two parts. The workshop design is presented first and is followed by a presentation and discussion of the six guidelines developed in this research for creating and facilitating this kind of internationalizing the curriculum development program. The description and discussion of each guideline is supported by an explanation of how it is incorporated into the workshop design. It is recommended that the reader review Appendices E and F so that the discussion of how the guidelines have been applied to the design can be more clearly understood.

Design Outline

Overview

The following is an overview of the program design. It provides a description of objectives and areas covered, with explanations and rationales for how it is structured. It starts with a description of the institution that the designer had in mind while creating the design. Next it gives an overview of the whole program before going into more detail for the specific sessions (Appendix E and F).

To provide a context envisioned for this particular design, I used a medium-sized institution in Western Canada with a student population of about ten thousand. It has served traditionally as a regional university-college. In recent years, however, as a result of an internationalization strategy, there has been a steep increase in the number of international students in attendance. They come predominantly from Asia, a large number coming from China, Japan, and Korea, and fewer coming from Thailand, Indonesia, and India. The increased proportion of international students in classes has challenged faculty to reconsider their approaches.

The first workshop in this series taps into the expressed need of instructors for training so that they can better understand these students and feel more satisfied that they are able to provide these students with good instruction. The later three-day retreat builds on the first by deepening participants' intercultural competence and involving faculty in structured activities to help them redesign their curricula so that they integrate intercultural and international dimensions.

These workshops are separated into an initial three-hour session, which is followed up by a three-day retreat. It is expected that the first session will be delivered a number of times throughout the fall and spring semesters because it is topical and has been designed to meet broad needs. Those who participate in the first session can then apply for the three-day internationalizing the curriculum retreat by submitting a course curriculum that they wish to redesign. All of the training is voluntary, and the intention behind applying for one of the ten allotted spots in the retreat is to ensure that applicants are aware of the kinds of topics and demands the three-day session will place on them. The submission of a course outline and a brief explanation of why the instructor wishes to take the training also help the facilitator in his or her preparations.

There are two unique features to the retreat. First, participants meet two weeks prior to take the IDI and to get an overview of the retreat details. After completing their inventory, they arrange a one-on-one interview with the IDI administrator for the following week. The private consultation can provide a powerful opportunity for developing cultural self-knowledge, which participants can take into the sessions and have access to long after. It is intended to contribute to each participant's ability to reflect on their intercultural competence. The second feature is the gap between the second and third day of the retreat, which allows time for instructors to redesign and create their own internationalized course

Session Profiles

Teaching in the Intercultural Classroom

As mentioned earlier, this training session was designed and promoted to the institution to meet a current need. It employs a practical approach that closely links intercultural theory and frameworks to solving classroom challenges. The training was designed to provide foundational theory so that a shared vocabulary and set of understandings could be developed. A definition of culture as a constructed subjective experience, the importance of self-awareness, and an understanding of how ethnocentrism shapes perception form the foundation for future sessions.

Two areas closely tied to instructors' needs and expectations of this program relate to the adjustment difficulties that many of their students experience, and to issues around communication styles and classroom performance. The session includes theory on cultural adjustment and culture shock, with activities designed to make the concepts applicable to instructors' needs. To provide a deeper understanding and appreciation of the communication challenges instructors perceive in their classrooms, an adaptation of Hall's (1983) high and low context culture styles is presented. Again, discussion and examples that are used and elicited are designed to help faculty approach their challenges with new tools and the motivation to engage them in new ways.

The Retreat

The purpose of the retreat is to help instructors develop their intercultural expertise so that the internationalized curriculum that they produce truly integrates intercultural and international learning.

Day 1.

Day 1 links with the introductory workshop in how it ties the development of self-knowledge to the final product of the retreat, and then further deepens participants' acquisition of intercultural competence. This is a concept-heavy day, which introduces and investigates many intercultural models and perspectives so that this new knowledge can influence the curriculum redesign process in the afternoon of day two and after. Day one must build a strong case for the centrality of intercultural competence in the development of an internationalized curriculum. Early in the day, activities are planned in order to position intercultural content. After this, essential topics such as communication styles and values are explored through activities that place them in the classroom and within the curriculum.

At the end of the day, concept mapping is introduced and practiced so that instructors can use this technique as an aid to identify the essential components and developmental sequencing, or organization, of the course they are going to redesign. Concept mapping is introduced at the end of the day so that instructors can take it away and prepare a concept map of their course, which they will present on Day 2.

Day 2.

The second day uses the concepts taught in previous sessions, but is less explicitly focussed on intercultural theory. Its purpose is to look at a diverse range of learning models and styles. Instructors will identify their learning style according to Kolb's model using the Learning Style Inventory, and then expand this self-awareness to explore how they can adapt their instructional approach to improve their effectiveness with a diverse student population. Three Asian learning constructs are then presented to provide a contrast to the Western style that exists at the institution. Faculty are engaged in an exercise using Bloom's taxonomy and one Asian model to conceive of a way in which courses can be more inclusive to serve a larger number of students.

In the afternoon, faculty present their concept maps and go through a series of collaborative activities in cross-disciplinary teams. Adopting the cross-disciplinary teams of Saroyan and Amundsen (2004) is intended to force instructors to be clear and precise in how they explain their courses. The activity encourages cross-disciplinary questions, sharing, and investigation to promote clarity so that the essential course components and their organization become more clearly articulated. In this way, when faculty undertake their redesigns, the essential learning objectives of the course are clear. Day 2 ends with participants having begun the process of identifying the areas that they will target first in their redesign. Participants then have two weeks to prepare their new course for presentation on the third day.

Day 3.

Day 3 of the retreat is a reporting day, where participants present their final designs and exchange final feedback on their work with their peers, with whom they have, by this time, developed good working relationships. This day is the culmination of the first two days of the training and the two-week interlude in which instructors have had time to reflect on and create their newly designed course.

Follow-up session.

Something not indicated in the overview schedule is the follow-up meeting for the participants to come together and share their teaching experiences once they have taught their new internationalized courses. The session is used to share challenges and lessons learned among faculty as well as the workshop facilitators. For faculty, the lessons shared hold the potential to improve teaching practice. For the facilitators, this can provide valuable examples and feedback that can be used to improve the design and facilitation of future sessions.

Guidelines

The six guidelines are as follows:

1. Place the Development of Intercultural Competence at the Core of the Design
2. Employ a Transformative Design
3. Ensure the Facilitator's Credibility and Competence

4. Make Participation Voluntary
5. Incorporate Faculty Experiences and Disciplinary Perspectives
6. Make the Sessions Part of a Larger Institutional Plan

Place the Development of Intercultural Competence at the Core

The foundation of this approach is the development of the intercultural mindset and skillset in faculty. Intercultural competence is understood to transform our ways of knowledge, attitudes, and skills. Combining the intercultural mindset and skillset with international learning has the potential end result of a deep learning experience for students studying with faculty who have gone through this process to internationalize the curriculum. This research has found that combining the development of intercultural competence as part of the process of redesigning curricula will help faculty more critically assess, select, and design instructional materials and resources. It can also improve the quality of instruction for our increasingly diverse student population so that the promise of internationalized curriculum and instruction can truly be an integration of intercultural and international.

The study findings indicate that training needs to follow good intercultural training principles if it is to succeed. Intercultural learning is cognitive, affective, and behavioural and therefore requires a structure that integrates didactic and experiential activities, as well as culture-general and culture-specific content. Also, because the training is for instructors, other topics related to learning and teaching styles found in different cultures should also be included.

Developmentally, the training should move from a focus on the self to an understanding and analysis of how self-construal (Ting-Toomey, 1999) influences interaction with an understanding of other individuals, groups, and ideas. The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) is recommended as an instructional design guide and also as a method for assessing participant needs. This can help trainers target the session to the participants' requirements and also limit what Bennett and Bennett (2004) refer to as "push back" (p. 147) that can derail a training session from its objectives. Paige (2004) recommends as a useful training strategy, the use of the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). The IDI provides individualized feedback that will help participants gain a deeper self-awareness of opportunities for their own intercultural development.

This kind of intercultural training includes interaction about topics that can be intellectually and emotionally challenging. These challenges produce the resistance in the training context noted above as push back. Facilitators need to incorporate appropriate sequencing of activities so that inoculations (Weaver, 1993) can be included particularly in the early stages. Inoculations can involve defining culture, differentiating stereotypes and generalizations, or developing group norms. Such inoculations create a collective language and climate conducive to engaging the content and one another as the training progresses.

After the early stages, the topics of values, communication style, identity, perception, and learning style should be included. How these are sequenced to provide the appropriate balance of content and experiential learning, as well as the appropriate levels of challenge and support, can be facilitated by using the DMIS in conjunction with

a scheme such as J.M. Bennett's (1993) framework for balancing content and process challenges for learners.

While these workshops focus on faculty development and experiences, it is essential to keep in mind that the end objective is to improve student learning. Therefore, facilitation needs to run on parallel tracks. The development of instructors' intercultural competence must match the development of a level of content expertise in intercultural theory so that they can incorporate these concepts in their own internationalized curricula and classrooms.

Guideline One as Used in the Design

Intercultural learning is the central objective of this multi-session faculty development design and the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) is the unifying intercultural construct. The DMIS is used both as content presented to participants and as the theoretical foundation of the developmental design of the sessions. It is introduced in the first workshop as a means to help deepen participants' understanding of ethnocentric and ethnorelative worldviews so that they can better recognize these in their students, curricula, teaching materials, and themselves. After the initial session, this knowledge of the DMIS is combined with individual participants' Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) results to help facilitate a deeper self-awareness of the worldview they are working from. It is also intended that this self-awareness has the potential to make further intercultural development possible. Of additional importance, the IDI results can also be used to help the designer and facilitator

more closely target the three-day retreat's content and process more closely to the needs of the participants.

With the DMIS as the foundation, other theory can be introduced at different stages in ways appropriate to the developmental stage of the faculty taking the training. As an example, the first workshop introduces the framework of high and low context, a model that can be used to uncover useful insights for faculty in how they understand the expectations and behaviors of their students.

Later, during the retreat, frameworks related to value orientations, communication style, and learning and teaching styles will be introduced and explored in depth. Intercultural learning is the primary emphasis in the introductory session as well as a good proportion of the first two days of the retreat. This strong emphasis on intercultural learning in the first part of the design is intended to foster integration of intercultural perspectives into the international content in faculty members' redesigned curricula and instructional approaches.

Employ a Transformative Design

Intercultural learning is inherently transformative (Paige and Martin, 1996), and the design of this training should incorporate this important consideration. It should encourage faculty to discover and investigate assumptions, particularly regarding how culture influences the curriculum and instruction. The design should build in regular opportunities for the internalization of concepts and for the investigation of insights and observations. Cranton (2002), who conceived a seven-stage transformative learning model, encourages trainers to balance private reflection with group dialogue situated at

different stages of the learning to achieve different objectives. In early stages, reflection and dialogue can be used to recognize and identify “underlying assumptions that have been uncritically assimilated and are largely unconscious” (Cranton, p. 66). Once these assumptions are more consciously known, participants can discuss, investigate, and assess new perspectives before they move to integrate their fresh insights into their new way of knowing, believing, or acting.

This training will promote critical self-investigation as it relates to the intercultural self that designs the curriculum; evaluates, selects and designs materials; and interacts with learners. Insight gained through the intercultural training can have a significant impact on how instructors re-conceive their roles.

Guideline Two as Used in the Design

The approach taken in this series of workshops was strongly influenced by Cranton’s (2002) seven-step conceptualization of transformative learning. In the discussion to follow aspects of the design will be outlined to demonstrate how they were intentionally linked to these seven stages. The first stage is the activating event that starts the transformative learning process. It is likely that this has taken place prior to these workshops and may be the reason behind the participants’ interest in attending this particular development opportunity. Then, during the workshop, participants can engage in the next stage of recognizing and articulating their assumptions. The intercultural and learning frameworks presented in the workshops help faculty to identify their own and others’ styles and values. One example of this is during the second day of the retreat

when Western, North American Native, Chinese, and Japanese learning frameworks are investigated.

After faculty have been introduced to these models they can more readily identify their own and others' assumptions as they engage in small and large group discussions. This section focuses on faculty expectations of classroom behaviour, the role of teacher, grading criteria, instructional approach, and the selection and sequencing of teaching content and materials. This facilitates the fourth transformative stage, which is the promotion of open investigation of alternative viewpoints. While this takes place at various points in this design, it is important to note that at different times during the sessions, faculty are placed in groups composed of participants from other disciplines to encourage the exchange of different perspectives.

Throughout the sessions, participants are engaged in large group, pair, small group, and diverse disciplinary group activities and discussions to help promote the engagement and revision of their understanding and assumptions. These are Cranton's (2002) fifth and sixth stages. One example of how participants are encouraged to revise their previously held views and ways of being is through sharing a concept map of the course they will redesign, and then going through the process of revising and redesigning the curriculum over the three days of the retreat. The seventh stage involves having participants act on their revisions. This is achieved first by having participants present their revised designs to their workshop peers on the final day, and second by planning a workshop follow-up meeting at the end of the semester, once they have taught their new course. This follow-up session can provide useful peer support and learning that can be incorporated into future curricular redesigns.

Ensure Facilitator's Credibility and Competence

The designer/facilitator of this program needs to possess competence as an intercultural trainer, and a thorough knowledge of internationalization of the curriculum and current educational theories and approaches. Interviews described examples of unsuccessful training that resulted from either under-qualified or poorly prepared facilitation. Paige's (1996) article outlining trainer competencies should be reviewed by individuals considering undertaking this kind of project.

Trainers who intend to adopt the training design outlined in the next section will need to look into becoming a licensed IDI administrator. Use of the IDI is not a necessary component of this design, but a thorough familiarity with the DMIS is strongly recommended as it is the core intercultural developmental framework guiding this design.

Additionally, as this training aims to improve both, curriculum and instruction, the trainer needs to possess curriculum and instructional expertise and serve as a model of good instructional design and method. The absence of this dimension could lead to a lessening of the credibility and effectiveness of the trainer and the overall program.

Guideline Three as Used in the Design

The design can be led by a single facilitator or a team. It is not outlined in the design of these sessions whether there should be one or more facilitators to ensure that intercultural, curricular, and instructional issues are appropriately handled. Individuals planning to undertake this kind of project need to assess themselves and decide if they

should co-facilitate so that these diverse areas of expertise are covered and complementary areas of expertise can be combined.

Make Participation Voluntary

Participation in these faculty development sessions should be voluntary because of the potentially transformative nature of intercultural development and the effort that undertaking a curricular redesign requires. Intercultural competence building involves cognitive, affective, and behavioural learning that can challenge participants' long-held views of themselves and their roles as instructors. This can be thrilling for some, but very difficult for others and, therefore, it is recommended that voluntary participation in this process is best.

Redesigning a course curriculum that integrates intercultural and international frameworks and content can be very challenging. This redesign could take a good deal of time and effort to complete, since it requires faculty to reassess the topics and content they teach, the selection of new instructional materials, the development of themes and concepts, the teaching methods employed, and evaluation approaches used. Voluntary participation in the training should contribute to ensuring that all participants are committed to doing the kind of work needed personally and professionally to ensure a successful outcome.

Guideline Four as Used in the Design

This multi-session design was created with the understanding that participants will be volunteers who are motivated to involve themselves in their learning process and

curriculum redesign. The staged approach of these workshops requires participants to enroll twice if they are going to take part in the whole program. The first session is only three hours, places few demands on the participants, and involves primarily cognitive learning. It is intended to have a broad appeal and to provide some useful and relatively easy to apply intercultural constructs and useful vocabulary that participants can bring to their classroom interactions.

The second stage of the design is much more demanding on participants' time and effort involving a three-day retreat and the expectation that they will produce and present a redesigned internationalized curriculum by the final session. Prior to the retreat participants take the IDI and meet the facilitator for a one-on-one consultation. Taking the IDI prior to the three-day retreat is intended to help participants deepen self-investigation into their own intercultural development and its influence on their work. It lays a foundation of critical reflection that participants will be expected to continue during the retreat.

During the three sessions, the faculty work alone and in groups to produce their redesigned curricula. Participants share and explain their current curriculum designs and work intensively with each other to ensure that intercultural and international dimensions are effectively integrated in their new designs. On the last day, participants' final products are presented to all participants when they each give and receive final questions and feedback before launching their new internationalized curricula with their students.

Incorporate Faculty Experiences and Disciplinary Perspectives

A training program needs to take into account the characteristics, needs, and expectations of its participants. Voluntary participation in the training should contribute to ensuring that all participants are committed to doing the kind of work needed personally and professionally to better ensure a successful outcome.

The trainer needs to make the training align with participants' goals through a careful selection of appropriate activities, examples, and materials. And, as the interviews clearly indicated, all aspects of the training need to be grounded in concrete experiences and examples that the trainees can easily relate to and see as practically linked to the work they do with students. The trainer needs to be familiar with the kinds of courses the participants teach and be prepared to make changes to the sessions so that content and flow of the training meet expectations in as many ways as possible.

Faculty are generally very comfortable in the world of theory and as a result may favor a more didactic approach that involves them in discussion of the concepts. Having said this, it is important to achieve a balance between didactic and experiential methods so that training engages more than the cognitive, but also facilitates affective and behavioral learning as well. These types of participants have the potential to generate rich outcomes in brainstorming, group work, case study, discussion, peer review and feedback, and other interactive and collaborative activities. In this way, the training will help them work through the practical challenges they face and contribute to grounding the theories and frameworks they are learning into more accessible and useful experiences that can relate to their work as teachers.

Guideline Five as Used in the Design

The sessions will incorporate content and activities that will acknowledge and explore the different disciplinary perspectives present in the faculty participating. The various epistemological perspectives represented in the workshop provide an opportunity to explore intercultural issues across disciplines. This can serve as a kind of living laboratory of diversity if handled sensitively. Participants are placed in interdisciplinary faculty groups that function as diverse teams to investigate various epistemological perspectives that will be incorporated into their content as well as instructional approaches.

Make the Sessions Part of a Larger Institutional Plan

Internationalizing the curriculum is one part of a larger institutional internationalization effort that will usually include other components such as study abroad, international institutional linkages, faculty exchanges, research, and international student recruitment to mention a few. It involves the long-term investment of time and resources to bring about an institutional shift in culture. As the earlier discussion of the transformative learning process highlights, it is an activating event that starts individuals on the path to seek out new ways of knowing. Through its various internationalization activities, the institution exposes faculty to diverse experiences that can serve as activating events.

It is not only the trigger event of starting faculty along this exciting path that these institutional efforts provide, however. They also supply faculty with on-going

opportunities to broaden and deepen their intercultural and international knowledge and experiences. Attending this kind of professional development is one part of an unfolding process for a faculty member who is internationalizing a curriculum and instructional approach. It is through on-going self-investigation and revision over time that faculty members will achieve their intended goal. The institutions' long-term policies and activities are critical in supporting the successful realization of this objective.

Guideline Six as Used in the Design

This internationalizing the curriculum effort is designed to complement a larger institution-wide internationalization strategy. It is expected that faculty who participate in the workshops will have had a good deal of contact with a very diverse international and domestic student population. Many faculty may have also taken part in faculty exchanges, study abroad, international development projects, and other related activities. Participants who may be new to the institution or who have not yet taken part in these kinds of internationalization activities may view the sessions as a useful way to prepare themselves for these future challenges.

The sequenced design of this project is intended to appeal to faculty at different stages of experience and levels of interest. The first session's introductory nature is designed for a wide population. It is expected that a much smaller number of committed participants who have partaken in other international activities will enroll in the three-day intensive retreat.

Faculty at different stages of commitment to integrating intercultural and international dimensions into their curricula and instruction can be served by this design.

In addition, it is important that the institution continue to support these kinds of efforts on an on-going basis over a longer term to ensure there are sufficient resources and opportunities for the continued development of faculty engaging in this complex challenge.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Study Outcomes

This project seeks to contribute to the improvement of student learning outcomes in higher education through faculty development. The internationalization of higher education has many dimensions and the four outcomes of this study concentrate on how intercultural competence and the intercultural perspective can be integrated with international content in the design and instruction of an internationalized curriculum.

This study produced the four following outcomes:

1. A list and discussion of seven themes resulting from the analysis of current literature in the field with interview data collected from four experts who have contributed to the development of internationalized curricula and instruction through their research and work in the field.
2. A clear rationale based on a review of current research and interview data that places the development of intercultural competence at the core of faculty development efforts for internationalizing the curriculum and instruction.
3. A set of six guidelines that faculty developers can use when they plan internationalizing the curriculum professional development efforts that make the development of intercultural competence and theoretical expertise an

integral part of creating an internationalized curriculum and instructional orientation.

4. A sample design for a multi-session “Internationalizing your Curriculum and Instruction” program that faculty developers, intercultural trainers, curriculum designers, and higher education administrators can use as a guide to efforts they plan for their own institutions.

It is hoped that the groups this research was intended to serve will derive benefit from these findings and that they in turn will contribute to this topic by sharing their own perspectives and findings.

Recommendations

There are a number of recommendations for future activity and study that can be made as a result of what this project has produced. They will be outlined in the discussion to follow.

First, the design needs to be thoroughly evaluated once it has been implemented to measure its effectiveness and make changes where necessary. By the time the writing of this thesis was completed the workshops were conducted. Additionally, follow-up research using a faculty participant focus group has been undertaken, but is not part of this thesis to report on. The findings from this focus group maybe published in the future.

Other useful research into the effectiveness of the training could include data collected from the students of the instructors who have internationalized their courses. This could include surveys, interviews, and/or focus groups. A study that contrasts the experiences and learning of students in an internationalized course with those of students

in a traditional course could provide useful data regarding what kind of contribution to student learning this new course curriculum and instructional approach is having on learners. Class observations could also serve as a rich source of data to investigate how intercultural learning is incorporated into the delivery of lessons.

Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) results could also be a valuable in tracking longitudinal changes in the development of intercultural sensitivity in faculty and students. Follow-up IDI testing could be conducted with faculty to measure the degree to which the training may have promoted intercultural development. Another means of using the IDI results could be to compare the inventory results with the courses faculty produced and to look for any correlations between intercultural development and the approach adopted by instructors in their final curriculum design such as those suggested by the research of Ellingboe (1990) and Bell (2004).

The IDI could also be used with the students of these instructors to track whether the internationalized curriculum's promise of developing intercultural competence is actually taking place. Pre-course and post-course IDI results could be compared and supplemented by interviews, or focus group data could be collected from the students. To assess the impact of the internationalized curriculum and instruction on the development of intercultural competence, data from these students could also be compared with that from control groups of students who had studied in traditional classrooms.

Another outcome of this training could be a collaborative research paper produced by participants in the project. One interesting possibility would be to have the interdisciplinary groups work together to write about their experiences. Another could be to have participants journal during the training and the curriculum design stages, and also

while they implement their new programs. The journals could provide constructive and practical insights for the design of future professional development as well as a rich phenomenological study of the implementation stage of curriculum innovations for others working in this kind of higher education reform.

The last recommendation is for faculty developers who undertake this kind of project to compare their experiences through research, presentations, and collaboration. Earlier recommendations discuss the possible areas for research, but another effective mode of innovating new approaches to this kind of initiative is through co-facilitation and collaboration. Trainers undertaking this kind of endeavour often work in isolation, and so coming together to exchange perspectives, experiences, and expertise could be a rewarding and fruitful way of forwarding the practices and outcomes of the field.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Banks, J. (1999). *An introduction to multicultural education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bell, M. (2004) *Internationalizing the higher education curriculum – Do you agree?*
Retrieved May 20, 2005 from
<http://herdsa2004.curtin.edu.my/Contributions/RPapers/P036-jt.pdf>.
- Bennett, J. M. (1993). Cultural marginality: Identity issues in intercultural training. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 109-135). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (2004). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed., pp. 147-165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Toward ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Triandis, H. C. (1996). The role of culture theory in the study of culture and intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 17-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bond, S. (2003). *Untapped resources, internationalization of the curriculum and classroom experience: A selected literature review*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Bond, S., Qian, J., & Huang, J. (2003). *The role of faculty in internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum and classroom experience*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Bremer, L., & van der Wende, M. (1995). *Internationalizing the curriculum in higher education: Experiences in the Netherlands*. The Hague: The Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education.
- Cogan, J. L. (1998). Internationalisation through networking and curricular infusion. In J. A. Mestenhauser & B. J. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus* (pp. 106-117). Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Cranton, P. (1994). *Understanding and promoting transformative learning: A guide for educators of adults*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Cranton, P. (2002). Teaching for transformation. *New directions for adult and continuing education*, 93, 63-71.
- Crichton, J., Paige, M., Papademetre, L., & Scarino, A. (2004). *Integrated resources for intercultural training and learning in the context of internationalization of higher education*. Retrieved May 17, 2005 from <http://www.unisa.edu.au/staff/grants/archive/2003-integrated-report.doc>.
- De Wit, H. (1995). *Strategies of internationalization of higher education. A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States*. Amsterdam: European Association of International Education.
- De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Ellingboe, B. J. (1998). Divisional strategies to internationalize a campus portrait: Results, resistance, and recommendations from a case study at a U.S. university. In J. A. Mestenhauser & B. J. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus* (pp. 198-228). Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Francis, A. (1993). *Facing the future: The internationalization of post-secondary institutions in British Columbia*. Vancouver, BC: British Columbia Centre for International Education.
- Fowler, S. M., & Blohm, J. M. (2004). An analysis of methods for intercultural training. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed., pp. 37-84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fowler, S. M., & Mumford, M.G. (1995). *Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods* (Vol. 1). Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press.
- Gardenswartz, L., & Rowe, A. (1994). *The managing diversity survival guide: A complete collection of checklists, activities and tips*. Los Angeles, CA: McGraw-Hill.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Guzley, R. M., & Hammer, M. R. (1996). Designing intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 61-80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hall, E. T. (1983). *The dance of life: The other dimension of time*. New York: Anchor Books-Doubleday.
- Harari, M. (1992). Internationalization of the curriculum. In C. B. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 52-79). Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators.

- Jenkins, B. (2001). *A question of quality: Evaluating the international dimension of higher education*. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
- Kegan, R. (2000). What "form" transforms?: A constructive-developmental approach to transformative learning. In J. Mezirow (Ed.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 35-69). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Knight, J. (1993). Internationalization: Management strategies and issues. *International Education Magazine*, 9(1), 20-21.
- Knight, J. (1994). Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints. *Research Monograph*, No. 7. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Knight, J. (1997) Internationalization of education: a conceptual framework. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Internationalisation of higher education in the Asia-Pacific countries*, (pp. 5-19). Amsterdam, :
- Knight, J. (1999). A time of turbulence and transformation for internationalization. *Research Monograph*, No. 14. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2-3.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definitions, approaches and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Knight, J., & De Wit, H. (1995) Strategies for internationalization of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. In H. De Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalization in higher education*. Amsterdam: European Association of International Education (EAIE).
- Leask, B. (1999, October). *Internationalisation of the curriculum: Key challenges and strategies*. Paper presented at the IDP Education Australia 1999 Australian International Conference, Australia.
- Leask, B. (2001). Bridging the gap: Internationalizing university curricula. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5 (2), 100-115.
- Levy, J. (1995). Intercultural Training Design. In S. M. Fowler & M. G. Mumford (Eds.), *Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods* (Vol. 1). Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press.
- Li, J. (2002). A cultural model of learning: Chinese 'heart and mind for wanting to learn.'" *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 95(2), 258-268

- Liddicoat, A.J. (2004). Internationalisation as Education. In J. Crichton et. al (Eds.), *Integrated resources for intercultural teaching and learning in the context of internationalization of higher education* (pp. 70-78). Retrieved May 17, 2005 from <http://www.unisa.edu.au/staff/grants/archive/2003-integrated-report.doc>.
- Maidstone, P. (1996). *International literacy: A paradigm for change: A manual for internationalizing the curriculum*. Victoria, British Columbia: Centre for Curriculum, Transfer and Technology.
- McKellin, K. (1998). *Maintaining the momentum: The internationalization of British Columbia's post-secondary institutions*. Victoria, British Columbia: British Columbia Centre for International Education.
- Mestenhauser, J. A. (1998). Portraits of an international curriculum: An uncommon multidimensional perspective. In J. A. Mestenhauser & B. J. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus* (pp. 3-39). Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Mestenhauser, J. A. (2000). Missing in action: Leadership for international and global education for the twenty-first century. In L. C. Barrows (Ed.), *Internationalization of higher education: An institutional perspective. Papers on higher education* (pp. 23-62). United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization: Bucharest European Centre for Higher Education.
- Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow (Ed.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3-33). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Morey, A. I. (2000). Changing higher education curricula for a global and multicultural world. *Higher Education in Europe*, XXV(1), pp. 26-39.
- Nilsson, B. (2000). Internationalizing the curriculum. In P. Crowther, M. Joris, M. Otten, B. Nilsson, H. Teekens, & B. Wachter (Eds.), *Internationalisation at home: A position paper* (pp. 21-27). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Otten, M. (2000). Impacts of cultural diversity at home. In P. Crowther, M. Joris, M. Otten, B. Nilsson, H. Teekens, & B. Wachter (Eds.), *Internationalisation at home: A position paper* (pp. 15-20). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Otten, M. (2003). Intercultural learning and diversity in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7 (1), 12-26.

- Paige, R. M. (1993). *Education for the intercultural experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Paige, R. M. (1996). Intercultural trainer competencies. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 148-164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paige, R. M. (2003). The American case: The University of Minnesota. *Journal of Studies International Education*, 7(1), 52-63.
- Paige, R. M. (2004a). The intercultural in teaching and learning: A developmental perspective. In J. Crichton, M. Paige, L. Papademetre, & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Integrated resources for intercultural teaching and learning in the context of internationalization of higher education* (pp. 79-90). Retrieved May 17, 2005 from <http://www.unisa.edu.au/staff/grants/archive/2003-integrated-report.doc>.
- Paige, R. M. (2004b). Instrumentation in intercultural training. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed., pp. 85-128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paige, R. M., & Martin, J. N. (1996). Ethics in intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 35-60). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paige, R. M., & Mestenhauser, J. A. (1999). Internationalizing educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35 (4), 500-517.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000) Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination. The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates
- Saroyan, A., & Amundsen, C. (2004). *Rethinking teaching in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schoorman, D. (2000). *Internationalization: The challenge of implementing organizational rhetoric*. EDRS
- Steiner, D. (2000). "The show is not the show, but they that go": The Janus face of the internationalized university at the turn of the century. In L. C. Barrows (Ed.), *Internationalization of higher education: An institutional perspective. Papers on higher education* (pp. 63-73). United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization: Bucharest European Centre for Higher Education.

- Taylor, E. (2000). Fostering Mezirow's transformative learning theory in the adult education classroom: A critical review. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education, 1*(2), 1-28.
- Teekens, H. (2000). Teaching and learning in the international classroom. In P. Crowther, M. Joris, M. Otten, B. Nilsson, H. Teekens, & B. Wachter (Eds.), *Internationalisation at home: A position paper* (pp. 29-34). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Teekens, H. (2003). The requirement to develop specific skills for teaching in an intercultural setting. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7* (1), 108-119.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Whalley, T. (1997). *Best practice guidelines for internationalizing the curriculum*. Ministry of Education, Skills, and Training and the Centre for Curriculum, Transfer, and Technology, Province of British Columbia, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
- Whalley, T. (2000). *Internationalizing learning through linked assignments: An instructor's manual*. Victoria, Canada: British Columbia Centre for International Education.
- Wachter, B. (2000). Internationalization at home: The context. In P. Crowther, M. Joris, M. Otten, B. Nilsson, H. Teekens, & B. Wachter (Eds.), *Internationalisation at home: A position paper* (pp. 5-13). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Yershova, Y., DeJaegere, J., & Mestenhauser, J. (2000). Thinking not as usual: Adding the intercultural perspective. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 4*, 43-78.
- Yoshikawa, M. (1997). *The double-swing model of intercultural communication between east and west*. L. Kinkaid (Ed.), San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview Questions

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this study. My MA thesis will develop guidelines for planning and delivering intercultural communication workshops for faculty who are internationalizing their courses and instruction. I will use the data you provide me with to integrate the experiences and recommendations of experts working with faculty to internationalize higher education with what the literature says a good intercultural program should include and be conducted.

1. Can you please describe two or three examples you've seen or been a part of where faculty intercultural development was integrated into the internationalization process?

(Warm-up and elicit specific concrete examples I can later refer back to)

2. What made these examples successful?

(probes: commitment of people to process; leadership (then ask them to elaborate on what leaders, what they did to promote process); specific resources available; external events (e.g., timing around something like 9/11, or funding opportunity)

3. How is facilitating faculty intercultural development in higher education for internationalization of courses and instruction unique from other contexts?

(prompts to include teaching undergraduates, diversity, anti-racism, corporate,

community development)

(Link from the more general contexting Q1/2 to the specific case of developing faculty. Obtain specific facilitation advice)

4. What intercultural theories, models or frameworks need to be included in such a faculty development workshop?

a) Any you think are essential?

b) Any you think are not suitable, misused or over-used?

(Obtain specific recommendations to compare and analyze in relation to the literature)

5. Realizing the faculty participants will eventually be teaching and using these intercultural models and concepts in their own classes:

a) What kinds of intercultural competencies does faculty need to go away with?

b) What can be expected to develop over time?

(Two objectives... First, confirm Q5 answer contents. Second, elicit the personal and professional intercultural competencies of an intercultural facilitator or educator-knowledge, skills, personal qualities)

6. What do you think is being missed or needs to be better developed in the faculty IC development efforts you have known?

(Two objectives....First, elicit facilitation and design warnings and advice.

Second, may gain a glimpse into the gap between practice and what is published in the context of faculty development in the internationalization of higher education)

7. Who do you think I should know about that is doing good work in this area?

(Elicit further contacts and potential interviewees)

8. What advice can you give me as a graduate student in intercultural relations who is about to undertake the design and delivery of this kind of faculty development?

9. What have I not asked or elicited that you think needs to be considered in these kinds of efforts?

(Elicit what I have not anticipated and allow the experts to give voice to their experience, expertise and perspective)

- 10. OPTIONAL QUESTION...How much time should this kind of faculty development be planned to take? Please describe any good examples of formats/schedules you know or think should be tried.**

APPENDIX B
DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

Design Considerations

Data organizer

	Interview #1	Interview #2	Interview #3	Interview #4
Theory's role in IC development				
Use of instruments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kolb • IDI 				
Didactic-Experiential				
Emic-Etic CS-CG				
J. Bennett's Sequencing Considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cognitive-Affective, Behavioral • Concrete-Abstract • Low-risk to High-Risk • Objective Knowledge-Subjective Application • Support-Challenge 				
Training vs./and Education Orientation				

APPENDIX C
FRAMEWORKS AND THEORIES

Frameworks and Theories

Data Organizer

	Interview #1	Interview #2	Interview #3	Interview #4
Culture Defined <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective-Subjective • Iceberg 				
Stereotyping and Generalizations				
Non-Verbal				
Communication Style <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct-Indirect • Circular-Linear • High-Low Context • Speaking-Listening • Cognitive-Affective Confrontation • Face and Self-Other Enhancement 				
Language and Culture				
Identity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Knowledge • Growth 				
Perception and World-View				
Ethnocentrism-Ethnorelativism				
Values <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hofstede • Kluck-Strod 				

APPENDIX D
TEACHER/FACILITATOR GUIDELINES

Teacher/Facilitator Guidelines

Data Organizer

	Interview #1	Interview #2	Interview #3	Interview #4
KNOWLEDGE				
IC Phenomena <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychological/Social Dynamics (Stress) 				
IC learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Perspective • Stages and Characteristics 				
IC Training: Design Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methods • Development • Planning 				
IC Training: Learner Issues				
IC Training: Trainer Issues				
IC Training: Content				
IC training: pedagogy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and Sequencing • Appropriate Techniques 				
International Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of 				

Int'l Political, Social, Devel, Critical Dimensions				
Diversity Training Issues				

	Interview #1	Interview #2	Interview #3	Interview #4
SKILLS				
Needs Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learner Level • Organizational 				
Training Design: Goals and Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear Link to Needs Assessment 				
Training Design: Content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Cultural Content • (CS-CG) 				
Training Design: Pedagogy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and Sequencing • Appropriateness to Learners' 				

Needs				
Program Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present, Debrief, Link to Needs 				
Program Evaluation				

	Interview #1	Interview #2	Interview #3	Interview #4
PERSONAL QUALITIES				
Tolerance of Ambiguity				
Cognitive and Behavioral Flexibility				
Cultural Identity Understood				
Patience				
Enthusiasm and Commitment				
Interpersonal Skills				
Openness to New				

Experiences and People				
Empathy				
Respect				
Sense of Humor				

APPENDIX E
OVERVIEW OF COMPLETE PROGRAM

Overview of Complete Program

Introductory Session		Internationalizing the Curriculum 3-day Retreat									
Teaching and the Intercultural Classroom <i>3 hours</i>	Apply to 3-day retreat	IDI administration and individualized consultations <i>Meetings scheduled to meet faculty schedules</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Day 1</th> <th>Day 2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"> The Intercultural Self and the Curriculum </td> <td style="text-align: center;"> Learning Styles and the Curriculum </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Day 1	Day 2	The Intercultural Self and the Curriculum	Learning Styles and the Curriculum	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Day 3</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"> Participants Presentations and Peer Feedback </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"> Wrap-up </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Day 3	Participants Presentations and Peer Feedback	Wrap-up
Day 1	Day 2										
The Intercultural Self and the Curriculum	Learning Styles and the Curriculum										
Day 3											
Participants Presentations and Peer Feedback											
Wrap-up											

APPENDIX F
DETAILED WORKSHOP LESSON PLANS

Introductory Session: Teaching and the Intercultural Classroom

Detailed Lesson Plan

Duration: 2.5-3 hours

Number of Participants: 20 per session

	Session Activities and Development	Objectives
9:00	Introduction to the Group <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My personal introduction 2. Small groups of 4-6 people introduce one another 3. Introduce the purpose and schedule of the workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greet and establish my role and credibility • Elicit teaching areas, experiences, and expectations of the group • Align the schedule and objectives to the group profile
9:20	Slide-Making Culture Conscious What is Culture? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build a definition of culture 2. Ask “What is the usefulness of the iceberg metaphor of culture?” 3. Present a mix of subjective and objective culture dimensions and have participants separate them 4. Ask “What is the relationship of the subjective to the objective?” 5. Ask “When a Canadian looks at a Balinese dance, are they able to interpret the dance as accurately as someone from the local culture may?” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inoculate by clarifying what culture we are discussing • Develop awareness of how subjective influences objective • Introduce the idea that our understanding and perception of other cultures (subjective and objective) is influenced by our own.
	Consciousness and Competence <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present Howell’s Staircase model of consciousness and competence on whiteboard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce the idea that we need to be conscious of our assumptions and values in intercultural contexts • Investigate how this development

		<p>takes time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate that it is often through a lack of consciousness that intercultural misunderstandings and trespasses occur.
	<p>Slide-Culture and Learning Culture and School</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present and discuss the slide. 2. Elicit experiences of faculty who have lectured/studied abroad to illustrate this point 3. Elicit experiences of instructors in their own classes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link the iceberg to the classroom as a cultural artefact and context • Develop the understanding of how culture (particularly for learners from other countries) can influence how teachers and students think about the physical school, the idea of good teaching and good learning, and a good curriculum
9:35	<p>Slide-Cultural Distance Cultural Distance and Adapting</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present Ting-Toomey's concept and highlight the following aspects <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. It requires a greater amount of time for students from culturally distant cultures to adapt to our system b. It is more stressful in many ways for students from culturally distant cultures c. Students from distant cultures confront us as teachers as <i>challenges, problems, weak</i> d. Also introduce how students from "close" cultures can have unrealistic expectations regarding the ease they will be able to translate their own style to the local context. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build understanding and empathy for students working to bridge the divide between home and Canadian culture • Introduce how our perception of these students can lead to negative stereotyping that is inaccurate • Identify challenges students and faculty face when working in culturally diverse classrooms and how it is important to avoid premature evaluation

	<p>Slide-the Bridge</p> <p>Appreciating the Adaptation Process of International Students</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Groups discuss the bridge metaphor <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. “Bridge-crossing” experiences from one “life” to another that they have had. b. What emotions were associated with these crossings? c. What helped them adapt to the new life circumstances? d. What did the experience teach? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build empathy and appreciation for what international students experience • Start to think of ways that these experiences while at times can be difficult, can ultimately add depth and character to a person’s life
	<p>Slides-Adaptation: crossing the Bridge <u>and</u> Adapting to Life Abroad</p> <p>Student Adaptation and Culture Shock</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present slides and discuss the factors related to what students go through as they adapt to life in a new country 2. Link the earlier slide that discussed cultural distance 3. Discuss <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What relationship might there be between cultural distance and how students experience the adaptation process? b. What kinds of signs are there that a student is going through this experience? c. What can we do as faculty and an institution to support these students? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an understanding of the factors that challenge students as they adapt to school in a new culture • Build familiarity with the language and stages associated with transitions into new cultures • Give faculty tools to identify and where needed intervene and be able to recommend campus support services for students experiencing difficult transitions
10:00	COFFEE BREAK	
10:20	<p>Slide-Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity</p> <p>The DMIS, Ethnocentrism and Ethnorelativism</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present the fundamental structure of the model emphasizing the concepts of Ethnocentrism and Ethnorelativism. 2. Relate the DMIS to the developmental thinking of Perry and the development of complex thinking in students 3. Also use slides –Ethnocentric stages/Ethnorelative stages 4. Discussion: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deepen understanding of the ethnocentrism and ethnorelativism • Recycle and reinforce the understanding of how perception in intercultural contexts is influenced by our intercultural development • Link ethnocentrism and

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. How does this knowledge inform us about how ethnocentrism/ethnorelativism influences our perception and ways of understanding what we learn, see, and experience? b. In what ways can what this model and Ting-Toomey's idea of cultural distance be linked when we think of student behaviours, or experiences we may have had personally. 	ethnorelativism to what can happen in a classroom.
11:00	<p>Dealing with an institutional challenge</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background: At present the institution is experiencing an influx of students that come from a number of high context cultures. The challenges faculty have been experiencing is well known in staff rooms. Part of the purpose of this training is to provide a practical framework to help faculty better understand and work with students coming from these cultures. 2. Groups brainstorm some of the challenges and confusion they are experiencing using Bennett and Bennett's DIE (Describe, Interpret, Evaluate) exercise with clear instructions and examples to begin with non evaluative DESCRIPTIONS of behaviours they are experiencing. i.e. Students are do not ask questions in class 3. After a ten minute brainstorm field what has been observed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link theory to the teaching experiences of instructors • Teach the DIE method and encourage non-evaluative perspectives at the early stages of intercultural misunderstandings
	<p>Slides High and Low Context #1-6</p> <p>High and Low Context Styles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present slides and link the slides to the individual experiences described to the group. This model will not apply to all examples, but it will cover a number. 2. Use the model with two or three of the behaviors described and develop informed interpretations of the behaviors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build faculty's understanding of high and low context theory • Increase instructors' awareness of their own cultural style and how it is similar and different in important ways from the styles of their students

	<p>3. Highlight the importance of withholding evaluation or judgement in intercultural contexts before you have developed an understanding of the behaviour and values behind it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground the DIE method as a part of good teaching practice
<p>11:35-</p>	<p>Slide- Reflection: Where am I now?...</p> <p>Reflection and Integration</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reflection -Allow a few minutes for instructors to answer the questions on the slides dealing with their current practice and how they might change as a result of the topics explored in this workshop. 2. Groups share what they have come up with and exchange perspectives, experiences, and any resources they may be aware of. 3. Bring the group back together and field group experiences and perspectives. Take the opportunity to recommend resources where appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage instructors to reflect on and discuss how they can use what they have learned to their work
<p>11:45- 12:00</p>	<p>Slide-Summing Up</p> <p>Closure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note that this is a continual process of learning and innovation. And on that line, announce the three-day retreat scheduled that they can apply to participate in later in the year. 2. Distribute feedback forms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforce the nature of this kind of learning as a continuous process • Make participants aware of the 3-day session • Get feedback on the session

Three-Day Retreat: Internationalizing your Curriculum

Detailed Lesson Plan

Duration: Day 1 and 2 (6 hrs each) and day 3 (4 hrs)

Number of Participants: 10

DAY 1

	Session Activities and Development	Objectives
9:00	<p>Slides-Session Objectives and Session Schedule</p> <p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participants introduce themselves to the group and answer the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The course I will internationalize and why I chose it b. At this stage in my career/life, how does participating in this project fit? c. What has stayed with me from the first workshop? d. Go over the Session Objectives and the schedule for the three days we will be together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greet and establish my role and credibility • Elicit teaching areas, experiences, and expectations of the group • Create a link between the previous session and this one • Align the schedule and objectives to the group profile
	<p>Slides: What is Internationalization? and Curriculum Continuum</p> <p>Setting Context and Terms</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present and clarify the definitions 2. Use whiteboard to present the findings of Bond regarding the continuum of add-on, infusion, and transformative approach 3. Groups discuss and place the three definitions on the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify the terms internationalization and internationalized curriculum • Make participants aware of the range of approaches to internationalizing curriculum that include add-on, infusion, transformation • Start participants reflection regarding the form their redesign will take • Clarify that the internationalized curriculum

	<p>continuum</p> <p>4. Discuss Nilsson’s definition of the internationalized curriculum-Is this conception of the cognitive, affective, and behavioural what you expect? Explain.</p>	<p>incorporates a new way of approaching both content and instructional orientation/approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify that the approach we will take involves teaching for knowledge, attitudes, and skills
	<p>Overhead of “Double Image”</p> <p>The Power of Learning New Ways to See</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Place a double image for the group. This is a particularly difficult one used by Stella Ting-Toomey and usually requires the trainer to show the second “less obvious” image. 2. The message to leave is “Sometimes we need to learn how to see things differently” and intercultural learning has great potential when it is integrated into the curriculum with international and other material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the metaphor of the hidden image to introduce the idea that our epistemologies help us to see some things more clearly, but also can keep us from seeing outside of that system.
10:30	COFFEE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This break is strictly scheduled to make sure the learning associated with the double image can be achieved
10:50	<p>Overhead again</p> <p>The Power of Learning cont’d</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place the same overhead up. Now ask how many can see both images.... This is the power of education and new ways of seeing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground the idea introduced before the break. Demonstrate how a new way of “seeing” can open new ways of interpreting and experiencing the world. • Link the above to the power of a well developed intercultural mindset on ways off seeing and understanding
11:10	<p>Slides-Intercultural and International Integration <u>and</u> Intercultural Competence <u>and</u> Intercultural Teaching and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a clear link between the development of intercultural competence to the ability to create n

	<p>Learning Involves</p> <p>Intercultural Competence as a Central Component of an Internationalized Curriculum</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development of intercultural perspectives and competence is what separates the style of curriculum you choose to undertake 2. Present and clarify the statement by Crichton et al. This is a central feature of this program 3. Link the above to Knight’s definition of internationalization being the “integration of intercultural and International” 4. This kind of learning involves the cognitive, affective and behavioural... Present J. M. Bennett’s definition of Intercultural Competence 5. Discuss and clarify the components of this multi-layered definition 6. Activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muneo Yoshikawa’s mobius metaphor. Each participant is given a strip of paper and piece of tape and shown how to form a mobius. They then take a pen and connect the line • Elicit participant perspectives on how this might be a useful metaphor for the way we are looking at intercultural learning, and also the integration of the intercultural and intercultural 7. Present Crichton et al slide “Intercultural Teaching and Learning Involves” and explain each point in detail 8. Link to the Mobius activity 9. Link to Bennett’s definition 	<p>internationalized curriculum that integrates the intercultural and international</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn a definition of intercultural competence from Bennett as a mindset, skillset and heartset • Link this definition with the earlier discussed conception of an internationalized curriculum and instruction including the development of knowledge, skills, and behaviours (Nilsson) • Develop an understanding of how the intracultural is linked to the intercultural using Yoshikawa’s mobius metaphor
--	--	---

11:40	Slide-Three Pillars The Three Pillars of Interculturalizing and Internationalizing your Curriculum and Instruction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss the role of the self and developing intracultural as a core to building intercultural competence 2. Discuss the connection between our own development and our ability to select materials, design curricula and teach lessons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present a framework that participants can use to conceive the inter-relationship between their own (self) development and perspectives, the curriculum they design/ materials they select to teach, and the way they interact/teach students.
12:00	LUNCH	
1:00	Slide-Intercultural/Intracultural Learning Cycle and Communication Styles Learning How to Identify Different Classroom Communication Styles <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present the framework of various communication styles put together by Bennett and Bennett 2. Video <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Set up the video by asking to observe and try to identify the different communication styles b. Groups discuss c. their findings after the viewing AND d. How they might use the “Learning Cycle” in this kind of case? e. How might this be used with students? f. Debrief as a group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce and identify a variety of communication styles • Use video to ground the “abstract” nature of these styles to something faculty may have encountered in their own classrooms • Develop ideas and approaches generated by faculty for dealing with the challenges diverse communication styles in the classroom can present them with
	Slides-Intercultural Expertise Development and Cross-Cultural/Intercultural Communication/Intercultural Relations Building Your “Expertise” <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lecturette on D. P. S. Bhawuk & H. C. Triandis’ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build a clear link between the importance of having a theoretical understanding of the intercultural that is grounded in personal experience through reflection and other ways of

	<p>framework for building expertise through experience, theoretical knowledge, and behavioral training (cognitive/affective/behavioral).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Point out that this conception is useful because it stresses the importance of linking theoretical knowing with experiential knowing in a simply laid out framework 3. Explain the similarities and differences between cross-cultural, intercultural communication and intercultural relations. 	<p>learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite and challenge participants to view the cross-disciplinary teams they have been placed in as different “cultures(epistemologies) that they can use as an opportunity to learn new ways of seeing, and behaving. • Recycle the reflection cycle by Schaetti, Watanabe, and Ramsey as a tool they can use when they encounter an “interdisciplinary” cultural impasse, surprise, conflict or misunderstanding. • Clarify the vocabulary and conceptual differences and similarities between cross-cultural, intercultural communication, intercultural relations
1:45	<p>Activity: North American Cultural Styles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distribute handouts and have participants place themselves on a number of continua that will help them to identify where they stand in relation to a set of values adapted from L. Gardenswartz & A. Rowe (1994) 2. Then work in groups at their tables and compare 3. Elicit any observations 4. Highlight the “typical” values of the local culture and the institution 5. Discuss If there are any faculty that feel they do not match those institutional values and what it demands it places to adapt to them 6. Link back to what happens when we have learners from values and expectations that are different from our own? 7. Link back to Howell from first session and the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an understanding of some aspects of North American values and norms • Develop awareness of one’s own internalized values and how Howell’s model can help us understand the importance of this awareness • Link how these values can play out in the classroom/staffroom • Develop awareness of the importance these values plays in how we teach, interact with students, evaluate.

	importance of building self-awareness as we work toward becoming more interculturally competent	
2:15	<p>Slides: Culture-General vs. Culture-Specific <u>and</u> Some Well-Known Values Orientation Frameworks</p> <p>Values Models and the Intercultural</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elicit participant ideas about examples they now know that may be culture-specific or culture-general. 2. Clarify and show slide 3. Give a brief overview of the models by K&S, Hofstede, Trompenaars and Hampden-turner, Hall (they covered high/low context in session 1) 4. Invite participants to take the time to familiarize themselves with these models reading on their own time 5. Link the North American Styles activity to these theories 6. Discuss in groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the best way I can use this kind of theory in the work I do? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a survey knowledge of the various values models by K&S, Hofstede, Hall, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner • Motivate participants to do their own research and reading on these models • Develop an ability to identify values in themselves, the institution, and the community that may /may not be characteristically “North American” • Share and discuss how easy/challenging it can be to work/live/study when your values are congruent/incongruent with the community you are in. • Build appreciation for the challenges of entering or being in cultures that are different from your own • Link this knowledge and appreciation to the classroom and interactions with students • Relate this back to the first workshop session on bridging cultures , cultural distance, and the challenges of crossing cultures
2:45-3:15	<p>Slides- Concept Maps</p> <p>Concept Mapping as a Curriculum Design Tool</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Outline that we will use concept mapping to redesign our curricula 2. How they can be used as a planning tool 3. How they can be used as a teaching tool 4. Assignment: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce and practice the use of concept mapping • Develop an understanding of how concept maps can be used to brainstorm, plan, sequence, and teach • Prepare participants for their assignment and the curriculum redesign project and process

	5. Prepare a concept map for your course to be ready to explain in a group tomorrow	

DAY 2

	Session Activities and Development	Objectives
9:00	Slide-Day 2 Overview Flashlight Review 1. Groups Share a. Something I will be able to use b. Something I want to investigate more c. Share highlights with the whole group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce the German expression for the recapping of the previous day • Take temperature and clarify/investigate/elaborate any areas that come up in this review and reflection time
9:30	Slides-Kolb's Experiential Learning <u>and</u> Learning Styles Inventory <u>and</u> Implications Learning Styles 1. Participants complete the Learning Styles Inventory 2. Basic overview of the model 3. Groups discuss questions on the LSI slide 4. Share their findings with the whole group 5. Discuss the Implications slide's questions. This is applying the learning to the participants purpose in a concrete way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Familiarize and ground Kolb's theory of Experiential Learning by having faculty do the LSI • Develop an ability in participants to identify the characteristics of each style • Link and ground the styles with curriculum and instructional method
10:40	COFFEE	
11:00	Slides-Four Learning Models and <i>Hao-Xue-Xin</i> Other Learning Models and Bloom and Please Discuss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate three Asian learning approaches • Develop participants ability to identify student

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain Jin Li's model <i>Hao-Xue-Xin</i> (Heart and Mind for Wanting to Learn) 2. Elicit from participants if there are behaviours our students (Chinese esp.) do that demonstrates the existence of this orientation to learning? 3. On the whiteboard write, "I remembered it by heart" 4. Ask group: What kind of learning process is this associated with? 5. Use whiteboard to demonstrate Yoshikawa's <i>Kata-Katachi</i> model 6. Use the whiteboard to write these three characters, <i>Shu-Ha-Ri</i> and explain their literal meaning of "protect-break-depart" 7. Elicit views and discuss how this represents a learning approach of some Confucian cultures. 8. Groups Discuss questions linking Bloom <i>with Shu-Ha-Ri</i> 	<p>tendencies, expectations and behaviours they have misinterpreted or not recognized/been aware of in the past</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at ways rote memorization and deep learning approaches are similar and may differ in these Asian conceptions of 'good' learning and instruction. • Analyze and practice building an understanding/ appreciation/interest in how Bloom's Taxonomy and these models can be used in a complementary way
11:40	<p>Slides-Internationalizing my Course #1,2,3,4</p> <p>Guidelines</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide an overview of criteria and reflection questions developed by my colleague Giroux to evaluate internationalized curricula and instruction 2. Provide a sample copy of T. Whalley's Best Practices for Internationalizing the Curriculum for participants to review and request copies of. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce criteria that participants can use in the design, reflection on, planning, teaching, and evaluation of their internationalized curricula • Make T. Whalley's in-depth best practices available for participants to work with
12:00	LUNCH	
1:00	<p>Sharing Concept Maps-The Current Course</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Groups of participants from different fields work together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants provide and receive feedback on their concept-mapped curricula • Concepts, linkages, developmental considerations

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Participants share their concept maps for the courses they are currently teaching in groups 3. Peers ask clarification questions ensure that the objectives are clearly understood 4. After all participants have finished time is allotted to help them to reorganize or “clean up” their concept maps based on feedback they received 	<p>are clarified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essentials are clearly identified • New ways of understanding or organizing concepts can be investigated and discovered through interdisciplinary perspectives and feedback
2:00	<p>Concept Maps-Identifying Opportunities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Working in their groups the participants work on one course at a time to identify opportunities and areas that they can change to include intercultural and international content and concepts 2. Groups need to be aware that curriculum redesign can be a continuous and on-going process so, encourage areas that can be dealt with most readily, and to put difficult challenges on the back-burner for the present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative and interdisciplinary perspectives combine to identify ways of reorganizing and reconceptualizing curriculum design • Various opportunities for integrating the intercultural and international are discussed, evaluated, presented, and adopted • Develop an appreciation of the continuous process this kind of redesign can be because of how changes lead to new ways of understanding, increased confidence, and ways of conceiving the integration of the intercultural/international
2:40	<p>Concept Maps-A New Design that Integrates Intercultural and International Learning and Concepts</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participants take time to create concept maps that incorporate intercultural and international dimensions 2. Share with their group before they leave for their two week break until the next session 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow for individual reflection time for approaching curriculum designs • Allow for time for clarification and consultation between the facilitator and individual participants
	<p>Homework</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Over the two week break between sessions the participants will create a new internationalized curriculum that they can present to everyone 	

	Presentations should be 15-20 minutes and will allow time for questions	
--	---	--

DAY 3

	Activities and Development	Objectives
9:00	Slide-Session Objectives Welcome Back 1. Outline the Schedule for the Day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take temperature and clarify/investigate/elaborate any areas that come up • Clarify the day's objectives and schedule
9:30	Slides-Sequencing Considerations and Content and Process Some Sequencing considerations 1. Present two useful frameworks from J.M. Bennett for sequencing programs. Though the Curricula are being presented, these frameworks should be kept in mind for the feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide frameworks that feedback sessions can use • Provide a model that participants can take away and use when they do their lesson planning for the new curricula they have created
	Slide-Mindful Listening and Peer Input Mindful Listening 1. Participants copy the character in their notebooks 2. The facilitator explains the components of the “ting” character. The parts are the ears, heart, and eyes. It is a powerful image of deep listening. Adopted from Ting-Toomey's training approach 3. Relate this to the mobius and the intercultural/intracultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a “mindful listening” orientation for the curriculum presentations and feedback sessions. • Synthesize this approach to listening with the intracultural/intercultural listening and reflection discussed earlier with the mobius

	<p>Presentation Instructions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage participants to listen mindfully during the presentations and to give feedback to presenters using the two questions on the Peer Input slide. 2. Presentations will be 15 minutes and will have question and discussion time after. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants present and receive constructive feedback they can use to move forward with their redesigns
10:00	<p>Presentations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participants take turns presenting their new Curricula 2. Comments and questions after each presentation to use the above instructions 3. Allow the participants to decide if they would like to schedule time at the end for a final discussion and peer feedback time with their interdisciplinary group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow for the sharing and clarification of designs • Give participants the choice regarding how they would like to give and receive feedback
12:00	LUNCH	
1:00	<p>Interdisciplinary Group Feedback Session</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Optional time that the participants can set parameters for to allow them to work in their diverse groups for a final discussion and collaboration on their designs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit extra time and feedback with the participants most familiar with the curriculum redesign they have been working on
	<p>Closure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wrap-up the presentations and make all participants aware of the follow-up next year after everyone has had an opportunity to teach their newly design curriculum 2. “Multiculturalism is an invitation to learn” present and final discussion about how this statement from Mary Catherine Bateson relates to our work as teachers and the work we have been undertaking over these sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an opportunity to final closure activity and discuss how the many details considered and efforts undertaken in this program are linked to a set of values such as those expressed in the quote “Multiculturalism is an Invitation to Learn”

