

Internationalizing Higher Education

Critical Collaborations across the Curriculum

Rhiannon D. Williams and Amy Lee (Eds.)



SensePublishers

Internationalizing Higher Education

Internationalizing Higher Education

Critical Collaborations across the Curriculum

Edited by

Rhiannon D. Williams and Amy Lee

University of Minnesota, USA



SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM/BOSTON/TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: 978-94-6209-978-4 (paperback)

ISBN: 978-94-6209-979-1 (hardback)

ISBN: 978-94-6209-980-7 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,
P.O. Box 21858,
3001 AW Rotterdam,
The Netherlands
<https://www.sensepublishers.com/>

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved © 2015 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

We would like to dedicate this book to Bruce and Felicity Williams, and to Timothy Robert Brandon Lee who have dedicated their lives to being present and engaged in a more wholehearted world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ix
Internationalizing Higher Education: Critical Collaborations across the Curriculum <i>Rhiannon D. Williams and Amy Lee</i>	xi
Section 1: Mindful Global Citizenship: Critical Concepts and Current Contexts	
1. On the Hologram of International Education: With Raya Hegeman-Davis, Amy Lee, Nue Lor, & Rhiannon Williams <i>Josef A. Mestenhauser</i>	3
2. Promoting Holistic Global Citizenship in College: Implications for Education Practitioners <i>Elena Galinova</i>	17
3. The Challenges and Implications of Globalization for Undergraduate Pedagogy <i>Marta A. Shaw</i>	35
4. Institutional and Instructional Techniques to Promote Undergraduates' Intercultural Development: Evidence from a Multi-Institutional Student Survey <i>Krista M. Soria</i>	47
Section 2: Developing Intercultural Programs and Practitioners	
5. Internationalizing Teaching and Learning: Transforming Teachers, Transforming Students <i>Gayle Woodruff, Kate Martin and Mary Katherine O'Brien</i>	63
6. Strategies for the Development of an Intercultural Environment <i>Jill E. Blondin</i>	87
7. Global Citizenship: Surfacing the Gap between Rhetoric and Reality in Internationalization of Management Curricula <i>Diana Rajendran, Janet Bryant, Patricia Buckley and Ryan Jopp</i>	101
8. Social Competencies in the European and Polish Qualifications Framework: A Tool for Designing Intercultural Environments <i>Ewa Chmielecka and Izabela Buchowicz</i>	117

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 3: Critical Reflections from across the Curriculum

9. Internationalizing Teaching and Learning in a Graduate Doctor of Nursing Program Curriculum <i>Mary Benbenek</i>	131
10. Internationalizing College Algebra <i>Susan Staats</i>	151
11. Illuminating a Course Transformation Journey <i>Catherine Solheim, Mary Katherine O'Brien and Scott Spicer</i>	171
12. Social Media & Intercultural Competence: Using Each to Explore the Other <i>Barbara Gibson, Meredith Hyde and Troy Gordon</i>	187
13. Developing Diversity-Related Competences in Creativity Workshop for Teachers <i>Adam Jagiello-Rusilowski</i>	201
14. On Becoming a Global Citizen: Critical Pedagogy and Crossing Borders in and out of the University Classroom <i>Sahtiya Hosoda Hammell, Rose Cole, Lauren Stark, Chrissie Monaghan and Carol Anne Spreen</i>	213
15. "Unpacking" International Experience through Blended Intercultural Praxis <i>Jane Jackson</i>	231
Notes on Contributors	253

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to acknowledge our colleagues and students whose fiery passion for diversity, equity and the learning of teaching inspires us every day. We particularly thank Gayle Woodruff for her leadership and daily work in international education; Raya Hegeman-Davis for her editing and input; and John Magers for his overall and constant support.

RHIANNON D. WILLIAMS AND AMY LEE

INTERNATIONALIZING HIGHER EDUCATION: CRITICAL COLLABORATIONS ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

...the development of our students as individuals, as moral agents, as responsible members of their community, and even as global citizens, hinges on their ability to have meaningful encounters with issues of diversity rendered in terms of the global realities of our lives. (Charles, Longerbeam, & Miller, 2013, p. 49)

There is little doubt that higher education is facing unprecedented change—from evolving expectations for student outcomes, rapidly developing technologies, changing student demographics, to pressures and shifts in funding. Today’s graduates need particular skills, awareness, and knowledge to successfully navigate a complex and interconnected world. Higher education institutions and practitioners are under pressure to be more attentive to internationalization initiatives that support increasingly mobile and globalized student populations and that foster the development of global citizenship competencies which include, “problem-defining and solving perspectives that cross disciplinary and cultural boundaries” (Hudzik, 2004, p.1 as cited in Leask & Bridge, 2013).

While there is growing awareness of the changing realities and expectations for graduates, that awareness is not yet systemically realized in undergraduate education. Historically, institutions and graduate programs have done very little to support faculty development related to teaching that supports intercultural development. Internationalization of the curriculum initiatives are growing more common and take an increasingly diverse range of forms, from service learning to study abroad. However, global citizenship competencies, the skills and awareness necessary for effective communication and participation in contemporary life, need to be developed and supported across the undergraduate experience if they are to reach a stage where they can be effectively implemented and expanded upon graduation. This is not unlike the normative understanding that disciplinary knowledge, and the ability to apply it skillfully and in unique contexts, accrues and develops longitudinally and as a result of multiple opportunities to practice, test, refine, and hone (knowledge and skills). This developmental process requires long-term and intentional support that is effectively embedded across the undergraduate experience. However, support is often focused on individual faculty or classrooms and initiatives are often ad hoc rather than systemic and comprehensive.

Scholars in the field contend that in order for effective internationalization to happen, internationalization efforts across disciplines and within majors require support in the form of both resources and infrastructure, from the institutional and college level (Clifford, 2009; Leask & Carroll, 2011; Mestenhauser, 2011). Furthermore, intercultural undergraduate classrooms should be informed by advances in our understanding of undergraduate learning, as well as by current technologies that provide powerful opportunities to support learning activities and that facilitate the development of mindful global citizens (Guth, 2013). Childress (2010) argued that, “the development of a critical mass of faculty supporters is key to integrating international perspectives into an institution’s (work)” (p. 27). This requires building the knowledge and capacity to support intercultural pedagogy among faculty whose research or teaching specialization is not internationalization.

Faculty who want to support students’ development as mindful global citizens do not simply need theoretical knowledge or current research, they need ideas and models for the practical application or use of that research and tips for continuing to develop within their own dynamic and shifting teaching contexts. In Lee, Poch, Shaw and Williams’s (2012) *Engaging Diversity in Undergraduate Classrooms*, the authors argued that effective, substantive internationalization of the curriculum initiatives require *intentional pedagogy and informed practitioners*. Undergraduate faculty across disciplines benefit from practitioner-oriented scholarship on intercultural pedagogy that fully acknowledges and explores the experiences of various stakeholder-participants in authentic sites of practice. By their nature, authentic sites of practice are unpredictable and dynamic. They provide a context for critical reflection on obstacles, challenges, and the dissonance that occur between theoretical models and the practices for implementation in sites of practice.

While there is no one-size-fits-all or magical formula to this work, there are pedagogical principles and approaches, technological tools, and frameworks for assessment that scholar-practitioners have found to be useful in the development of mindful global citizens and the support of intercultural learning. This edited volume focuses primarily on supporting the design, pedagogy, and implementation of intercultural pedagogy in contemporary higher education contexts. The authors represent the range of institutional vantage points that participate in the work of internationalization and student development. Scholar-practitioners featured here include: institutional researchers, directors and key implementers of the EU/Bologna process in Poland (one of the newest members and one that is facing unprecedented change in the diversity of its students due to mobility), international partners in learning abroad programs, theorists and classroom instructors across a range of humanities, STEM, and social sciences. Their shared aim in these chapters is to investigate, to better understand, and to inform intercultural pedagogy that supports the development of mindful global citizenship. In selecting chapters to include, our goal was to feature the dynamic and evolving nature of this work, from its historical

roots to its current implementation in both traditional classrooms and innovative, cutting-edge programs. We also sought to represent the spectrum of practitioners that are required to support the goal of intercultural development: advisers, teachers, scholars, and administrators.

In working with the contributors for this volume, we emphasized the importance of reflective practice and of grounding or contextualizing the scholarship within its specific site (whether that was a moment in time, an institutional location, etc). The chapters represent the range of contexts in which intercultural learning happens and is facilitated in institutions: from theory and institutional research that drives development of models, to implementation of broad institutional initiatives to build faculty capacity, to individual practitioners' efforts to incorporate, refine, and engage global citizenship and intercultural pedagogy within a particular course. We noted with interest, though not surprise, a common thread across these domains: authors consistently identified flexibility and adaptation as a critical component. That is, success in the dynamic site of practice didn't flow from adherence to a plan or model but rather it resulted from participants (faculty, students, program administrators) being willing to practice an ongoing process of assessment and reflection, navigating unpredictable relationships, and engaging dissonance and uncertainty. Just as intercultural effectiveness and mindful global citizenship require reflection, tolerance of ambiguity, listening, and collaboration so does the practice and refinement of intercultural pedagogy. Of course, the volume also features the tensions and complexities of varying viewpoints and experiences with internationalization work.

We have organized the chapters into three sections as follows:

Section 1: Mindful Global Citizenship: Critical Concepts and Current Contexts

The concept of mindful global citizenship relies on scholarship from several historically distinct fields of research, including intercultural competence, internationalization, and multicultural education (Arkoudis, 2010; Charles, Longerbeam, & Miller, 2013; Green, 2012; Otten, 2003). Given that those of us aiming to support this developmental process are also likely to come from a range of disciplinary backgrounds, the volume begins by providing a solid conceptual framework for mindful global citizenship. In addition, many of us who teach and support current undergraduates did not come of age in a globally interconnected, tech-rich environment, therefore, gaining more nuanced understandings of today's students seems core to effectively supporting intercultural learning and development. This section thus provides institutional research and current theory to help provide a dimensional and empirically-informed understanding of contemporary postsecondary learners, primarily in Western contexts.

Section 2: Developing Intercultural Programs and Practitioners

As Dr. Mestenhauser points out in the introductory chapter, given the relatively recent emergence of intercultural learning as an institutional priority, systems must learn how to create spaces for engagement and capacity development. The initiatives and programs described in this section seek to inspire intercultural learning in various sectors of the institution as well as promote ongoing discussions and collaborations. These chapters highlight the unique complexities of each system and how these initiatives have sought to navigate and work within these complex systems of practice.

Section 3: Critical Reflections from across the curriculum

In this section, contributors will present and reflect on program or classroom-based efforts to support, develop, and implement intercultural pedagogy. This section features diverse disciplines and undergraduate contexts and presents models for, and reflections on, supporting students' development in areas of global competency, such as the capacity to communicate with diverse others, seek out multiple perspectives, or share information/ products with diverse others.

Our goal is to stimulate critical action and reflection at the individual, classroom, and institutional levels and across different stakeholder groups. As Dr. Mestenhauser articulates in his interview with Nue Lor, it is critical to acknowledge and to actively promote the interdependence of the historically differentiated (and often competing) domains in which the work of "internationalization" has been done. His interview opens the volume and sets the tone and stage for the chapters to come. His capacity to look both back at 60 years of leadership in this field and to forecast ahead to what is necessary to sustain and strengthen our work has served as a point of reference for us in developing this book and we are grateful to him for his leadership, critique, vision, and tenacious insistence on mindfulness and interdependence, both of which can fly in the face of received and normative ways of doing things in the academy. Our hope is that as scholar-practitioners, the diverse chapters presented in this edited volume on internationalization within institutional sites of practice provide ideas, material for discussion with colleagues, and potentially guidance in each of your teaching and learning journeys.

REFERENCES

- Arkoudis, S., Yu, X., Baik, C., Borland, H., Chang, S., Lang, I., . . . Watty, K. (2010). *Finding common ground: Enhancing interaction between domestic and international students*. Melbourne: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Charles, H., Longerbeam, S., & Miller, A. (2013). Putting old tensions to rest: Integrating multicultural education and global learning to advance student development. *Journal of College & Character*, 14(1), 47–58. doi: 10.1515/jcc-2013-0007

INTERNATIONALIZING HIGHER EDUCATION

- Childress, L. (2010). *The twenty-first century university: Developing faculty engagement in internationalization*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Clifford, V. A. (2009). Engaging the disciplines in internationalizing the curriculum. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 14(2), 133–143.
- Green, M. F. (2012). Global citizenship: What are we talking about and why does it matter? *Trends and Insights for International Education Leaders*, 1–4.
- Guth, S. (Ed.). (2013). *COIL Institute for globally networked learning in the humanities: Case studies*. SUNY, NY: National endowment of the humanities.
- Hudzik, J. (2004). *Why internationalize NASULGC institutions? Challenge and opportunity*. Retrieved April 20, 2013 from <http://www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=38>
- Lee, A., Poch, B., Shaw, M., & Williams, R. D. (2012). *Engaging diversity in undergraduate classrooms: A pedagogy for developing intercultural competence* (ASHE Monograph Series). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Leask, B., & Bridge, C. (2013). Comparing internationalization of the curriculum in action across discipline: Theoretical and practical perspectives. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 43(1), 79–101.
- Leask, B., & Carroll, J. (2011). Moving beyond ‘wishing and hoping’: Internationalisation and student experiences of inclusion and engagement. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 30(5), 647–659.
- Mestenhauser, J. (2011). *Reflections on the past, present, and future of internationalizing higher education: Discovering opportunities to meet challenges*. Minneapolis, MN: Global Programs and Strategy Alliance, University of Minnesota.
- Otten, M. (2003). Intercultural learning and diversity in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 12–26.

SECTION 1

MINDFUL GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP: CRITICAL CONCEPTS AND CURRENT CONTEXTS

JOSEF A. MESTENHAUSER

1. ON THE HOLOGRAM OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

*With Raya Hegeman-Davis, Amy Lee,
Nue Lor, & Rhiannon Williams*

INTRODUCTION

We are delighted to present a conversation with Dr. Josef A. Mestenhauser, Distinguished International Emeritus Professor in the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy and Development at the University of Minnesota. The chapter resulted from a series of in person and written conversations that we were privileged to have with Dr. Mestenhauser. Dr. Mestenhauser was an early advocate of international education and has contributed six decades of pioneering research and practice, helping to define and legitimize this work as a field of expertise. He has published more than 120 books, monographs, articles and book and a recipient of Fulbright grants in the Philippines, Japan and Czechoslovakia. He served as President of NAFA: Association of International Educators, ISECSI (International Society for Educational, Cultural and Scientific Interchanges).

*Let's start with the basics. Why is international education important?
What is the purpose?*

American students are very lucky to have one of the most advanced educational systems, modern building facilities, parks and physical education programs, and libraries full of up-to-date books and magazines. They have many more advantages offered to them by their educational system than my generation or culture could even dream about. The best and greatest opportunities are, however, still awaiting, if the students and their teachers can see them. The opportunities do not come cheap – they must be earned. The “business as usual” of our educational system is not sufficient to gain the advantages.

So we need the key to the gate that opens these opportunities. The key is this relatively new field of international education (International Education) which has been here for more than half a century and is visible in virtually every university and college, but to many is still invisible.

The purpose of the field is to explain when, why, and how people in various cultures do and think differently from the way we do. This field of international education is complex and challenges both students and their teachers. But this is a positive thing because cognitive complexity is one of the most important competencies. Cognitively complex people accomplish more, recognize more problems, solve them more easily and effectively, and explain them to others.

One of the roles of international education is to ensure access to the largest knowledge base possible and to focus on the utilization of that knowledge in practical situations. If the cognitive map of our faculty and students is ethnocentric, then people think that the knowledge they do not know, in fact, does not exist. There is sufficient evidence that our students, both undergraduate and post graduate, are not being educated well enough to produce knowledge through research and that they receive only the minimum exposure to international subjects

What exactly is international education?

International Education combines two exceptionally complex domains, “*international*” and “*education*.” “*International*” means the entire world, composed of hundreds of individual nations, thousands of cultures and languages, religions and sub-cultures, and the relationships among them. “*Education*” is not only the pedagogy used in teaching about such a world -that includes ourselves-, but the many theories of cognition, learning, motivation, transfer of knowledge, and thinking. Thus, in the arena of higher education, we distinguish international education as the field of knowledge and internationalization of higher education as a program of educational change to implement the concept into practice.

The vast literature about this field keeps growing exponentially but is scattered in virtually all academic disciplines and their sub-specialties in many countries. A cynic might say that we have more studies than knowledge about International Education. Nonetheless, as is customary in the social sciences, there is a large range of views about International Education. This complexity allows several interpretations and approaches to the field. Many individuals, including international educators and students, seek to simplify both the meaning and practice of international education in order to reduce this complexity.

For example, most researchers use a standard definition of international education provided and amended several times by Knight (2004), “internationalization of higher education is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service elements of an institution” (p. X), but this definition has many shortcomings. First, it is circular: international education is international perspectives. Secondly, international education is impossible to attain if it must be mainstreamed into every function of a higher education institution. I cannot even imagine how some 7,000 faculty and staff of my university might accomplish such a feat and educate some 50,000 students – especially in our culture

that does not favor an omnibus approach to policy. Suffice it to recall two ill-fated omnibus bills, the international education act of 1966 and the present Obama care. Thirdly, to get out of the “omnibus – universality” dilemma, Knight employs an escape clause that individual institutions decide how to accomplish the “process” – in other words, everything goes. Fourth, by defining internationalization as a process, she ignores the product that results from the process and vice versa. Fifth, the definition makes no reference to knowledge, yet education is the name of the field that is all about knowledge.

So what definition would you offer? Can you provide a better definition of International Education, based on your years of experience?

Internationalization of higher education is a program of major educational reform designed to ensure that higher education produces globally thinking and knowing students able to work anywhere on short notice without prior preparation. As such, International Education consists of both formal and informal knowledge, cognitive, experiential, and implicit domains of learning, and it originates across multiple academic disciplines. My definition challenges some established wisdom and practices because the recent dramatically growing literature and research prefers the opposite approach; it tends to divide the field into smaller units of analysis and smaller size topics that tend to fragment International Education the same way that higher education is fragmented.

How then is International Education different from the traditional curriculum students pursue?

The curriculum students pursue is based on an established body of knowledge which is grounded in research and experiences that conveys to them the frontiers of their field, how much they already know in relationship to how much more there is to know. International knowledge does not have the same frontiers. It is “all over.” Furthermore, typical curriculum is organized hierarchically from introductory to advanced, based on perceived complexity. International education hits us unexpectedly, at any time, and without regard to being introductory or advanced. It also challenges the typical production of knowledge based on our much cherished analytical thinking that reduces complexity to the smallest units of analysis. International Education does the opposite, it does not reduce the units of analysis but expands on them and brings several more to bear. Research evidence shows that only a small number of courses include the “international dimension” of any kind, that references to other countries are presented from a US perspective, and that the “infusion” is usually a limited amount of knowledge “injected” only at one time. How the international content is integrated with predominantly “domestic” emphasis remains a major issue that international educators seek to resolve. When

J. A. MESTENHAUSER

I worked in Indonesia, I found thirteen possible patterns that emerged when people attempted to insert and integrate foreign concepts (e.g. quality circles) that were being introduced into the native culture.

Furthermore, international education supports the idea of cultural heterogeneity and diversity as a great strength of the society of the future. Culture is not only the source of peoples' identities but also a screen that inhibits learning about others. Change is the most permanent aspect of modern living and if understood may bring about new opportunities perhaps never before available. The most common methods of changing peoples' minds are new mental representations (difference between "emic" and "etic") and multiple perspectives on issues.

You have argued that the concept and the field of international education needs reframing. Why is it necessary to reframe international education?

The most common method of our analytical tradition is to break down the field by different functions (study abroad, foreign students, agreements, etc) with which the field is associated historically and treat each separately. This conceptualization makes International Education into a "holding corporation" that has specialists in many aspects of the field. This format is consistent with a familiar pattern of analytical thinking. However, it allows some part to think of itself as the whole.

Ever since Bolman and Deal published their seminal work about reframing organizations, I started thinking how this theory might help reframe international education. The field has grown and expanded but at the cost of coherence and is thus a candidate for reframing. I am motivated to find a different way of thinking about the field than the current paradigm of instrumentalism, competitiveness, and pragmatism. In various publications, I have attempted to formulate such a new way of thinking about the field by doing precisely that – by re-framing it (Mestenhauser, 2011).

You are known for applying a systems approach to higher education. From a systems perspective, how is an institution better able to achieve its goals when all parts are working in unison?

In short, systems thinking and systems perspectives helps identify knowledge that is missing, streamlines administration, provides research materials, shows trends, and sees the whole and all the parts. All systems are interrelated and interdependent. Changes in one system or sub-system influence changes in others; change is a constant which explains the dynamics and movements we see every day. This is why we need to understand the historiography of the field, to see what parts changed over a long period of time and how they influenced other parts. Several scholars and practitioners of the field have recently paid attention to trends, but treat them

very superficially. A trend is not something that happens over a short time, from one conference to the next, or is triggered by recently released statistical studies about student enrollments. Trends are changes that happen over a long period of time and are caused by both internal and external sources. That is another reason why understanding the history of the field is important to the systems theory, but it has been neglected by many practitioners and faculty.

You have proposed the idea of conceptualizing the work of international education as a hologram. Can you explain and elaborate on this idea?

I want to offer a new and different way of thinking about this large field. I look at International Education as a system of knowledge that is so complex that it cannot be understood through the established way of analytical and critical thinking. It can only be explained through several frames of reference, each part of a system, all seen simultaneously, as in a hologram. *The metaphor I use is a hologram – something physicists do to capture a picture of a subject that also contains all its parts.* Again, following Senge and Bolman and Deal, I present seven of these frames of reference that together form the system. The multiple “frame” method is most useful in social sciences whenever we need to explain complex phenomena, when variables are interdependent, and where the causes of problems lie in the system rather than in individual parts. Accordingly, taking such an approach, I suggest that international education can be understood by the following seven frames of reference:

1. Ideas, philosophy, peaceful relations, and cultural diplomacy;
2. Body of knowledge and corresponding intellectual competencies;
3. Form of inquiry;
4. Giant laboratory of international and intercultural relations;
5. Program of educational reform of higher education;
6. Business, economics, and employment;
7. Leadership as integrative force.

Many people see international education as structures, projects, or programs from which to pick and choose at random, as small pieces like dressing on a cake. The field is too complex to be divided by these projects and may discourage some from pursuing it. They miss knowledge of cognitive complexity that has become a requirement of many professions and is needed for promotions and professional advancement. As I explained above, but it stands repeating, cognitively complex people accomplish more, solve more problems, do so more effectively, and explain problems to others. In addition, research shows that complex explanations gain more credibility. Systems thinking is a multiplier of learning because it re-arranges the clutter in the brain by arranging masses of information into higher level categories, thus creating more space for new ideas (Mapes, 2003).

J. A. MESTENHAUSER

This is a lot to unpack. So let's begin with you elaborating on why the concept of cultural diplomacy is important to international education?

Modern international education started as an ideal of a peaceful world without wars. This frame will restore this dimension of the field because like it or not, everybody is a cultural diplomat of sorts. How we behave, what we say, what we do, and what we write about others and about ourselves is transmitted instantly, locally, and around the world, where it reinforces pre-existing positive or negative biases. Arndt (2005) traced the history of official US policy for international education in his encyclopedic work, which should be required reading for international educators, because it documents that universities are not the only places where international education is done. Governments play a very important role by both promoting and creating barriers for the field. The term "international education" was, in fact, coined for one of the US Government programs in Latin America.

Cultural diplomacy should not be treated as an isolated goal that is often labeled pejoratively as "ideology." It should be an ongoing process of learning. It provides a counterpoint to the self-centered paradigm of competitiveness and may be the only way to keep mankind from killing itself out, if we can figure out how to make this idea the property of a critical mass.

So then what are the practical implications associating cultural diplomacy with international education?

First, students should know enough about their own country so that they can explain it to others. Similarly, they need to know the mindsets of most their countrymen in order to explain to them people of other countries.

Second, students need to fully understand the cognitive consequences of ethnocentrism that Thomas (2002) defines as "an attitude that one's own cultural group is the center of everything and all other groups are evaluated with reference to it" (p. 44). Ethnocentrism, not globalization, is the antecedent of International Education. It causes misunderstandings, miscalculations, and as significant social science research shows, prejudice, contempt, stereotypes, and conflict. Ethnocentrism is difficult to change because it is both conceptual and perceptual: we do not know and do not want to know.

Third, explicitly identifying cultural diplomacy as a facet of international education calls attention to the vast growing and most sophisticated sub-field of International Education, intercultural communication, which is needed by individuals to interact with people of other cultures. There are ample academic literature, handbooks, and training programs available to hone one's intercultural communication skills (Deardorf, 2009; 2012). Not to be neglected are equally ample resources that address the important issues of cooperation and of peace and war.

What are the sources of knowledge that International Education comes from?

Most formal knowledge about international education originates in some fifteen social sciences and humanities, while much of international relations is conducted by technical, information, and scientific fields such as agriculture, public health, medicine, engineering, military, economics, business, and finance. This discrepancy allows many specialists to ignore cross-cultural knowledge and think that all they need is their excellence in their specialty. Groennings and Wiley (1999) attempted to identify the international dimension of key disciplines, but did not succeed. Several of these “hard core” social sciences are culture-bound in a way that was described by Ross (2004).

What is the significance of Ross’ insights?

Ross’ work confronts the need to think of International Education as an interdisciplinary field. Interdisciplinarity has become a very popular concept that is used commonly by higher education institutions to publicize themselves as being “world class” institutions. Unfortunately, the record of most institutions does not conform to these images. By far the greatest number of teaching faculty have been socialized exclusively within their own discipline and do not have the incentive or the foundation to conceptualize the theoretical framework for interdisciplinary cooperation. Each discipline has its own paradigmatic foundation into which it has a tendency to absorb the international dimensions of that discipline (Sperber, 2008). As a result, these faculty members simply juxtapose their discipline with others, without conceptual sharing, something that Klein (1990) has termed as multi-disciplinarity, not interdisciplinarity. Research has indicated that it takes about three months for graduate students to understand the logic of another discipline. Once mastered, however, additional disciplines may require as little time as one week to fully understand (Mapes, 2003).

One of the frames of reference in your hologram concept is, “a giant laboratory of international and intercultural relations.” Can you talk more about this frame of reference so as to make it more concrete for me?

While this frame is the most visible part of international education, it is also the most neglected and misunderstood. Universities have become trans-national institutions and join other public and private agencies in hosting a number of other categories of people ranging from students, to research scholars, teachers, trainees, administrative and legislative leaders, journalists, parliamentarians, school teachers, and military personnel. In addition they institute joint academic programs, often joint degrees, and open branch campuses. Every human variable is involved in this

massive movement of people and ideas. The scope of the exchanges is impressive; some estimate that as many as five million students study in countries other than their own. Their presence is an enormous source of research material for virtually any field of study. Unfortunately, this important sub-field has been perverted by a paradigm of competitiveness and reduced to recruiting foreign students to bring valuable funds into our countries. The US Department of Commerce reported that in 2012 international student contributed to the US 18.2 billion dollars. It is not just the US that is counting the presence of foreign students as business. Spain has announced that US students on study abroad in that country bring into it more than 200 billion Euros.

Due to the ethnocentrism mentioned earlier, foreign students are considered as outsiders so that knowledge and interpersonal relations can hardly be regarded as mutual and reciprocal – to the detriment of domestic students and the classroom instructors who lose a great deal of insights and new perspectives that these foreign students bring with them (Mestenhauser, 2002). Furthermore, the social psychology of ethnocentrism suggests that we teach them, not the other way around. One seldom seen loss is the potential to teach our students meta-learning and emic thinking. Foreign students have to overcome and adjust to the differences in educational systems which gives them an advantage in developing a coping strategy through acquisition of meta-learning (learning about learning). The skills and perspectives that foreign students come with and acquire here are needed by domestic students who also need the same unique learning that is not available in a typical lecture-based classroom or in study abroad.

*You propose that international education is a learning multiplier.
How can that be when there may be issues of cultural gaps between
international and domestic students?*

Integration of international students in the lives and cultures of our institutions and their mutual relationships with domestic students remains a major issue for international education. Intercultural communication skills are needed by both domestic and international students to bridge the cultural gaps. Undergraduate students have a unique opportunity to participate in the multi-cultural world that our universities are becoming.

Mutual and reciprocal relationships have more than social benefits. Students acquire new knowledge and perspectives that help them enlarge the opening to the brain (to allow more new information to pass through) and expand the long term memory through creation of new “bins” for new knowledge. To use an economics metaphor, the cognitively rich get richer. This is the basis for the claim that International Education is a learning multiplier. Some research suggests that the multiplier effect is a result of learning one thing in relationship to another. In other words, as the students study their specialty, and add, let’s say intensive study abroad, that creates the multiplier.

What is the basis of international education as educational reform?

Unlike traditional educational reform, internationalizing universities is not a matter of a single step that can be legislated by government or institutions, but a continuous change that occurs on several levels and has multiple goals, such as from single to multiple perspectives, from simple to complex concepts and theories, and from ethnocentric to global consciousness. The reform should have two major objectives, first, to correct ethnocentrism, and second to provide students with frameworks for living and working in the future.

I like to recall what President Wilson was attributed as saying, “it is easier to move the cemetery than to change the curriculum.” It appears easier to create a new course than to change the existing ones. The pattern that seems to dominate is that academic departments hire at least one “cross-cultural scholar” while the rest of the department does “business as usual.”

Recent years have witnessed an exceptionally rapid and exponentially expanding production of knowledge in the form of concept papers, articles, journals, books, handbooks, and conferences in all fields that crowd the already busy curriculum beyond its ability to provide students with the breadth and depth of knowledge required for life and work in a complex society. Educators have a difficult task to handle this explosion of both domestic and international knowledge at a time when the curricular system is static and while students should learn more than the system offers. The only answer is that students must motivate themselves to learn more than the present credit system allows.

There is an increasing pressure on undergraduate students to conduct research. They should know that knowledge produced by research is almost always “etic” – from the perspective of an outsider (observer) looking in (Headland, at al. 1990); questions are formulated in the US by disciplinary frames. This is legitimate knowledge as long as the methodology is transparent because the “etic” method is probably the only one available to do cross-cultural studies involving more than one culture. When the “etic” approach does not consider its “emic” dimension, (the looking out from the inside), the research may produce misleading information and conclusions. The emic concept is difficult to teach because most faculty see it as a form of relativism.

Why is it important to view international education as an agent of change?

These are major changes that may challenge many peoples’ firmly established views. Histories of educational reforms in democratic societies suggest that they are successful when there is perceptive leadership, simultaneous training (Fullan, 1991), and knowledge about how people think. Change is difficult, but people and institutions do change their minds (Gardner, 2004) and education and knowledge is the best method to produce change. Undergraduate students need to be globally educated if they wish to influence the change needed.