

# *Teaching for Global Literacy in Higher Education: How Prepared Are the Educators?*

Sabine Schuerholz-Lehr

---

*This article examines the relationship between faculty's professional and personal backgrounds and the extent to which they incorporate an approach to teaching for global awareness and intercultural sensitivity into their curriculum. Through an analysis of the pertinent literature, the study examines the relevant theoretical frameworks of personal practical knowledge and professional knowledge landscapes, as well as the evidence linking faculty's cultural competence and world-mindedness to classroom practice. The article concludes that a considerable number of empirical studies have been carried out that explore different aspects of faculty experiences, background, and disciplinary affiliation, and how such variables affect intercultural sensitivity, cultural competence, and world-mindedness among faculty. However, less conclusive evidence is available as to whether and how such traits in faculty translate into classroom practice. More studies, in particular classroom observations, need to be carried out to elucidate actual classroom practices.*

---

**Keywords:** *global awareness; global literacy; instructors' personal/professional backgrounds; intercultural competence; intercultural sensitivity; world-mindedness*

The *internationalization* of higher education institutions is a global phenomenon that comprises a large number of activities, including student mobility initiatives such as exchange programs, field schools, internships, and other study abroad programs; research and collaborative development projects with partners abroad;

---

*Author's Note:* The author would like to express her special gratitude to Dr. Helen Raptis, who provided extensive feedback on earlier drafts of the article. An earlier version of this article was presented at the annual conference of the 'Comparative and International Education Society West,' Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, September 30 to October 1, 2005. Correspondence should be addressed to Sabine Schuerholz-Lehr, University of Victoria, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, PO Box 3010 STN CSC, Victoria, BC V8W 3N4, Canada; e-mail: sabine@uvic.ca.

*Journal of Studies in International Education*, Vol. 11 No. 2, Summer 2007 180-204

DOI:10.1177/1028315307299419

© 2007 Nuffic

faculty exchange programs; offshore programs such as twinning arrangements and satellite campuses; and others. More recently, universities have started paying attention to internationalization on their own campuses and are beginning to acknowledge the vital role played by faculty members in the internationalization of the curriculum (Bond, Qian, & Huang, 2003; Ellingboe, 1998), a process that aims to ultimately provide students with an international education.

The necessity to make university courses more internationally relevant arises not only from the increasing number of international students in our classrooms but also from the recognition that we have a responsibility to prepare all our students for life in an increasingly interdependent world. It has been noted that although there has been a focus on preparing teachers to be culturally sensitive to the needs of ethnically diverse classrooms, the equally important need to prepare all students for life in plural societies has attracted less attention (Craft, 1996). Sensitivity to difference is not enough to constitute intercultural preparation (Hickling-Hudson & McMeniman, 1996). This aspiration to educate for a sense of belonging to plural societies appears to be modeled on the image of an *ideal* graduate who possesses a high degree of world-mindedness and who is perfectly suited to live and work in different places on the globe as a socially responsible and interculturally knowledgeable citizen.

For the past 2 years, I have been involved in a professional development workshop project for faculty and other teaching staff at a Canadian university that aims at helping instructors to include an international dimension into their course design. The course (re)design for internationalization workshop (CRIW) examines the process of designing new courses and redesigning existing ones from a methodological viewpoint, while at the same time applying the *lens* of internationalization to the course (re)design process. The workshop is based on the work of Saroyan and Amundsen (2001, 2004) and McAlpine and colleagues (e.g., McAlpine & Harris, 2002; McAlpine & Winer, 2002) whose research focuses on understanding the process of teaching development among university faculty members and the impact of various factors and educational interventions on the capability of faculty to design and implement curricular change. Their findings have culminated in an educational intervention, which they refer to as the course design workshop (CDW). The CDW focuses on teacher thought and action through providing a context and stimulus for faculty to examine critically their assumptions about their subject matter, their teaching, and their expectations about learning and learners (Saroyan et al., 2004). We modified the CDW by applying what we called an *internationalization lens*: We encouraged and guided participants in adopting an international perspective throughout the four elements of the course (re)design process—content, learning outcomes, instructional and learning strategies, and assessment.

During the pilot CRIW that was conducted in May and June 2004, it quickly became apparent that some of the participating teaching staff struggled with concepts such as internationalization, intercultural sensitivity, international education, global awareness,

and the nefariously overused concept of global citizenship. Although the participants unanimously agreed in the final summative evaluation that they had learned a lot and had challenged their thinking during the 1-week workshop, several persons indicated that they still had significant gaps that prevented them from fully embracing and applying the concepts discussed during the workshop (Schuerholz-Lehr, 2004). I started asking myself how those teaching staff, as well as many who will not be able to participate in the CRIW over the coming years, would be able to design their courses for a globally relevant education. This consideration, in turn, prompted the larger question of how the personal and professional backgrounds of teaching staff are related to the course design process. Several problems are embedded in this question: To be able to teach for global awareness and intercultural sensitivity among learners, instructors have to be socially responsible and interculturally knowledgeable citizens themselves. If we accept this assumption, and if our goal is to assist our faculty and instructors in becoming more effective global educators, we need to know what it is in the instructors' personal and/or professional backgrounds that might predispose them to display such characteristics. Does it follow from this assumption that instructors who lack such predispositions are doomed to remain unenlightened with regard to global competencies, or are there ways in which we can assist them to become interculturally competent/sensitive and globally knowledgeable educators?

## **DEFINITIONS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

As exemplified by the CRIW pilot workshop, it is difficult to find a nomenclature that is widely understood and accepted in international education. The concept of internationalization itself appears too broad and means too many things to different people. Conceptualizations of the internationalization process are still hotly contested and might remain so for a considerable time to come, although internationalization has come to be widely seen as an integral part of the educational process (Schoorman, 2000). Although educational researchers are still grappling with the various theoretical constructs related to internationalization and international education, we as educators have to choose a construct and go about applying it; thus, testing the validity of our theorizing in daily practice. Interventions such as the CRIW provide venues for critical inquiry into commonly used constructs and for challenging and redefining such constructs. Over the course of the CRIW, for example, it became apparent that participants shifted from a mechanistic perception of internationalization to a much deeper understanding of this concept as a cognitive framework for structures of social interaction: "I no longer immediately think of a place on the globe when I hear 'international' or 'internationalization'—I now think of a place within the mind's eye" (2004 CRIW participant).

One of the dominant themes in the pilot CRIW was the ongoing deconstruction of internationalization and the concomitant reconstruction of the potential meanings behind this term with regard to questions of multi- and pluriculturalism, intercultural

sensitivity, global thinking, and world-mindedness. In this review, I have therefore focused on literature that examines a variety of concepts and terms to denote a globally sensitive mind-set and related characteristics displayed by individuals. My inquiry was guided by what I see as one of the major problems in the assessment of instructors' preparedness to teach for *global literacy*: In the absence of a convenient toolbox to detect a person's *global characteristics*, researchers are restricted to *measuring* not the presence of the characteristic itself, but of certain attitudinal expressions and cognitive/behavioral patterns that are judged to be indicative of the presence of a particular characteristic. In the following, I suggest several terms and definitions frequently used in the literature reviewed that are consistent with the operational constructs that have so far emerged from the CRIW.

*Intercultural competence*: A set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies displayed and applied by individuals that enable these individuals to interact effectively in cross-cultural situations (based on a definition of cultural competence by Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs, as cited in Helms, 2004).

*Global awareness*: The extent to which a person is cognizant of the fact that experiences and events are part of an international, global, or world society, and his understanding of himself as a member of that society.

*Global literacy*: Ability to function effectively in the global community. Concern with the condition of all human beings, no matter where they live. Acquiring an understanding of what is happening around the world, and not judging but respecting others' rights to live those differences (Bender-Slack, 2002). Contrary to cultural relativism or ethnorelativism that denotes a theoretical framework which assumes that cultures must be understood relative to one another and that behavior always needs to be assessed within its cultural context (Bennett, 1993), global literacy focuses on individuals' values, belief systems, and behaviors.

*World-minded person*: "[An] individual who favors a worldview of the problems of humanity, whose primary reference group is mankind, rather than American, English, Chinese, etc." (Sampson & Smith, 1957, p. 99). Sampson and Smith make it clear that such a person may, or may not, have a heightened interest in and knowledge about international affairs, a criterion these authors use to distinguish the concept of world-mindedness from international-mindedness.

*World-mindedness*: A worldview that encompasses a cognitive and affective understanding of the totality of humanity as primary reference group rather than the nationals of particular countries or regions of the world. This term is often used interchangeably with global literacy or global awareness. Although some scholars distinguish between world-mindedness as the affective part of international education and education for a global perspective as the cognitive part of international education (Farmer, 1993), I am using world-mindedness in its more inclusive sense.

It is recognized that these definitions are located within a particular paradigm and might be perceived quite differently or even seen by some as "the exported products of Western inventions" (De Frankrijker, 1997, p. 663); however, the definitions do

appear to capture the CRIW participants' understanding of the main concepts associated with internationalization in the context of pedagogy and curriculum. Based on the foregoing problem description, I carried out a literature review that attempted to provide some context to the following questions:

- What factors in instructors' personal/professional backgrounds and life experiences have an influence on their cognitive framework as it relates to education for global awareness and intercultural competence?
- In which ways do instructors' personal and professional backgrounds interact with their classroom practice regarding education for global awareness and cultural sensitivity and competence?
- To which extent are targeted interventions (e.g., professional development, study tours) effective in changing instructors' levels of intercultural competence and world-mindedness? Do these changes have an influence on the instructors' approach to course design with respect to education for global awareness and intercultural competence?

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Criteria for Inclusion**

This review investigates empirical research on the relationship between faculty members' personal/professional backgrounds and life experiences and their pedagogies related to global awareness and world-mindedness. Congruent with my research questions, studies were selected that examined three main sets of topics: (a) studies linking instructors' personal/professional backgrounds to their attitudes, values, and beliefs regarding their level of global awareness and situatedness in the world; (b) studies linking instructors' personal/professional backgrounds and life experiences to their pedagogical approaches regarding global awareness and world-mindedness; and (c) studies examining the effect of targeted interventions on instructors' mind-sets and classroom practices as they relate to global awareness and world-mindedness.

Although I was well aware that several of the studies generated by my search were tangential to my inquiry in that they did not fit exactly into the concepts of world-mindedness or global sensitivity and competence, I nevertheless decided to include some of those articles in my review because the pertinent concepts appeared to be manifested in those studies, though sometimes by another name. I also found a sizable body of literature on concrete interventions aimed at changing instructors' mind-sets toward more globally sensitive educational practices. Except for three studies, I excluded items that examined the impact of intercultural experiences on students because I was concerned with the impact of such interventions on instructors rather than on students. Of the three studies on students I included, two were chosen because they contradicted some of the findings of other studies, in particular regarding the impact of foreign language proficiency, and the third study was chosen because it

described the impact of an overseas experience on preservice teachers who were soon going to be instructors themselves.

In my review, I paid particular attention to comparing studies that examined cognitive structures among participants (analogous to Bennett and Hammer's [1998] intercultural development inventory) and those studies that examined attitudes (analogous to Sampson and Smith's [1957] scale of world-mindedness). Although I made an effort to look at examples of studies undertaken in a variety of jurisdictions, I had to concede that the geographic spread of research in this area is limited. I examined research undertaken by doctoral students and faculty members, as well as by educational administrators and practitioners.

### **Search Procedures**

Because of my professional practice and involvement in the CRIW for the past 2 years, I had already collected a body of literature on the topic under review before undertaking this study. For the purpose of this review, I examined the reference sections of those articles, book chapters, and reports to identify additional potentially relevant literature. I selected and read an additional 23 items of which I included the 14 items, that most closely met my criteria for this review. Among the 14 items were 9 journal articles, 4 book chapters, and 1 Web site.

I supplemented this material with relevant literature through a more systematic search using the following procedure. Although I did not limit the time period searched because of the existence of some older literature that still forms the basis for current research (e.g., Sampson and Smith's [1957] work on world-mindedness), I included mostly work from 1990 onward. Three online databases were searched: (a) Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), (b) Cambridge Scientific Abstracts Education, and (c) ProQuest Digital Dissertations. The following keywords were used: cultural sensitivity and faculty, cultural sensitivity and instructors, world-mindedness, intercultural sensitivity, global literacy and faculty, and global literacy and instructors. The search resulted in a total of 159 items, with some represented in more than one of the resulting lists. All abstracts of the 159 items were scanned and the duplicates removed to identify potentially relevant articles. The vast majority of items focused either on students or on teaching strategies and program evaluations rather than on instructors. Of the remaining items, some focused on schoolteachers rather than on university-level instructors. Because my primary area of concern were university instructors, I kept all articles that had faculty as their focus but was more selective regarding articles that focused on schoolteachers. Of the remaining 12 items, I removed 6 that seemed less pertinent to the review topic. The 6 items I decided to include consisted of 3 doctoral dissertations and 3 journal articles. An examination of the reference sections of those items pointed to one more doctoral dissertation that I decided to include in the review because of its high relevance.

## **THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: LINKING PERSONAL/PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE**

Some of the most useful epistemological conceptualizations on the relationship between instructors' personal/professional situatedness and their pedagogical approach emanate from the early work of Clandinin and Connelly on what they describe as *personal practical knowledge* in the context of schools, as well as their later work on professional knowledge landscapes. Personal practical knowledge refers to schoolteachers' past experiences, their present minds, and their future plans and actions (Clandinin & Connelly, 1999; Craig, 1995). This concept attempts to explain how teachers' identities are lived out in their work, a model previously termed *teachers' implicit theories*, and which was based on a similar assumption that teachers' practices result from their interpretation of their experience and their sense making of the world (Clark & Yinger, 1977). Clandinin and Connelly (1987) claim that both action and prior experience shape teachers' practical thinking, and they call for a cognitive and affective understanding of the personal practical knowledge of teachers that, in their view, is composed of practical actions, as well as thoughts in isolation from action and biographical history. Arguing against a preoccupation with reason, Clandinin and Connelly (1990) emphasize that "emotion, value, felt experience with the world, memory and narrative explanations of one's past do not stand still in a way that allows for certainty" (Introduction, para 5). This appeal for the inclusion of affective components in teachers' knowledge perspectives is echoed by Elbaz (1983), who includes in the search for knowledge the full range of human feelings, needs and desires, as well as the perspectives, viewpoints, and constructs elaborated to deal with the world. A similar point is made by Beattie (1995), who examines teacher knowing and learning along intellectual, social, moral, emotional, and aesthetic dimensions. Citing Carr, Beattie elaborates on how teachers, just like everybody else, are historical beings with history serving as the horizon and background for everyday experiences.

In their review of Schön's (1983) book *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*, Clandinin and Connelly (1986) point explicitly to two related relationships: the one of researcher and practitioner during inquiry and the other one of theory so gained to the practice of schooling. This is an important dimension of the research/teaching interface, which is of particular importance in the context of the academy. Schön terms the resulting practice *reflection in action*: The recognition that professionals can think about what they are doing while they are doing it (Schön, 1983). He calls for a new union of research and practice through reflection in action, which allows for an immediate exchange between research and practice. In this context, Schön stresses the importance of frame analysis whereby researchers can provide practitioners with a critical awareness of the frames that the latter use for constructing reality, allowing them to search for alternative ways of

framing the reality of their practice. Schön's theory is critically important in the context of higher education practice where researchers and practitioners are identical. Using his terminology, university instructors are both reflective researchers in their respective disciplines, as well as practitioners in the higher education *enterprise*. Translated into the problem under study, reflective scholarly practitioners would thus constantly examine their research-related frames of reference in their instructional practice and would make the necessary adjustments. Although there are several frames that could be the subject of such critical reflection, the one I am most concerned with in the context of this study is the level of global awareness exemplified and built into her teaching approach by the scholar-practitioner.

In their work on professional knowledge landscapes, Clandinin and Connelly (1995) describe teachers' knowledge as "that body of convictions and meanings, conscious or unconscious, that have arisen from experience (intimate, social, and traditional) and that are expressed in a person's practices" (p. 7). The term *professional knowledge landscape* refers to the interaction of teachers' lives in their classrooms and their lives in other professional, communal places (Clandinin, 2000; Clandinin & Connelly, 1995). With this formulation, the authors have moved away from their earlier focus on the intersection between personal and practical knowledge; however, they make it clear that

this professional knowledge landscape is in intimate interaction with what one might call landscapes of the personal, outside the professional setting. These settings, each understood in terms of personal and social narratives of experience, weave a matrix of storied influence over one another. . . . Furthermore, the everyday personal life of the teacher off the professional landscape influences the life on the landscape. Conversely, teachers' professional life on the landscape influences their personal life off the landscape. (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995, p. 27)

Although the concept of the professional knowledge landscape adds to the earlier discussion of personal practical knowledge, the choice of terminology unfortunately implies that the impact of the personal is smaller than that of the professional. This is, however, not necessarily the case: Teachers' stories and identities interconnect their personal practical knowledge with their professional knowledge contexts and are shaped in past and present experiences on and off the landscape (Clandinin, 2002; Huber, Murphy, & Clandinin, 2003; Whelan, Huber, Rose, Davies, & Clandinin, 2001). This notion was earlier expressed by Eisner (1988), who stated that "how we come to see the world, what we think it means, and eventually what we believe we can do about that world are intimately related to the technologies of mind we have acquired" (p. 19).

Professional knowledge landscapes also contain the diverse stories of students. Huber et al. (2003) make this point by arguing that we also need to consider "the bumping up of the diverse stories to live by of children and teachers and the bumping

up of teachers' diverse stories to live by and stories of school" (p. 359). This point is forcefully reiterated by Greene's (1993) feminist rendering of diversity and inclusion in which she explains how diversity will enter the curriculum once students are permitted to start disclosing their diverse backgrounds; thus, exchanging stories grounded in other landscapes and hitherto foreign to those with whom they share the space.

Although most of the work on personal practical knowledge and the related concepts of professional knowledge landscapes and stories to live by was carried out in the context of schools, it nevertheless appears feasible to apply these concepts and frameworks to teaching in higher education and to the issue under investigation. I hypothesize that the ability of higher education instructors to teach for intercultural competence and world-mindedness within their professional knowledge landscape is positively related with the extent to which they have acquired a world-minded identity both on and off the professional landscape. Although acquisition *on* the landscape might happen through faculty's research or the inclusion of students' experiences into the classroom practice, acquisition *off* the professional landscape could, for example, be the result of personal travel experiences or of choice of literature.

### **INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY, WORLD-MINDEDNESS, AND CLASSROOM PRACTICE**

A range of studies have been carried out that examine the impact of various factors on the level of faculty's intercultural competence and/or world-mindedness. However, hardly any of these studies link those traits in faculty back to the classroom. It is still contested how levels of intercultural competence and world-mindedness among faculty translate or fail to translate into a more culturally sensitive and interculturally appropriate teaching approach for global literacy in higher education. Even more difficult to determine is the extent to which such faculty characteristics and, potentially, the resulting pedagogical approaches affect the students' learning. In their literature review of close to 200 articles on multicultural education, Grant and Sleeter (1985) found only two studies using self-reports to examine the study subjects' implementation of multicultural teaching in the classroom following some training for multicultural knowledge and awareness; however, Grant and Sleeter conclude that neither of these studies found much effect of the training on teaching practice. Johnson and Inoue (2003) cite data that suggest a willingness and openness among many faculties to diversity and multiculturalism, but at the same time, many faculties struggle with strategies to incorporate those attitudes into their teaching. Johnson and Inoue's study at a small American Pacific Island university aimed at measuring the degree to which perceptions of classroom practice reflected theory and attitude of faculty toward multiculturalism. Using a survey method, the authors attempted to understand the extent to which faculty believe that they infuse

their curricula with culturally diverse concepts and strategies. A secondary goal was to shed light on the link between general attitudes toward diversity and multiculturalism on one hand and the faculty's perceptions of their classroom practice on the other hand. Although the majority of respondents ranked high on most indicators for knowledge and awareness about issues of multiculturalism and diversity, a significant number reported that they only seldom or very seldom incorporated multicultural instructional materials in their teaching.

Although multicultural education was not the direct object of my study, it is, however, directly related to intercultural competence/sensitivity and world-mindedness through its focus on social justice and relevant educational experiences for diverse groups of learners. The apparent disconnect between high rankings on attitudinal/behavioral indicators and lower rankings on approaches to the learning environment apparent in Grant and Sleeter's (1985), as well as Johnson and Inoue's (2003) studies needs further investigation. In this context, the previously described CRIW provides an attempt to build bridges between instructors' teaching approaches (the pedagogical focus) and their existing and emerging intercultural competence (the internationalization lens).

Welch (1997) points out that although international mobility among tertiary students has been much studied, the internationalization of academic staff has been less well analyzed. He claims that not all universities could readily tell who among their staff reflect an "international background." A large-scale international survey of some 20,000 academic staff in 14 countries, carried out under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, investigated several indicators of internationalization, including academic staff who had their highest degree from another country, the extent of their international connections, and perceptions of the importance of such links (as cited in Welch, 1997). Regarding gender, the study found active discrimination against faculty women with respect to opportunities to travel and study abroad. With respect to discipline, academics in business, health, technical fields, and education all rated low on having gained their highest degree internationally, whereas scholars in computing science, physics, humanities, and social sciences rated highest. *Peripatetic* or internationally minded academic staffs were more likely to be among the senior ranks than those with less international experience. Of particular interest is the study's conclusion that academics with an international background favored research over teaching in terms of their primary academic interest. This might indicate that those most suited to apply their international experiences to classroom practice have the least interest in doing so. In his use of the term *internationalized academic staff*, Welch adheres to the common mechanistic terminology associated with internationalization in higher education. His analysis of international-mindedness is more reminiscent of Sampson and Smith's rendering of this term as denoting knowledge of and interest in international affairs. However, Welch's study is of interest because he examines indicators such as location of gaining highest degree, gender, discipline, and so on and correlates those indicators to faculty's

propensity to teach. The latter is a dimension not explicitly considered in the other studies in this review and however, is highly relevant with respect to the likelihood of any transfer occurring between instructors' personal/professional backgrounds and classroom practice.

Several in-depth studies on cultural competence and world-mindedness and/or global-mindedness among faculty at selected universities in the United States are discussed in the doctoral works of Khishtan (1990), Helms (2004), Hosseinali (1995), and Hett (1993). Khishtan's study employs a scale to measure world-minded attitudes first developed by Sampson and Smith (1957). His work rests on the assumption that faculty members ought to understand and accept the concept of world-mindedness to be able to emphasize the global dimensions in the teaching of their respective subjects. Khishtan (1990, p. 9) describes the focus of his study as follows:

- (a) whether selected demographic data and life experiences are related to attitudes toward world-mindedness;
- (b) to what extent faculty members understand the concept of world-mindedness or are world-minded themselves; and
- (c) how much, and in what ways, do these faculty members transmit the concept of world-mindedness to their students, colleagues, and to society in their capacity as teachers.

Khishtan's study included 485 full-time faculty members teaching in the schools of education, engineering, and business administration at three U.S. institutions. He used a survey instrument to collect data on the participants' personal and professional backgrounds. The personal and professional characteristics studied were travel abroad, study abroad, employment in foreign countries, participation in international conferences, using teaching to convey the concept of world-mindedness, educational background, major field of study, teaching experience, age, and academic area of teaching. To measure world-mindedness in faculty, he adopted the eight dimensions of Sampson and Smith's scale relating to religion, immigration, government, economics, patriotism, race, education, and war.

When the personal and professional background data were statistically correlated with the data derived from the World-Mindedness Scale, Khishtan found that the faculty characteristics with the highest correlation to positive attitudes toward world-mindedness were travel abroad, employment in foreign countries, and participation in international conferences (see Table 1).

Khishtan's study has a number of weaknesses: First, the use of teaching materials to promote an international perspective is presented as shaping the attitude of faculty toward dimensions of world-mindedness. However, this argumentation presents a circular line of reasoning in that it is just as likely or even more feasible to assume that the use of such teaching materials is a result of faculty's world-mindedness, rather than vice versa. Second, the study is completely quantitative and thus relies exclusively on data gathered from faculty on questionnaires that did not allow for any narrative comments. Third, the study does not really provide any answers

**Table 1 Statistical Correlation of Personal/Professional Background With World-Mindedness Scale (Adapted from Khishtan)**

<b>Personal/Professional Characteristic</b>	<b>Significant Influence on Faculty Attitudes Toward <i>n</i> Dimensions of World Mindedness (Out of Eight)</b>
Travel abroad	Six (economics, education, government, immigration, religion, and war)
Study abroad	Four (education, government, patriotism, and war)
Employment abroad	Three (economic, education, government)
Participation in international conferences	Three (economic, education, and war)
Using teaching materials to promote an international perspective	Four (government, immigration, racial issues, and war)
Educational background (doctoral degree vs. nondoctoral degree)	Three (economic, patriotism, and religion)
Major field of study (humanities vs. other disciplines)	Three (immigration, religion, racial issues)
Experience in teaching (more or less than 15 years)	Three (education, immigration, and patriotism)
Age	Two (religion and war)
Academic area of teaching (business, education, engineering)	Two (economic and war)

to Khishtan's third research question, that is, how much, and in what ways, do the participants transmit the concept of world-mindedness to their students, colleagues, and to society in their capacity as teachers. Any comments in that regard are based on the participants' perceptions about the contribution of their international activities to their professional development. Finally, the eight dimensions originally used by Sampson and Smith and adopted by Khishtan might be problematic: In their 1957 article, Sampson and Smith failed to explain how they arrived at these particular eight dimensions that appear to have arisen out of the context of a postwar world and that might be outdated by now. It is unclear whether these same dimensions provided Khishtan with the most useful results possible over 30 years later. As indicated by Bennett and Hammer (1998), a criterion-referenced test such as the one designed by Khishtan is highly susceptible to situational factors and is thus problematic with respect to generalizability and validity. Given the general difficulty with applying a quantitative tool to a value construct such as world-mindedness that lacks a widely accepted rigorous definition, a qualitative study would appear appropriate to further investigate some of these issues.

A study undertaken by Duckworth, Walker Levy, and Levy (2005) appears to contradict some of Khishtan's findings. These authors studied 90 pre- and in-service

international schoolteachers who participated in a professional development program. Using Hett's (1993) instrument to measure global-mindedness, Duckworth et al. found that there was

[no] significant correlation between scores on the GMS and the following factors: gender, age, ethnicity, whether or not a participant had lived outside the USA, the number of countries a student had lived in, where a student was born, the length of time a student had spent living outside his/her home country, what languages a student could speak, the number of languages a student could speak, whether or not a student had taught outside his/her home country, and the length of time a student had spent teaching outside his/her home country. (p. 298)

The authors note that one of the reasons for this surprising result may lie in the quantitative nature of the study and that the quality of the individuals' experiences in developing global-mindedness was not taken into consideration. I would add that another reason for the homogeneity displayed in the results might be because of selection bias because all respondents were either already teaching or had opted to teach in international schools where they were exposed to a much larger diversity than the average teacher in a noninternational school.

Helms (2004) looks at similar issues through an investigation of the level of cultural sensitivity and exhibition of cultural competence among faculty at three U.S. liberal arts institutions. She uses nationality/ethnic background, gender, age, educational level, graduate professional preparation, work and life experiences, cultural awareness, contact with persons from various cultures, and location during formative years as her independent variables. Helms addresses three main research questions:

What are the characteristics of an academic model of cultural competence? . . . Do faculty in any particular discipline demonstrate greater intercultural sensitivity, thereby greater potential for exercising cultural competence? . . . What is the difference between the perceived level of cultural sensitivity and the actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity for faculty? (pp. 54-55)

Helms's (2004) study employed the multicultural competency questionnaire, as well as the intercultural development inventory, which is based on the developmental model of intercultural sensitivity developed by Bennett in 1986 (as cited in Helms). The multicultural competency questionnaire was used to supplement the quantitative part of the study with a qualitative perspective through eight open-ended questions. The multicultural competency questionnaire revealed that coursework and immersion in other cultures were reported to have the greatest impact on the development of intercultural competence during graduate professional preparation. Congruent with Khishtan's (1990) conclusions, Helms found that travel was the most prevalent response with respect to faculty's enhancement of their level of intercultural competence. Living in another country was also identified as having a considerable impact on one's own cultural perspectives.

Helms's (2004) analysis of the scores on the intercultural development inventory showed that faculty perceived themselves in general to be much more interculturally sensitive than they were assessed to be by the instrument. Faculty frequently saw themselves at the acceptance/adaptation stage of Bennett's (1993) model (first ethno-relative stage), when they were, in fact, operating at the minimization stage where cultural differences tend to be seen as cosmetic and one's own culture is viewed as being universal (last ethnocentric stage). These findings substantiate the existence of potential problems with Khishtan's (1990) research, which relied heavily on faculty's self-reporting through a questionnaire. It is consistent with Bennett and Hammer's (1998) claim that the measuring of cognitive structures through a valid psychometric instrument can reduce bias and increase reliability of data. Helms also concludes that in spite of many faculty having spent time living in another culture and having been provided these opportunities through their work environment, few of these experiences have assisted faculty in relating cross-culturally to diverse student populations at their own institutions. Contrary to Khishtan's findings, Helms concludes that "no faculty in any particular discipline demonstrated greater intercultural sensitivity, thereby the potential to exercise greater cultural competence" (p. 107). Likewise, the above-mentioned differences between perceived and measured intercultural sensitivity were statistically significant for all five disciplines. Congruent with Helms, a study by Ellingboe (1998) found that graduate school preparation played an important role in faculty preparedness for interculturally competent teaching, arguing that many recent graduates resisted cross-cultural or interdisciplinary teaching because it went against the way in which they were educated and how they perceived their profession.

Helms's (2004) findings are compatible with those of other authors (Ellingboe, 1998; Green & Olson, 2003) who note that personal knowledge and expertise regarding internationalization in many cases do not translate into cognitive competence. High levels of personal capacity and experiences with other cultures and languages apparently do not automatically provide faculty with the competence to carry out the intellectual processes necessary to deliver interculturally sensitive/competent curricula. Green and Olson (2003) explicate that faculty with international experiences need to shift their thinking before they can apply such knowledge and experience to their teaching because they might not see the immediate connections and relevance between their international experiences and their teaching practice.

A third dissertation by Hosseinali (1995) is of interest in that it combines the use of two quantitative instruments, as well as a qualitative instrument. He used both Sampson and Smith's World-Mindedness Scale as well as the Acceptance of Global Education Scale (AGES) developed by Bingham in 1979, which is not widely used. According to Hosseinali, the World-Mindedness Scale measures value-oriented attitudes in people, whereas the Global-Mindedness Scale measures attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge about international affairs. Because the latter is not the focus of this

review, no further studies using the AGES have been examined. The quantitative part of Hosseinali's study is limited to 48 respondents from the College of Education at the University of Arkansas. He conducted two multiple regression analyses to correlate participants' demographic variables with levels of world-mindedness and global-mindedness. He found that gender, teaching experience abroad, and living outside the United States were all significant predictors for world-mindedness. These findings appear to be largely congruent with Khishtan's.

The qualitative portion of Hosseinali's (1995) work, albeit limited to 10 participants, sheds some light on the question of traveling and living abroad to changed classroom practice. All professors who were interviewed expressed that travel had affected their teaching style in that they had adopted a broader perspective that allowed them to try different pedagogic approaches in the classroom that they would not have tried if they had not had the experience of interacting with people abroad. Hosseinali's contribution is limited in this regard because he does not go into further detail to provide richer descriptions of the nature of the faculty's changed classroom practices. Also, the research is limited in that it relies on the faculty's self-reporting, like most of the other literature reviewed.

Jane Hett (1993) developed her own instrument to measure global-mindedness and tested it for her dissertation research. Unlike Hosseinali (1995), Hett uses the term global-mindedness in the sense of a value orientation, much like world-mindedness has previously been used in this review. Although the empirical part of her study focuses on students, the study was included in this review nevertheless because of the contribution to theory embedded in the development of a new measurement scale. Hett arrived at her scale through an interviewing process that included 14 participants from a wide variety of personal and professional backgrounds. Her final 30-item Global-Mindedness Scale (GMS) contains five factors under which the 30 items are subsumed—responsibility, cultural pluralism, efficacy, global centrism, and interconnectedness. A test of the GMS conducted among 396 undergraduate students at the University of California in San Diego found that students scored significantly higher on the instrument if they

(a) were female, (b) were registered at a college which requires a broad internationalized curriculum, (c) had enrolled in a total of five or more classes with an international focus, (d) participate in internationally oriented activities, (e) possess a strong degree of political interest and liberal political attitudes, (f) have friends from other countries or cultures, and (g) have studied or lived outside the United States for nine weeks or more. Class level, age, ethnicity, country of birth, and additional language ability were not related to global-mindedness scores. (pp. 148-149)

Hett's findings are consistent with Khishtan's (1990) and Hosseinali's (1995) on the overlapping dimensions measured, although it has to be kept in mind that Hett conducted her survey among students rather than faculty members.

Another study using Bennett's (1993) developmental model of intercultural sensitivity was undertaken by Olson and Kroeger (2001) among 52 New Jersey City University faculty and staff. The authors' research aimed to assess the relationships between the respondents' training and experiences and their levels of global competence and intercultural sensitivity. This study was limited by its small sample size and by the fact that data were collected only at one particular institution. Nevertheless, the study yielded some insights not contained in either Helms's (2004) or Khishtan's (1990) research. Overall, Olson and Kroeger found that advanced proficiency in a language other than English and substantive experience abroad were positively correlated with global competence and intercultural sensitivity indices. In particular, the authors found the following:

Speaking one or more languages other than English with advanced proficiency increases the likelihood that someone will be globally competent. . . . Speaking one or more languages other than English with advanced proficiency increases the likelihood that someone will be more advanced on the Bennett Intercultural Sensitivity Scale. . . . Substantive experience abroad increases the likelihood that someone will have more developed intercultural communication skills. . . . Substantive experience abroad increases the likelihood that someone will be more advanced on the Bennett Intercultural Sensitivity Scale. (pp. 132-133)

Findings related to foreign language proficiency as a determinant of intercultural sensitivity and cultural competence are significant in light of Hett's (1993) assertion that language ability was not a factor in the scoring of participants on her GMS. Similar to Hett's conclusions, Deng and Boatler's (1993) application of the World-Mindedness Scale in a study involving business students yielded no evidence of a positive relation between world-mindedness and foreign language ability. In their concluding section, Olson and Kroeger (2001) claim that "with more globally competent faculty and staff . . . we can respond more effectively to the pressing demand for globally oriented curriculum" (p. 135). This hypothesis has neither been confirmed nor rejected by their study that did not look at this particular aspect. In this context, it is noteworthy that 2 years after the study at New Jersey City University, Olson refuted the notion of a direct link between globally knowledgeable and competent faculty on one hand and the cognitive competence to deliver internationalized curricula on the other hand (Green & Olson, 2003). My own research on two offshore programs carried out at the University of Victoria also found that faculty involved in these programs, although gaining personally and professionally from their involvement, had not made use of their experiences with respect to converting some of their newly gained perspectives into curricular change (Schuerholz-Lehr, 2002).

The impact of studying or living in another country on cultural sensitivity and competence warrants further attention. Citing Kramsch, Harbon (2003) states that there is no conclusive evidence that would link study abroad to cross-cultural

understanding or to the development of a cross-cultural personality. Halse (1999) conducted a phenomenographic study of schoolteachers' learning through short-term study tours to various Asian countries and examined the impact of their learning experiences on their identities and teaching practice in school. Based on the analysis of nine Australian teachers' accounts who participated in the Teacher In-Country Fellowships to Asia (TICFA) program in 1998, Halse concludes that intercultural encounters do not automatically lead to an increase in intercultural understanding. This is corroborated by Nunan (2000), who argues that increased contact with people of diverse cultures does not automatically result in better understanding and communication. Nunan distinguishes between intercultural sensitivity and cross-cultural adaptability as two different aspects of cultural competence. Although the first assesses a person's "ability to consider the possible complexities of an intercultural occurrence and to demonstrate an awareness that those complexities exist," the latter assesses "personality traits that would indicate possible success in adapting to a new and demanding cultural environment" (p. 141). Cross-cultural adaptability is therefore closely linked to the concept of global literacy. Nunan found that intercultural sensitivity was strongly affected by whether a person had traveled outside of Australia, whereas cross-cultural adaptability was related to whether a person had lived outside Australia. High scores on one scale did not necessarily translate into high scores on the other scale.

In Halse's (1999) study, there was considerable variation in participants' implementation of their study tour learning on return to their schools. Most important, Halse found few indicators that participants explicitly conceptualized the tour as having an impact beyond its temporality, and some teachers described the experience as terminating with the implementation of a mandatory teaching unit. The author concluded that any improvement of classroom teaching about Asia was not foremost in the thinking of the participants. Although all teachers translated their learning into classroom practice as part of the program, any longer-term commitment to such changes differed among participants. Halse concludes that "genuine cross-cultural learning and its effective application in schools is not a linear, unidirectional process that can be simplistically reduced to an uncomplicated binary of experience/application" (p. 14). In particular, participants' learning was found to depend on the nature, extent, and character of their experiences and interactions during the tour. In contrast to Halse's and Harbon's (2003) contributions, Cushner and Mahon (2002) conclude from their study of 50 teachers who participated in an overseas student teaching experience of 8 to 15 weeks that this intervention had a considerable positive impact on most participants' cultural awareness and professional development regarding global-mindedness. The researchers used an open-ended questions survey and assessed the responses using Bennett's (1993) developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. They note that "many of the responses given by the returned students give evidence for an increase in cultural sensitivity as proposed by Bennett" (p. 49).

Welch (1997) makes a similar point by arguing that situations can be problematic if epistemological, pedagogical, and other assumptions are not reexamined on contact with unfamiliar cultural forms and that such problems are more likely to arise if staffs lack cross-cultural experience. Toh and Farrelly (as cited in Welch) actually go even further in maintaining that the failure to reexamine a taken-for-granted knowledge base may result in inappropriate forms of teaching that may be more harmful than helpful. Halse's (1999) account of the implementation of the teachers' learning into classroom practice is somewhat limited; however, she does report that various contextual constraints, including state and school curriculum priorities, programming arrangements, and teachers' attitudes, inhibited substantial curricula changes following the study tours to Asia. Nevertheless, methods of cross-cultural comparison employed by teachers during the study tour were put into practice in some instances through new content and new pedagogical approaches.

The strength of Halse's (1999) study lies in her phenomenographic approach that seeks to identify, categorize, and understand qualitative differences in teachers' conceptions of their experiences and learning from a study tour abroad. Contrary to Khishtan (1990) and Helms (2004), Halse is able to go beyond simply establishing a correlation between studying abroad and teaching approaches in the classroom by reporting qualitative changes in teachers' approaches resulting directly from the study tours. However, her sample size is very small ( $n = 9$ ), and the study would have to be repeated with a larger number of teachers to draw generalizable conclusions. Court, Cohen, Broyles, Spenciner, and Michael (2002) also take a qualitative approach to evaluating changes resulting from study or work abroad in their interviews with 24 university and college faculty members who completed sabbaticals or other professional visits to institutions outside their home countries. Respondents reported both practical and transformative changes, with the former referring to direct effects on teaching practice and the latter referring to personal change in self-awareness and intercultural understanding. Court et al. present a few vignettes from respondents that illustrate practical changes implemented after their academic visits. These vignettes provide a useful first glimpse into the process from personal transformation to changes in classroom practice; however, the analysis is not detailed enough to provide any meaningful in-depth insights into this process.

Another look at the impact of study abroad on the internationalization of the curriculum is presented by Lesley Harbon (2003) from the University of Sydney. Using the example of the in-country experiences of Australian school languages teachers, Harbon conducted a review of the literature on the impact of study abroad on participants. She states that outcomes of in-country experiences differ according to length of stay, localities, varieties of immersion and learning opportunities, as well as the participants' differing attitudes and expectations. Depending on these variables, the impact of the in-country experience is not always unambiguously beneficial to language teachers. Harbon concludes that research data on this topic are not

extensive and require further exploration, in particular through examination over a longer time frame.

Yet another dimension of preparedness for more inclusive classroom practices is raised by Grant and Secada (1990), who hypothesize that teachers of nondominant backgrounds will be better prepared to teach a multicultural and multiethnic student body. They cite the example of teachers of color who might understand the cultural backgrounds of diverse learners better than do Whites. However, Grant and Secada caution that it is far from clear whether teachers of color may thus be in a better position to adapt classroom practice to meet those differences. They refer to a related study carried out by Sleeter (1988) in which teachers with preservice coursework in multicultural education reported what they did in their classrooms. The results were compared with those of other teachers who had less previous coursework in multicultural education. With respect to a total of 24 teaching behaviors, the average teacher who had taken more than four multicultural education credits reported engaging in 12 of the 24 behaviors more frequently than the average teacher who had taken less than four credits. Grant and Secada cite two more studies of short-term interventions for multicultural education of in-service teachers that showed very limited results regarding teachers' attitudes and classroom behaviors. Grant and Secada's claims are refuted by Hett's (1993) study, which found no significant relationship between participants' ethnicity, country of birth, and their global-mindedness scores. Although multicultural education is not the direct focus of my study, Grant and Secada's hypothesis that teachers might know content that they do not use is significant for the issue under study. Grant and Secada suggest that more work needs to be done on how teacher cognitions, beliefs, and skills regarding teaching for diversity actually develop. This is, in essence, a call for the type of research on the personal/professional knowledge landscape that Clandinin, Connelly, and some others have successfully carried out in other contexts.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

I started out by asking three research questions to guide my evaluation of the literature:

1. What factors in instructors' personal/professional backgrounds and life experiences have an influence on their cognitive framework as it relates to education for global awareness and intercultural competence?

A major problem related to this question is the use of survey methodologies in many of the existing studies: self-reporting on highly subjective criteria of intercultural competence, world-mindedness, and related concepts; the subjectivity inherent in the *measuring* index used; the choice of indicators to signify intercultural

competence and world-mindedness; as well as the choice of personal and professional life experiences or factors, all introduce a substantial level of bias into these studies. Problems with research designs manifest in substantial inconsistencies across studies. Although Sampson and Smith (1957), for example, point out explicitly that being female or male has been found to have no statistically significant impact on levels of world-mindedness, Deng and Boatler (1993), Hett (1993), and Hosseinali (1995) all conclude that female persons are significantly more world-minded than male persons. Welch's (1997) study provides some preliminary glimpses into the possible underlying causes for existing gender differences; however, the gender component needs to be studied more thoroughly because it appears to have been ignored in some other studies of instructors' levels of world-mindedness and intercultural competence.

As very aptly pointed out by Hett (1993), the time-bound nature of data collection through a quantitative instrument can lead to major distortions in the data gathered. In the case of her study, completion of the survey coincided with a number of events of major international significance, including the Tiananmen Square massacre and the disintegration of the Soviet Union. At the same time, the lack of agreement on definitions of world-mindedness and its related concepts in the empirical and theoretical literature reviewed makes a consistent measuring of factors correlated with world-mindedness, global sensitivity, and so on, very problematic.

2. In which ways do instructors' personal and professional backgrounds interact with their classroom practice regarding education for global awareness and cultural sensitivity and competence?

A number of conclusions can be drawn from the literature reviewed. Several studies confirmed that travel abroad and living in another country were major factors in shaping individuals' intercultural perspectives; however, such knowledge and high levels of personal capacity and experiences rarely seem to translate automatically into more globally inclusive teaching practices. Some authors seem to even doubt the impact of such experiences abroad, arguing that a major reexamination of epistemological assumptions and taken-for-granted knowledge would have to take place for the experience abroad to have any positive result. In the future, interventions such as the CRIW might play an important role in assisting instructors to carry out the intellectual processes necessary to translate knowledge and experiences into classroom action through the delivery of interculturally competent and globally sensitive curricula.

Discipline appears to have limited influence regarding instructors' ability and preparedness to apply pedagogical approaches toward more globally relevant curricula. More studies are needed that would take into consideration other factors including, but not limited to, proficiency in one and more foreign languages, home country, family background, and so on. These factors need to be correlated with

faculty's classroom practice to derive at meaningful descriptions of how faculty's personal and professional backgrounds shape their propensity to design curricula for global literacy. Based on the inconclusive findings of their study, Johnson and Inoue (2003), for example, express the need for future research to evaluate the actual practices of faculty in the classrooms through observations, ethnographic methodologies, and interviews with both faculty and students. Given the dearth of qualitative studies producing rich descriptions that can shed some light on the relationship between faculty traits, knowledge, and attitudes, on one hand and classroom practice on the other hand, there is an urgent need for the types of studies outlined by Johnson and Inoue. Observational research methods such as classroom observations, in particular, are needed to elucidate actual classroom practices, rather than relying on faculty responses to survey questionnaires in which they might overreport their perceived level of teaching for globally relevant outcomes. Student and faculty focus groups would also contribute to a better understanding of the issue through the interaction of the participants' points of view.

3. To which extent are targeted interventions (e.g., professional development, study tours) effective in changing instructors' levels of intercultural competence and world-mindedness? Do these changes have an influence on the instructors' approach to course design with respect to education for global awareness and intercultural competence?

Some relevant research has been carried out with respect to this question. Targeted interventions examined include short-term study tours (Halse, Harbon), travel and living for periods of time outside Australia (Nunan), or sabbaticals and other professional visits to institutions outside the home country (Court et al.). Length of time and level of engagement seem to be important factors in any observed change: Short-term interventions appear to produce mixed results, and any impact on teaching practice and course design tends to dissipate over time. Intercultural and cross-cultural competencies were strengthened if individuals worked outside the home country, compared with situations where they just traveled abroad. The depth and nature of an intervention's impact might also vary according to whether the intervention is strictly of a professional or of a more personal nature: Court et al. reported significant change following professional visits abroad. Again, Deng and Boatler (1993) report findings that contradict some of the other studies: In their study that employed the World-Mindedness Scale, neither short-term travel abroad nor a longer-term experience living abroad raised the students' levels of world-mindedness significantly. Deng and Boatler's work raises the question of whether and why there appear to be differences between students and instructors regarding the process of shaping world-minded perspectives. The links between teacher preparation for culturally diverse thinking at teacher education institutions and the effects of such preparation on classroom practice, also require further investigation (Craft, 1996).

This literature review points to the availability of a number of important empirical studies that explore different aspects of faculty experiences, background, disciplinary affiliation, and so on, and how such variables affect intercultural sensitivity, intercultural competence, and world-mindedness among faculty. Some of the studies are problematic in that they employ instruments that are subject to considerable subjectivity. In particular, studies using the intercultural development inventory tend to generate results that are inconsistent with several studies using the World-Mindedness Scale. At the same time, little conclusive evidence has been found regarding the relationship between levels of intercultural sensitivity, intercultural competence, and world-mindedness in faculty on one side and how these traits translate into classroom practice on the other side. Interventions like the CRIW play an important role in bridging this gap. They need to be followed up with qualitative research studies that track the impact of such interventions over time.

## REFERENCES

- Bingham, J. (1979). *The acceptance of global education scale*. (ERIC Document No. ED180857)
- Beattie, M. (1995). New prospects for teacher education: Narrative ways of knowing teaching and teacher learning [Electronic version]. *Educational Research*, 37, 53-70.
- Bender-Slack, D. (2002). Using literature to teach global education: A humanist approach. *English Journal*, 91(5), 70-75.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, M., & Hammer, M. (1998). *The intercultural development inventory*. Retrieved January 14, 2006, from <http://www.intercultural.org/pdf/idi.pdf>
- Bond, S., Qian, J., & Huang, J. (2003). *The role of faculty in internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum and classroom experience*. CBIE Research Millennium Series No. 8. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Clandinin, D. J. (2000). Learning to teach: A question of knowledge. *Education Canada*, 40(1), 28-30. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ603985)
- Clandinin, D. J. (2002). Storied lives in storied landscapes: Ten years later [Electronic version]. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, 4(1), 1-4.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1986). The reflective practitioner and practitioners' narrative unities [Review of the book *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*]. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 11, 184-198.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1987). Teachers' personal knowledge: What counts as "personal" in studies of the personal. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19, 487-500.

- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1990). Narrative, experience and the study of curriculum. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 20, 241-253.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (Eds.). (1999). *Shaping a professional identity: Stories of educational practice*. London, Ontario, Canada: Althouse Press.
- Clark, C. M., & Yinger, R. J. (1977). Research on teacher thinking. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 7, 279-304.
- Court, D., Cohen, L., Broyles, I., Spenciner, L., & Michael, O. (2002). Crossing borders: Culture and transformation. *World Studies in Education*, 3(1), 39-53.
- Craft, M. (1996). Cultural diversity and teacher education. In M. Craft (Ed.), *Teacher education in plural societies: An international review* (pp. 1-15). London: Falmer.
- Craig, C. J. (1995). Knowledge communities: A way of making sense of how beginning teachers come to know in their professional knowledge contexts [Electronic version]. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 25, 151-175.
- Cushner, K., & Mahon, J. (2002). Overseas student teaching: Affecting personal, professional, and global competencies in an age of globalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6, 44-58.
- De Frankrijker, H. (1997). The challenges of teacher education in and for a plural world. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13, 659-664.
- Deng, S., & Boatler, R. W. (1993). Worldmindedness among Canadian business students: Implications for curricula [Electronic version]. *Journal of Education for Business*, 69(2), 94-98.
- Duckworth, R. L., Walker Levy, L., & Levy, J. (2005). Present and future teachers of the world's children: How internationally-minded are they? [Electronic version]. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 4, 279-305.
- Eisner, E. W. (1988). The primacy of experience and the politics of method [Electronic version]. *Educational Researcher*, 17(5), 15-20.
- Elbaz, F. (1983). *Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge*. New York: Nichols.
- 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, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Farmer, R. (1993). International education as a worldcentric perspective: Defining international education. *New England Journal of History*, 49(3), 52-55.
- Grant, C. A., & Secada, W. G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. Houston (Ed.). *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403-422). New York: Macmillan.
- Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (1985). The literature on multicultural education: Review and analysis. *Educational Review*, 37, 97-118.

- Green, M. F., & Olson, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Greene, M. (1993). Diversity and inclusion: Toward a curriculum for human beings. *Teachers College Record*, 95, 211-221.
- Halse, C. (1999). *Encountering cultures: The impact of study tours to Asia on Australian teachers and teaching practice* [Electronic version]. Melbourne, Australia: Asia Education Foundation.
- Harbon, L. A. (2003). Internationalising the curriculum through languages: Teachers' 'in-country' professional development. In A. J. Liddicoat, S. Eisenchlas, & S. Trevaskes (Eds.), *Australian perspectives on internationalising education* (pp. 117-128). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Helms, S. M. (2004). The examination of cultural sensitivity and exhibition of cultural competence for faculty at liberal arts institutions within higher education. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(10), 3609A. (UMI No. 3107769)
- Hett, J. E. (1993). The development of an instrument to measure global-mindedness. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54(10), 3724. (UMI No. 9408210)
- Hickling-Hudson, A., & McMeniman, M. (1996). Pluralism and Australian teacher education. In M. Craft (Ed.), *Teacher education in plural societies: An international review* (pp. 16-26). London: Falmer.
- Hosseinali, T. (1995). The relationship of globalmindedness to travel and living abroad experiences of university professors. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56(07), 2544. (UMI No. 9536034)
- Huber, J., Murphy, M. S., & Clandinin, D. J. (2003). Creating communities of cultural imagination: Negotiating a curriculum of diversity [Electronic version]. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 33, 343-362.
- Johnson, K., & Inoue, Y. (2003). Diversity and multicultural pedagogy: An analysis of attitudes and practices within an American Pacific Island university. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 2, 251-276.
- Khishtan, M. (1990). An analysis of faculty awareness of and commitment to worldmindedness in selected universities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51(09), 2995A. (UMI No. 9104194)
- McAlpine, L., & Harris, R. (2002). Evaluating teaching effectiveness and teaching improvement: A language for institutional policies and development practices. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 7, 7-17.
- McAlpine, L., & Winer, L. (2002). Sustainable faculty development: An Indonesian case study. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 39, 205-216.
- Nunan, P. (2000). Readiness for internationalisation: A study of the intercultural sensitivity and cross-cultural adaptability of staff of a regional TAFE institute. In J. Ryan & P. Baird (Eds.), *University of Ballarat Second Annual Research Conference* (pp. 140-144). Australia: University of Ballarat.
- Olson, C. L., & Kroeger, K. R. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5, 116-137.

- Sampson, D. L., & Smith, H. P. (1957). A scale to measure world-minded attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 99-106.
- Saroyan, A., & Amundsen, C. (2001). Evaluating university teaching: Time to take stock. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 26*, 341-353.
- Saroyan, A., & Amundsen, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Rethinking teaching in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Saroyan, A., Amundsen, C., McAlpine, L., Weston, C., Winer, L., & Gandell, R. (2004). Tenets underlying our approach to faculty development. In A. Saroyan, & C. Amundsen (Eds.), *Rethinking teaching in higher education* (pp. 1-17). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schoorman, D. (2000). What really do we mean by "internationalization"? [Electronic version]. *Contemporary Education, 71*(4), 5-11.
- Schuerholz-Lehr, S. (2002). *Offshore programming as an instrument for internationalizing Canadian universities: A case study*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of London, Royal Holloway, London.
- Schuerholz-Lehr, S. (2004, June). *Report on pilot course (re)design for internationalization workshop*. Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: University of Victoria, Office of International Affairs.
- Sleeter, C. (1988). *Preservice coursework and field experience in multicultural education: Impact on teacher behavior*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Welch, A. R. (1997). The peripatetic professor: The internationalisation of the academic profession. *Higher Education, 34*, 323-345.
- Whelan, K., Huber, J., Rose, C., Davies, A., & Clandinin, D. J. (2001). Telling and retelling our stories on the professional knowledge landscape [Electronic version]. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 7*, 143-156.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

**Sabine Schuerholz-Lehr** is assistant director of the Office of International Affairs at the University of Victoria (UVic) in Canada. She has recently completed a temporary secondment to the British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education as senior policy advisor on international education. She is also a PhD student within the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, at the same institution. Her research interests include global trends in internationalization of higher education and internationalization on campus through curricular approaches. She cofacilitates the University's Course (Re)design for Internationalization Workshop with the director of UVic's Learning and Teaching Centre.