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Introduction

Globalization has played a key role in shaping societies over the past couple of decades. Still, there is little agreement on its merits and perils and, most importantly, on how it can be best defined. Attempts to provide a broader understanding of this charged concept see globalization as the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life, including economic, political, social and cultural spheres, as a result of rapid advances in technology, communication and travel (Giddens, 2000). This interconnectedness offers new possibilities to interact with and learn from culturally-diverse people, as well as to access information in real-time. However, it also brings challenges of unparalleled magnitude. Because we are interconnected (and interdependent), what happens in other parts of the world on a global level affects us on a local level, and vice versa. Hence, climate change, war and conflict, gender and social inequality, poverty and unemployment and forced migration have all become global problems with consequences for many different countries and communities.

Addressing these global problems requires increasingly complex skills, knowledge and predispositions from people (Banks, 2004), such as critical thinking; communication, negotiation and collaboration skills; knowledge and understanding of global issues and responsibilities; valorization of diversity; and commitment to social justice; to name but a few (Oxfam, 2015). This brings out the need for clearer and bolder education goals, as well as more flexible, appropriate and inclusive forms of education.

In the higher education sector, institutions have addressed these challenges by turning to internationalization (Maringe and Foskett, 2010). This meant attracting students and staff from different parts of the world, leading research addressing scientific and social issues of global significance, or developing teaching programs that have both local and international relevance. Despite adopting different approaches and strategies in the development of their internationalization agendas, higher education institutions seem to agree on the fact that an education suitable for this new era entails the integration of an international, intercultural or global dimension. These three terms are intentionally used as a triad in several definitions related with internationalization (Beelen and Jones, 2015; Knight, 2004; Leask, 2015). As Knight (2004, p. 11) explains:

> International is used in the sense of relationships between and among nations, cultures, or countries. But we know that internationalization is also about relating to the diversity of cultures that exists within countries, communities, and institutions, and so intercultural is used to address the aspects of internationalization at home. Finally, global, a very controversial and value-laden term these days, is included to provide the sense of worldwide scope. These three terms complement each other and together give richness both in breadth and depth to the process of internationalization.
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Concurrent use of these terms is not restricted to higher education or to the “Western” world. In a recent empirical study, Yemini and Fulop (2015) report on how Israeli school administrators are making substantial efforts to integrate an international, global and intercultural dimension into the processes of instruction and learning, as well as at the organizational level, in local secondary schools, in a parallel move to the related internationalization process taking place in higher education. These three dimensions have also been used to identify educational approaches suited to the characteristics of the contemporary world, as detailed below.

**Contemporary approaches to teaching and learning**

**Global education**

The concept of global education is not new and has a long tradition in English-speaking countries (Hicks, 2007; Tye, 2014). In the mid-1960s, for instance, an increasing number of educators in the USA began to question whether education was helping young people to understand the contemporary world, considering that it was essential to encourage greater understanding of local-global issues amongst students. Hanvey’s 1976 model of “education for a global perspective” marked a key moment in the history of the concept. In a revised edition of his seminal work *An attainable global perspective*, Hanvey (2004, p. 1) described this type of education as:

> [...] that learning which enhances the individual’s ability to understand his or her condition in the community and the world and improves the ability to make effective judgements. It includes the study of nations, cultures, and civilizations, including our own pluralistic society and the societies of other peoples, with a focus on understanding how these are all interconnected and how they change, and on the individual’s responsibility in this process. It provides the individual with a realistic perspective on world issues, problems and prospects, and an awareness of the relationships between an individual’s enlightened self-interest and the concerns of people elsewhere in the world.

With the arrival of the new millennium and as a result of unforeseen changes brought by globalization, educators and policy makers around the world recognized the importance of initiatives to infuse a global dimension in school curricula (Killick, 2015). The Europe-wide Global Education Congress, held in Maastricht in November 2002, was a pioneering event in this respect. The event brought together government representatives, regional and local authorities, as well as civil society organizations from member states of the Council of Europe and from several other nations of the world to increase and improve support for global education, understood both as a necessity and a right. At this event, a common definition of global education was drafted:

> Global Education is education that opens people’s eyes and minds to the realities of the world, and awakens them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all. Global Education is understood to encompass Development Education, Human Rights Education, Education for Sustainability, Education for Peace and Conflict (Council of Europe, 2002, p. 66).

According to this definition, global education is as an umbrella term that brings together the agendas of different fields of education, such as development education, human rights education, education for peace and conflict resolution and education for sustainability. Such an approach enables sharing of strategies across differing but similar types of education that share a critical global perspective for greater human dignity. The definition also alludes to the fact that global education involves not only cognitive factors, related with knowledge and understanding of global issues, but also affective factors, centered on respect for others and the world and aiming at promoting engaged participation for more inclusive and sustainable societies.
The focus on engaged participation explains the reason why some organizations, such as Oxfam International and the UNESCO, have chosen to operate under the heading of “global citizenship education”, in some ways possibly a clearer label than global education, traditionally understood in terms of “learning about the world”. For the UNESCO (2014, p. 15), global citizenship education “aims to empower learners to engage and assume active roles, both locally and globally, to face and resolve global challenges and ultimately to become proactive contributors to a more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable world”. In a similar way, Oxfam (2015, p. 5) regards global citizenship education as “a framework to equip learners for critical and active engagement with the challenges and opportunities of life in a fast-changing and interdependent world”.

Still, the concept of “global citizenship” is ambiguous and contested (Andreotti and Souza, 2012; Goren and Yemini, 2017; Oxley and Morris, 2013). Some authors (Bates, 2012; Parekh, 2003) consider that this type of citizenship is not feasible because it lacks an authority and/or a state in relation to which citizens can assume their duties and responsibilities. Moreover, it is not desirable, as it can lead to uprooting of the citizens from their local community. An opposing view suggests that globalization has brought about the possibility (and need) for people to see themselves (or at least part of their identity) as citizens of a global community (Peterson and Warwick, 2015). As Clifford and Montgomery (2011, p. 13) explain, “while some argue that there is no society for global citizens to be citizens of, we see planet earth as our commonality and endorse the ethic of social justice where we do not secure a better life for ourselves at the expense of a much worse life or others”. Thinking about global citizenship in this way challenges nation-based notions of citizenship by conceiving its possibility in terms of actions, participation and membership that exists beyond national borders.

Considering that the primary goal of global education is to prepare students to be effective and responsible citizens in a global society, several authors and organizations have attempted to identify the characteristics of global citizens. Oxfam (2015) sees the global citizen as someone who:

- is aware of the wider world and has a sense of his/her own role as a world citizen;
- respects and values diversity;
- has an understanding of how the world works;
- is passionately committed to social justice;
- participates in the community at a range of levels, from the local to the global;
- works with others to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place; and
- takes responsibility for his/her actions.

Oxfam (2015) goes on to propose a curriculum for global citizenship that includes the knowledge and understanding, skills, values and attitudes that learners need both to participate fully in a globalized society and economy and secure a more just, inclusive and sustainable world than the one they have inherited. These include knowledge and understanding of social justice and equity, critical and creative thinking, and respect for people and human rights. Oxfam’s framework emphasizes the need for global citizenship education to be integrated in a systematic and gradual way throughout the curriculum starting in the early years, thus providing a valuable tool for curriculum design.

**International education**

Global education is often confused or used interchangeably with international education. Some of this confusion is bound to rest on the fact that they both transcend national boundaries. Epstein (1992, p. 409) refers to international education as “organised efforts to bring together students, teachers, and scholars from different nations to interact and learn
about and from each other”. Crossley and Watson (2003, p. 14) identify the role of international education in the preparation of students for “employment anywhere in the world’ and the development of ‘an understanding of different countries, as well as good relations with people of different nationalities and languages”. Thompson and Hayden (2004, p. 276), for their part, see international education as being ‘related to the achievement of greater levels of mutual respect and harmonious coexistence among nations’.

The term international education has also been applied to the work of international education institutions, such as the European Commission, the Council of Europe, the OECD or the United Nations. In this respect, it is mainly concerned with policy matters, such as the acceptability of qualifications, the definition of assessment and benchmarking tools, the promotion of educational exchanges, and the initiation of cultural agreements. These global education superstructures, though, are fraught with criticism from many educationalists who believe that they lead to similar practices in national education systems across the world and to a “Westernization” of the curriculum, which are detrimental to the preservation of cultural diversity. Yet, this is a much debated topic. For instance, culturalists believe that global ideas are adapted by policy makers and practitioners to the local context, thus rejecting the suggestion that these organizations work together to create global education uniformity (Spring, 2009).

One way to promote international education is through international schooling. International schools are difficult to define. According to Marshall (2014), the location, curriculum and who the students are all contribute to how international a school is. The majority of international schools are private and fee-paying, students are the children of expatriates working in a country that is not their home, and follow an international curriculum. The idea of a formal curriculum with a specifically international focus first appeared in the late 1960s with the development of the International Baccalaureate. Its original purpose was to facilitate the international mobility of students and prepare them for university by providing schools with a curriculum and diploma qualification recognized by universities around the world. The relevance of such a curricular orientation to national education systems is increasingly recognized in recent years (Hayden, 2013). As a consequence, schools worldwide are offering an international curriculum with the aims of encouraging an understanding and appreciation of other cultures, languages and points of view. However, it is worth highlighting that international schooling is only a part of what constitutes international education. As cautioned by Marshall (2014, p. 118), “some international schools (it is important to note that not all) are involved in international education”.

Another way to promote international education is through fostering educational experiences in other countries, for instance, through short-term exchange programs. In Europe, the Erasmus program (currently Erasmus+) which stands for “European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students”, is a successful example. Established in 1987, Erasmus has supported not only more than 5 million students, apprentices and volunteers, but also staff and youth exchanges, amounting to 9 million people in total (European Commission, 2017). Specific issues tackled by the program include reducing unemployment, especially among young people; promoting adult learning, in particular for new skills and skills required by the labor market; encouraging young people to take part in European democracy; supporting innovation, cooperation and reform; reducing early school leaving; and promoting cooperation and mobility with the European Union’s partner countries. According to Phillips and Schweisfurth (2008, p. 44), these type of exchanges “play a key role in creating the international scholar”, as they not only enrich students’ academic and professional lives, but also improve language learning, intercultural skills, self-reliance and self-awareness.

Programs such as Erasmus illustrate a move in the rationale of international education from a more pragmatic function, which rests on the development of academic qualifications, to a more ideological role concerned with the moral development of the individual (Cambridge and Thompson, 2004). In this respect, international education has been pointed out as
leading to international mindedness and international understanding. International mindedness is about pursuing knowledge and understanding of cultural differences and global issues and how they affect us all. It is also about being able to critically analyze those issues to propose solutions. As Hill (2012, p. 246) highlights, “it is about putting the knowledge and skills to work in order to make the world a better place through empathy, compassion and openness”. International mindedness can be thought of as a precursor to international understanding. It refers to “the development of that insight and attitude in the individuals who, rising above their own selfish and narrow interests, find out the really valuable items in all other cultures besides their own” (Ravi, 2011, p. 700). Fundamental to international mindedness and understanding is appreciation of cultural diversity within and between nations and of the multiple perspectives that arise from it. This lies also at the heart of intercultural education.

**Intercultural education**

As a result of globalization, there has been an increased movement of people across national boundaries. Whether migrants, refugees of mere travelers, these people often bring along other languages, cultures and worldviews. Societies, previously considered monolingual and monocultural, are now much more diverse in terms of ethnicity, class, language and religion. This poses considerable challenges to education systems, which are being asked to deal with linguistic and cultural diversity on a daily basis, to guarantee the academic achievement and successful integration of all children and promote a heightened understanding of and respect for other people (UNESCO, 2009).

To achieve these goals, multicultural education has been introduced in various countries around the world as a response to the changing demographics of students. In a well-known definition, multicultural education is understood as “a field of study and an emerging discipline whose major aim is to create equal educational opportunities for students from diverse racial, ethnic, social-class, and cultural groups” (Banks and Banks, 1995, p. 11). More recent definitions highlight the role of multicultural education in promoting democracy and social justice (Banks, 2009), assisting students in thinking more critically (May, 2009), and empowering them to act and make significant contributions to the world (Banks, 2014).

Gollnick and Chinn (2013) list six fundamental beliefs underlying multicultural education:

1. cultural differences have strength and value;
2. schools should be models for the expression of human rights and respect for cultural and group differences;
3. social justice and equality for all people should be of paramount importance in the design and delivery of curricula;
4. attitudes and values necessary for participation in a democratic society should be promoted in schools;
5. teachers are fundamental to students learning the knowledge, skills and the need to be productive citizens; and
6. educators working with families and communities can create an environment that is supportive of multiculturalism, equality and social justice.

Themes of diversity, equality, democracy, social justice and anti-racism are, thus, central to our understanding of multicultural education. As such, this concept can be called slightly different things around the world. In Europe, for instance, the term “intercultural education” is often preferred to “multicultural education” (Portera, 2011). Intercultural education aims to “go beyond passive coexistence, to achieve a developing and sustainable way of living together in multicultural societies through the creation of understanding of, respect for and
dialogue between the different cultural groups” (UNESCO, 2006, p. 18). Intercultural education is regarded as pursuing the following aims: the reduction of all forms of exclusion, the furthering of integration and school achievement, the promotion of respect for cultural diversity, the promotion of understanding of the cultures of others, and the promotion of international understanding. These aims are meant to be implemented in curricula, teaching methods and materials, language teaching, school life, teacher education and also in the interaction between schools and the community (Santos et al., 2014).

After studying a number of documents from international conferences, the UNESCO (2006) put together three principles on which intercultural education should be centered. The first principle relates to respect for the cultural identity of the learner through providing culturally appropriate and responsive education for all. The second principle sees intercultural education as providing every learner with the cultural knowledge, attitudes and skills which are necessary for achieving active and full participation in society. Finally, the third principle sustains that intercultural education should promote respect, understanding, and solidarity among individuals, and among different ethnic, social, cultural and religious groups and nations.

If multicultural education sees equality for all at its core, in intercultural education the keyword is dialogue. Intercultural dialogue is “a process that comprises an open and respectful exchange of views between individuals and groups with different ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic backgrounds and heritage, on the basis of mutual understanding and respect” (Council of Europe, 2008, p. 15). In practice, this requires that individuals develop an intercultural competence, which involves the ability to interact effectively and appropriately with people from other cultures. In the past twenty years scholarly attention has been devoted to defining and creating a taxonomy for intercultural competence. Despite a variety of models and frameworks available nowadays, they all seem to agree that intercultural competence comprises attitudes, knowledge and skills that are developed gradually through a lifelong process (Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2009). The development of intercultural competence departs from situations of intercultural dialogue which occur in daily life and should be learned, practiced and maintained. Fundamental is an understanding that intercultural education is indispensable for all students, even in monocultural contexts, and should not be seen simply as a way to integrate migrant students or to deal with multicultural contexts. All students should have the opportunity to see diversity as a normal characteristic of current societies and as a means for personal development (Alred et al., 2002).

The above literature review indicates that there are many common themes in global, international and intercultural education. All of these approaches aim to promote students' understanding of the world outside their own countries and communities, develop attitudes and predispositions that underpin a respectful and equal discourse between cultures and inspire them to act toward positive change. In the end, they all embody a transformative vision of education and a new paradigm that goes beyond local and national barriers, individualism and competitiveness, toward a feeling of belonging to a greater whole. This implies a profound change in the basic premises that regulate educational programs. Indeed, it is no longer enough to educate children and young people to be efficient workers in a global economy; it is fundamental to teach them how to live together sustainably and peacefully, respecting one another and the environment, and provide them with opportunities for critical, ethical and responsible action toward greater equality and social justice.

Background, themes and organization of the special issue

In line with these themes, The International Institute of Knowledge Management (TIKIM), Sri Lanka, and the University of Northern Colorado, USA, joined efforts to organize the 3rd International Conference on Education (ICEDU), titled Models of Global Education and Education Mobility for the 2020’s. The conference was held between 20 and 22 April 2017, in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, and witnessed the participation of around 120 delegates.
representing more than 30 countries. Technical sessions, poster sessions and keynote speeches focused on a multitude of themes related with global issues, technological enhancements, inclusion, comparative education, cultural and linguistic diversity, mobility, curriculum design and teacher quality. The event, therefore, offered a platform for academics and policymakers to discuss and share knowledge and recent research under one common goal – to advance the quality of education received by students worldwide.

This special issue brings together a collection of selected papers from the conference, written by a wide range of contributors from around the world, as well as conceptual and research articles written by renowned experts in the field. The ten papers that comprise this special issue offer an updated and critical analysis and/or recommendations of how educational institutions (from primary up till higher education) meet the challenges associated with globalization and internationalization, mobility and migration, as well as the diverse needs of students, teachers and learning communities. Drawing on a synthesis of theory and practice, the papers focuses on one (or several) approach of contemporary education highlighted above from three distinct perspectives – a student perspective, a teacher perspective and a curriculum perspective.

David Killick, from the UK, leads off this special issue with an opinion piece on a holistic model for graduate attributes. Titled “Graduates in/for a multicultural and globalising world”, the paper questions the vague notion of “global citizen” and argues for a more holistic construct of global selfhood as a legitimate goal for graduates who must make their way in a multicultural and globalizing world. This theoretical model sees the global graduate as someone who has the capabilities to lead a life he/she has reason to value. These include “global perspectives”, related with a recognition of the ways in which one’s own personal and professional actions, and those of others, impact upon the capabilities of diverse people in diverse contexts to lead lives they have reason to value; and “cross-cultural capabilities” to conduct one’s personal and professional life among diverse people in diverse contexts in ways which do no harm to their capabilities to lead lives they have reason to value. From this theoretical modeling, the author presents practice implications for learning and teaching in higher education.

A different take on graduate attributes in/for a globalized world is offered by Maurice Danaher and Anthony Rhodes, from the United Arab Emirates, and Ashley Ater Kranov, from Saudi Arabia. In “Concurrent direct assessment of foundation skills for General Education”, the authors describe a performance assessment method to measure “foundation skills”, i.e. life skills, transferable skills and technology skills that allow graduates to succeed in the academic discipline of their choosing and subsequently in their employment. The General Education Foundation Skills Assessment (GEFSA) framework comprises a scenario/case describing an unresolved contemporary issue, which engages student groups in online discussions, and a task-specific analytic rubric to concurrently assess the extent to which students have attained the targeted foundation skills. The method was applied in three semesters to non-native English speaking students in a General Education program at a university in the United Arab Emirates. According to the authors, the results suggest that the method can consistently elicit and measure the foundation skills of students in a General Education program, providing valuable data for curriculum development.

Remaining with a focus on the students, Jakub Dostál, Martina Chalupová, Martina Černá and Martin Prokop, from the Czech Republic, address one of the main internationalization strategies used by higher education institutions worldwide – student mobility – and identify the challenges put forward by a current global threat. The paper, titled “International terrorism as a threat to student mobility”, presents a study that aimed to determine whether fear of terrorism is a barrier to international student mobility. Based on data collected through interviews with representatives of four universities located in the Czech Republic, Finland, Belgium and France, the authors describe how terrorist attacks in Brussels and Paris led to diminished participation of international students in these countries, as well as last-minute
cancelations of short-term mobility events, such as the International Business Week. The authors suggest that along with the traditional barriers of language, financial costs, and incompatibility of higher education systems, fear can become a serious threat to the internationalization of higher education.

Short-term mobility is also at the core of the next paper on the “Professional development of future foreign language teachers during short-term exchanges”. Written by Silvia Melo-Pfeifer and Christian Helmchen, from Germany, the study follows four prospective foreign language teachers before, during and after a short-term internship in Spain, to understand the self-perceived influence of these exchanges on their professional values, pedagogy and practice. Results from content and discourse analysis of future teachers’ letters of motivation, e-mails and focus group interview reveal a shift of priorities in their discourses; from an initial focus on language skills improvement, they come to value the intercultural pedagogic experience they lived, focusing on differences and similarities between professional values and pedagogical practices across contexts. Considering these results, the authors make a strong plea for the generalized implementation of professional exchange programs as a means to raise teachers’ awareness of global structural, educational, political and curricular contexts and demands, and help them reconsider taken-for-granted beliefs and practices.

Also addressing pre-service teacher education, Eny Winarti, from Indonesia, writes a paper on “Emancipatory education and the preparation of future teachers”. The paper describes the impact of a program sustained on the tenets of emancipatory education in the development of twenty-first century skills by a group of future elementary school teachers in Indonesia. Following the steps of action research, the author first describes how she planned and implemented the teaching program; then, she explains how she observed and reflected on the impact of the activities. Results point to changes in future teachers’ attitudes and skills related with the following aims of emancipatory education – manifestation of humanization, critical conscientization, and development of problem-solving skills. Yet, some remnants of “old tendencies”, typical to Javanese culture (e.g. not thinking out of the box or waiting for direct instructions), were visible. Based on these findings, the author offers recommendations for introducing emancipatory education in developing countries, to help teachers become more sensitive and respond in a more appropriate way to the challenges of teaching and learning in the twenty-first century.

The themes of twenty-first century skills and teacher education are also central to the next paper on “Teacher’s feedback in teaching science in a bilingual Bruneian primary classroom”, by authors Siti Munawirah Panjang, Roslinawati Roslan, Norashikin Yusof and Masitah Shahrill, from Brunei. The study depicted in this paper analyzes the use of feedback to students by a male primary teacher in a Year 5 science classroom that uses English as the medium of instruction. Drawing on Chin’s (2006) questioning-based discourse approach, the authors analyze the different types of teacher feedback, as well as the students’ cognitive processes that emerged from three lesson transcripts. The results show that the teacher only practiced low-level questioning, and gave feedback mostly to accept the students’ answers rather than to challenge their ideas. The authors highlight the need for science teachers to analyze their classroom talk and make recommendations about how to give useful feedback to students to promote higher-order cognitive processes. Furthermore, they make the case for Content Language Integrated Learning as a possible approach to overcome Bruneian students’ English language needs.

Susana Pinto, from Portugal, writes about “Intercultural competence in Higher Education: academics’ perspectives”. The study sought to identify and understand the perspectives of a group of academics who participated in a training program on intercultural competence on the components of this competence and on its relevance for higher education students. Using Deardorff’s (2006) Process Model of Intercultural Competence, the author analyzes the transcripts of two sessions of the training program, as well as observation notes taken on site. She concludes that academics are aware of the multidimensionality of intercultural
competence, acknowledging that it comprises attitudes, knowledge and skills, which are
developed over time and lead to internal and external desired outcomes. Academics also
consider intercultural competence to be crucial for higher education graduates in a context of
internationalization, because it helps them to fight prejudice, empowers them professionally and
prepares them to live in a globalized world. Based on these findings, and considering the central
role that academics play in developing students’ intercultural competence, the author underlines
the importance of promoting professional development programs for academics that allow them
to develop their own intercultural competence and learn how to embed it in the curriculum.

The last three papers of the special issue revolve around the higher education curriculum,
offering new perspectives and approaches. Michael Byram, from the UK, leads the way with a
conceptual paper on “Internationalisation in Higher Education – an internationalist
perspective”. In this paper, the author analyzes some conceptualizations and definitions of
internationalization and explains the concept of internationalism, arguing that it has a moral
dimension that may provide a normative value base for the processes of internationalization.
The author goes on to propose some implications of internationalism for the internationalization
of higher education, namely, for curriculum implementation and design.

Mónica Lourenço, from Portugal, stays on these themes with a paper titled “Internationalizing
teacher education curricula: opportunities for academic staff development”. The paper shares
the results of a study conducted with a group of teacher educators in a Portuguese higher
education institution, which aimed to understand the impact of a 13-month workshop about
internationalization of the curriculum and global education on teachers’ perceived
professional development. Through analyzing teachers’ discourses and interactions during a
focus group session, the author concludes that the workshop presented a meaningful
opportunity for teachers to develop knowledge on global education, reconsider their teaching
practice, (re)discover the importance of collaborative work and assume new commitments to
themselves and to others. The paper concludes with a set of recommendations for a
professional development program in internationalization of the curriculum.

The final paper of this special issue, written by Christy McConnell Moroye and Bruce
Uhrmacher, from the USA, has the seemingly paradoxical title of “Teaching in the moment:
educational experience in the age of tomorrow”. The authors begin by arguing that little
attention is being paid to the quality of present experiences in schools and classrooms, with
institutions and educational actors focusing too much on tests, standards, workforce
development and college readiness. Therefore, based on their own teacher education
practice and on the work of John Dewey, particularly on the notions of continuity and
interaction, the authors propose two types of “present” and “educative” experiences that have
potential to improve educational settings across the globe. These are esthetic experiences –
which they see as comprising connections, risk-taking, sensory experiences, perceptivity and
active engagement – and ecological experiences, involving ecological care,
interconnectedness and integrity. The authors end their paper by urging teachers and teacher
educators to “teach in the moment”, through creating the conditions for meaningful present
experiences for teachers and students that may lead to future growth and engagement.
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Graduates in/for a multicultural and globalising world

David Killick

Abstract

Purpose – This paper aims to question the terminology, modelling and vagueness surrounding the notion of “global citizen” and argues for the more holistic construct of global selfhood as a legitimate goal for graduates who must make their way in a multicultural and globalising world.

Design/methodology/approach – This paper draws upon established education and global citizenship theories to present a model of global graduate attributes. Using this theoretical model, practice implications for learning and teaching in higher education are presented.

Findings – This paper proposes some radical transformations to current practice.

Practical implications – Proposals within the paper offer academics and academic developers tools for reflection on and transformation of practice.

Originality/value – This paper takes forward the often reductive construct of “global citizen” and demonstrates how a more holistic notion of global self can be applied to higher education and graduate outcomes.

Keywords Higher education, Internationalization, Multicultural education, Global citizen, Selfhood

From theory

Global citizenship and global selves

Dewey (1916/2012; Dewey, 2006) argued for an education for democracy, and Paulo Freire argued that it should be for freedom through the development of critical consciousness (Freire, 1998; Freire and Faundez, 1989). The globalising world enlarges the scope of their visions and of the role that an internationalising higher education can play to secure individual freedoms across cultures, geographies and communities – locally and globally. I propose that a global graduate to be someone who has the capabilities to lead a life he/she has reason to value in a multicultural and globalising world. This definition owes much to the capability work of Sen (1999, 2008) and situates all our graduates as people who live in a culturally diverse world in which gender, ethnicity, nationality, social class and many other dimensions of difference materially impact upon an individual’s freedoms to conduct his/her life in ways which will give him/her reason to value it. University education makes a difference to what I refer to as an individual’s subjective capabilities for leading such a life, and today as never before, those capabilities need to be relevant to and applicable within a world in which encounters with diverse others are increasingly commonplace and often contested, and where the impacts we have upon the lives of diverse others are increasingly globally and locally dispersed.

Leading a life he/she has reason to value implies that a graduate’s life stands up to scrutiny and that he/she has reflected upon it and has drawn evidence of its value from how others also see the ways in which he/she leads that life. Unlike many framings of the global citizen, this does not call for any specific kind of active participation (Dower, 2003; Kubow et al., 2000;
Schattle, 2009); active participation requirements are untenable in a world where the capacity for any individual to act are circumscribed by the freedoms afforded by, for example, the intersections (Crenshaw, 1991) of his/her society, material wealth, race and gender.

The second difficulty with many framings of global citizenship is a tendency to focus upon the international impacts of lives (professions, industries and consumption), which neglects to acknowledge the value in more local impacts. Citizenship may not end at home, but it has a place there. A person leading a life he/she has reason to value in a multicultural and globalising world embraces both the local and the international parameters of scrutiny and the communities and contexts within which to base his/her evidence for critical self-reflection.

Where the discourse around global citizenship has emphasised global perspectives and competencies rather than its civic dimensions (Caruana, 2007), there remain other difficulties with the term “global citizen”: it has been appropriated by all manner of causes to describe all ways of being (Urry, 2000, 2003); for some, it implies a viable system of global governance, human rights or rule of law (Anker, 2002); it is an empty signifier in contexts where “citizenship” confers limited or differential rights to “citizens” who belong to different minority groups; it is apparently not open to individuals whose nation is at war (Noddings, 2005); and, most importantly I suggest, it focuses its attention on a specific performance of the self-as-citizen – and so, it is somewhat reductive. How about the self-as-employee or-employer, self-as-parent, self-as-tourist, self-as-romantic or self-as-activist? To lead a life he/she has reason to value requires a sense of self-in-the-world which transcends mere citizenship. Selfhood is a matter of identity; it is an embodiment of how I stand before myself in the world, among others. Self-in-the-world identity is rooted in an ethic and a sensibility which says that we are all equally human, and it is realised in acknowledgements which have their genesis in how we identify ourselves among diverse others. Illustrative examples would be:

I am the kind of person who . . .

- seeks to engage with others in ways which allow them the freedoms to lead lives they have reason to value;
- is inclined to find ways of being which do not depend upon limiting the freedoms of others to lead lives they have reason to value; and
- accepts that the ways in which I choose to conduct my life are not always the ways in which others choose to conduct their lives.

For these reasons, I suggest that universities should be concerned to provide learning and teaching experiences through which students develop dimensions of their identities which will enable them to become global selves, rather than, merely, global citizens, capable of leading lives they have reason to value, given the freedoms that are afforded or denied in the local and global contexts of a multicultural and globalising world.

Generically, we can propose two related sets of subjective capabilities which a graduate who identifies him/her self-in-the-world along the lines indicated above will need (for a detailed curriculum review guidance document, see Killick, 2006):

1. Global perspective capabilities to recognise the ways in which his/her own personal and professional actions, and those of others, impact upon the capabilities of diverse people in diverse contexts to lead lives they have reason to value.

2. Cross-cultural capabilities to conduct his/her personal and professional life among diverse people in diverse contexts in ways which do no harm to their capabilities to lead lives they have reason to value.
Global perspective capabilities

To recognise how others experience the world is at essence a matter of empathy. This may be misunderstood to mean something like “understanding how I would feel in her shoes” when what is really needed is more like “understanding how she feels in her shoes”. Being mindful, and reflecting upon “how this act enhances or diminishes her capabilities to lead a life she has reason to value.” This is akin to adopting an emic perspective (Headland et al., 1990) as used in anthropology or making isomorphic attributions (Triandis, 1994) in cross-cultural psychology. It requires understandings of human lives which recognise the inadequacy of measuring them simply by economic value or by juxtaposing them against “our” values. An action might enhance the economic circumstances of an individual, but if, in so doing, it robs him/her of something else – an aspect of social community, a symbol of moral value, a sense of personal worth – it risks, on balance, reducing his/her capability to lead a life he/she has reason to value. A global perspective requires:

- **knowledge** of some of the ways of the world, of how cultures, large and small, give different shapes to what brings people joy and sorrow or of how actions here can impact lives there;
- **dispositions** to apply that knowledge and a will to bring it to bear when acting in the world in whatever ways are open to me;
- **skills** to critique information and reflect upon meanings; and
- **emotional intelligence** within which empathy can flourish.

Cross-cultural capabilities

Human beings tend to live in communities and have built communities of many varieties in many contexts. This attests to the human capacity to live with others and to do so in diverse contexts. However, it seems that coming together in community leads us to favour the ways in which that particular community enacts its ways of being together and the social structures which in some ways demarcate the “best” way of being. Once established, our communities tend not to encourage deviation from their self-created norms. Self-identity is wrapped up in community, and in the rituals of community, and possibly also in the values of community – though I have some doubts concerning just how widely fundamental human values themselves do actually differ across most communities. Cross-cultural capability requires:

- **knowledge** about the mundane ways in which cultures are enacted and communicated;
- **dispositions** to bring that knowledge to bear to ease the flow of intercultural encounters and communications;
- **skills** to monitor and modify one’s own behaviours to ease those same flows; and
- **emotional intelligence** within which resilience and self-efficacy can flourish.

To practice

The practice of learning and teaching in higher education is not the only arena for the development of global-self capabilities, but for those who are privileged to attend university, it is a significant one. As illustrated above, required capabilities span learning dimensions, demanding attention for building the knowledge, dispositions, skills and emotional intelligence. Important aspects within learning and teaching practices for the development of global selfhood are the degrees to which:

- the **learning environment** is designed to reflect and promote principles of academic equity;
the formal curriculum is designed to develop cross-cultural capability and global perspectives; and

learning activities are designed to enable students to engage in equitable, intercultural experiences and reciprocal learning.

Space restrictions allow only a brief consideration of each of these, but all are needed, and as indicated, all need design. There is ample evidence suggesting that simply bringing together diverse students, whether internationally or locally, does little to promote mutual learning, and when conditions for intercultural contact are unequal, competitive or lacking in authority-support, they may even advance stereotyping and prejudice (Allport, 1979/1954; Pettigrew and Tropp, 2008). Education risks devaluing and destroying the cultural integrity of students from minority groups by a recognition, only, of the validity of majority values and perspectives (Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2013). For diversity to bring about the kinds of learning gain which will develop global selves without diminishing local identities, each of these dimensions of practice needs to be designed, and critically reviewed, for that end.

Learning environments

All learning environments – on-line, face-to-face, local and international – are populated by diverse students and diverse faculty. The parameters of that diversity vary by context and shift over time. Current activities in internationalising higher education are adding to student and faculty diversity and to the range of national and cultural contexts in which even a single programme might be delivered and experienced. Whether a particular cohort, campus or institution is diverse across multiple dimensions or “only” with regard to students’ preferred approaches to learning and prior educational experience, designing it to neither advantage nor disadvantage any individual or group of students is the foundational principle of academic equity. Students and faculty are the most significant elements of a learning environment; how they envision and engage with their diverse peers is the largest factor in determining the degree to which that environment is inclusive. Environments in which some people are excluded, segregated, discriminated against or set within a deficit model cannot support equitable learning and teaching practice. Nor can they create the conditions in which encounters between diverse students or students and faculty build either self-efficacy or empathy.

When thinking of an equitable and inclusive learning environment which promotes capabilities for a multicultural and globalising world, some of the particular design considerations are:

- diverse, majority and minority voices are sought out, heard and critiqued at all levels and in all forums and functions of the organisation;
- media displayed in any format and context represents a wide variety of diverse others in non-tokenistic ways, which do not demean or pander to stereotypes;
- learning and non-learning spaces are, and feel, safe, accessible, welcoming and empowering for all;
- any form of non-inclusive behaviour is challenged and seen to be challengeable; and
- the institution is transparent about its business practices and evidences how it takes corporate social responsibility, along with local and global stakeholder impact, seriously across its activities.

These are not small considerations and are always likely to need continuous attention, but institutions which call for their students to work towards global selfhood need to evidence that they are similarly striving to embody the same capabilities. The learning environments
which they create *inhibit* or *enable* global selfhood learning; they are not neutral spaces; and their messages cannot be left to chance.

**Formal curriculum**

In this context, formal curriculum refers to that which is set down within a course, module or programme documentation as the intended learning outcomes and content upon which a student will be assessed. Although many students enjoy freedoms with regard to modules or courses which might contribute to their full programme of study, required elements within their programmes, the “mainstream curriculum”, really define what it is to be a student of BA *x* rather than a student of BSc *y*. Effective practice in curriculum design means that outcomes associated with global selfhood are *required* and *assessed* elements within the mainstream curriculum. Otherwise, they carry less import, risk being seen as peripheral to the discipline and may be “escapable”. Perhaps radically, this practice model requires that students who do not develop global selfhood capabilities are unfit to graduate.

This is a weighty proposition. But the capabilities of those who are privileged to graduate from higher education, who become professionals, leaders, influencers, parents, role models and citizens, in a multicultural and globalising world is a weighty matter.

In such a model, the *design* of the mainstream curriculum and its assessment does not confine itself to disciplinary skills and knowledge but seeks to be personally transformative. It deliberately and systematically:

- *embeds* the capabilities of the global graduate *within* disciplinary learning outcomes;
- *incorporates and critiques* diverse disciplinary perspectives, models, practices and their impacts upon different peoples in different contexts, and it does so, attentive to the dangers of domination by those of majority groups;
- *enables* students to communicate with and dwell among peoples whose norms, rituals, beliefs and practices do not accord with their own; and
- *builds* a sense of identity, self-efficacy and emotional intelligence which underpin the *willingness and the inclination* to engage with the challenges associated with working with others to find common ground and workable solutions.

**Learning activities**

Learning activities can be thought of as an interaction space in which the formal curriculum meets the learning environment. The practice of building inclusive and equitable learning environments *aligns* with the practice of designing curriculum to build global graduate capabilities through the creation of learning activities within which all students can engage with each other and their learning equitably. Activities which facilitate and reward such ways of being include those in which students:

- collaborate rather than compete;
- are situated as expert informants;
- take responsibility for their learning *process*;
- take responsibility for their communications and interactions with peers;
- critique disciplinary knowledge and practice from alternative perspectives;
- recognise own perspectives as limited and limiting; and
- dismantle structures which give groups or individuals differential prestige or power.
Bringing students from diverse cultures, locally and internationally, into interactive learning activities is a significant social act. The educational outcomes of that act extend far beyond learning about the discipline. This is inescapable, and to neglect to design those activities in ways which will enhance the capabilities of all students to live lives they have reason to value within a multicultural and globalising world is irresponsible.

Faculty development

Learning and teaching practices are designed and delivered by faculty. Building practice in which global selfhood is an identified graduate outcome within the mainstream curriculum depends upon the faculty believing in its legitimacy and having the capabilities to develop and sustain learning environments, curricula and activities which are aligned towards that end. University policies and faculty development programmes are necessary to motivate, recognise and reward and support faculty in this work. Current developments within internationalisation are creating new opportunities for international and intercultural student learning partnerships, for global and local collaborative projects, and for building reciprocal learning communities for diversely situated students. They are opening similar opportunities for the academic community. The landscapes of academic practice (Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trainner, 2015) are newly complex, situating faculty at times as experts and at other times as novices as they traverse physical and virtual learning communities and contexts. Faculty cannot secure global selfhood for their students unless they are able to anchor their own identities and practice within the same frame. This requires a new understanding of the role and the scope of faculty development (Killick, 2015, 2018) if it is to build faculty capabilities to also lead lives they have reason to value in their tumultuous multicultural and globalising worlds.

Although this discussion has been principally situated in the contexts of internationalisation, it has direct relevance to diversity and multicultural education. Significant progress could be made by meaningful collaboration across the expertise within each of these fields (Killick, 2017; Olson et al., 2007).
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Concurrent direct assessment of foundation skills for general education
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Abstract

Purpose – There is considerable agreement around the foundation skills required by employers that will enable graduates to integrate and devise promising solutions for the challenges faced by knowledge and globalized societies. These are life skills (communication skills, teamwork and leadership skills, language skills in reading and writing and information literacy), transferable skills (such as problem-solving, including critical thinking, creativity and quantitative reasoning) and technology skills (search for knowledge and build upon it). Foundation skills, however, are recognized to be difficult both to teach and assess. This paper aims to describe a performance assessment method to assess and measure these skills in a uniquely concurrent way – the General Education Foundation Skills Assessment (GEFSA).

Design/methodology/approach – The GEFSA framework comprises a scenario/case describing an unresolved contemporary issue, which engages student groups in online discussions, and a task-specific analytic rubric to concurrently assess the extent to which students have attained the targeted foundation skills. The method was applied in three semesters – during 2016 and 2017. These students were non-native English speaking students in a General Education program at a university in the UAE.

Findings – Results obtained from the rubric for each foundation skill were analyzed and interpreted to ensure robustness of method and tool usability and reliability, provide insight into, and commentary on, the respective skill attainment levels and assist in establishing realistic target ranges for General Education student skill attainment. The results showed that the method is valid and provides valuable data for curriculum development.

Originality/value – This is the first method in published literature that directly assesses the foundation skills for General Education students simultaneously, thus providing educators with valuable data on the skill level of the students. Additionally, repeated use of the method is a valuable way of teaching skills.

Keywords Soft skills, Measurement, Transferable skills, Rubric, 21st century skills, Performance task

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

To succeed in the academic discipline of their choosing and subsequently in their employment, freshly graduated students from bachelor’s degrees must demonstrate proficiency in foundation skills. Foundation skills are critical to the development and growth of knowledge economies and are required for entry-level employees. These skills comprise three areas:

1. *life skills*, which are critical to learning, such as communication in English (reading, writing and speaking) and numeracy (digital literacy and mathematics);

2. *transferable skills*, which facilitate application of existing knowledge to new situations, such as collaboration, problem-solving, critical thinking, self-management and quantitative reasoning; and

3. *technology skills*, which are necessary to comprehend, analyze and use technology for multiple purposes and build upon it [Andrews and Higson, 2008; Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2013; Australian Government Department of
The majority of quality assurance organizations at the professional programmatic level and institutional accreditation at the regional or national levels now require programs to show evidence of student attainment of foundation skill outcomes. Examples include, but are not limited to, ABET (formerly known as the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology), the Commission for Academic Accreditation in the UAE, Middle States Commission on Higher Education, the Quality Framework Emirates and the Australian Quality Framework. Zayed University, the institution where this study was conducted, has six institution-wide learning outcomes, known as Zayed University Learning Outcomes (ZULO), which are aligned with the above definition of foundation skills. These are information literacy (IL), technological literacy (TL), critical thinking and quantitative reasoning (CTQR), global awareness (GA), language (LA) and leadership (LS), as illustrated in Table I. Student attainment of the institution’s learning outcomes is assessed at the college and programmatic levels on a regular basis. Results from the assessments spur dialogue and action in college and program assessment committees for continuous improvement and quality assurance reporting purposes, as well as to guide program curriculum development.

While employers value foundation skills, students seem to be under prepared and teachers lack substantial knowledge and skills to teach these skills (National Academies Press, 2017; Shuman et al., 2005). Thus, there is a need for practical (i.e. accurate, relevant and useful) teaching and assessment methods of foundation skills. Many measurement instruments already exist. However, they evaluate each skill distinctly from one another. Incongruent measurement tools not designed to complement one another are insufficient for data-driven curriculum decision-making (Schoepp et al., 2016). This constraint can be problematic for accurate and useful assessment of skill attainment. The method described in this paper enables precise, concurrent and actionable skills’ development and assessment to address these practical challenges. This paper summarizes the development of the General Education Foundation Skills Assessment (GEFSA) over a two-year institutional research incentive funded project. Furthermore, it describes the findings to date to create the GEFSA as a direct method to demonstrate student attainment of foundation skills for program-level assessment purposes in a General Education environment (i.e. pre-major) at a large public university in the UAE. The paper, then, proposes an extension to the GEFSA framework, which would cover a complete baccalaureate program. Such an extension would allow assessment of students’ skill levels at relevant checkpoints throughout their baccalaureate experience.

Table I  ZULO

| Critical thinking and quantitative reasoning (CTQR) | Graduates will be able to demonstrate competence in understanding, evaluating, and using both qualitative and quantitative information to explore issues, solve problems, and develop informed opinions |
| Leadership (LS) | Graduates will be able to undertake leadership roles and responsibilities, interacting effectively with others to accomplish shared goals |
| Technological Literacy (TL) | Graduates will be able to effectively understand, use, and evaluate technology both ethically and securely in an evolving global society |
| Language (L) | Graduates will be able to communicate effectively in English and Modern Standard Arabic, using the academic and professional conventions of these languages appropriately |
| Global Awareness (GA) | Graduates will be able to understand and value their own and other cultures, perceiving and reacting to differences from an informed and socially responsible point of view |
| Information Literacy (IL) | Graduates will be able to find, evaluate and use appropriate information from multiple sources to respond to a variety of needs |
Regional context

The assessment of student learning outcomes is crucial when discussing issues of pedagogy, higher education accountability and employability of fresh graduates. In short, what have graduates learned at the end of their undergraduate education and how do institutions of higher education know that with reasonable accuracy? This focus on learning outcomes is also underway in the Middle East Gulf region, as stakeholders continue to advance the priority of student learning and its relationship to employability.

Regional governments have recognized the strategic role that a highly skilled and educated workforce can play (UAE, 2010, 2014). Youth unemployment is a serious issue in the Arab region. Unemployment rates among the (Arab) youth (27 per cent) significantly exceed the global rate (12.6 per cent) (UNDP, 2014). As costs for education have far outstripped inflation, and consumers (primarily students and their families) have become more educated and demanding, there have been increasing calls for evidence that what is being promised is being delivered. Regionally, the core mission of higher education is ensuring that students become productive members of society with the requisite skills for gainful employment. However, numerous reports point to a notable misalignment between the knowledge, skills and attitudes demonstrated by university graduates in the Middle East, and in particular the Gulf region, and those desired by employers (Ernst & Young, 2015; UNDP, 2012, 2014).

In Perspectives on GCC Youth Employment 2014, 71 per cent of the 100 employers surveyed stated that the public educational systems do not adequately prepare graduates for the workplace (Ernst & Young, 2014). Yet, in striking contrast, 68 per cent of UAE youth surveyed replied that the educational system prepared them well for entry-level positions. The set of recommendations from this report are daunting, urging governments to “reform national skills and education models […] and rethink how education is provided to deliver the ultimate objective of work-ready young adults” (Ernst & Young, 2014, p. 11).

Zayed University, a public university in the UAE, faces the same foundation skills, competency and employability issues. Admirably, the UAE Government has been proactive in attempts to address future youth employment. In 2010, the UAE Government launched the UAE 2021 National Vision; one of its four goals is to be one of the most competitive knowledge economies in the world (UAE, 2010). Later, the UAE 2021 Vision set national performance indicators, two of which relate to the knowledge economy and employment of national youth in the private sector to alleviate citizen unemployment (UAE, 2014). Respectively, the targets for 2021 are a 5 per cent Emiratization rate in the private sector (from 0.65 per cent in 2013) and the share of Emirati knowledge workers in the workforce to increase from 20 per cent in 2013 to 40 per cent.

Zayed University is a UAE federal institution with campuses in Abu Dhabi and Dubai that primarily serve Emirati nationals in a gender-segregated environment, with most courses conducted in English. With a student population of approximately 9,500 (8,000 female and 1,500 male students), nearly all of whom are undergraduate students of 18-22 years of age with no work experience, the university strives to deliver programs that meet international standards to ensure graduating students are prepared to contribute to and promote the social and economic well-being of UAE society and the professions. Related to these ambitions, the university was established in 1998 as an outcomes-based institution with a focus on quality. This quality commitment has been manifested through attainment of a number of international accreditations. In 2008, the university first became accredited by the US-based Middle States Commission on Higher Education, and since that time, it has achieved accreditation through the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and ABET. The university’s commitment to an outcomes-based approach to education and continuous improvement
through assessment of student learning outcomes was recognized officially by the US-based National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment.

The University College is responsible for teaching and assessing student attainment of the university learning outcomes over the course of a mandatory General Education program, and all courses are taught in English by faculty across disciplines. The University College curriculum offers a foundation education experience to students and prepares them for their future majors and eventual employment. The experience is intended to install in the students a desire for lifelong learning, foster intellectual curiosity and engender critical thinking. Over three semesters, students take courses in global studies, English writing, mathematics, information technology and science, in addition to life skills and innovation/entrepreneurship courses. Because the university learning outcomes are institutional learning outcomes, they are necessarily broad, which, in turn, makes it challenging for instructors to design learning interventions and assessments for meaningful measurement of outcomes attainment in courses. To meet this challenge, the GEFSA has been designed and implemented as a performance assessment task underpinned by the university learning outcomes. A definition of each General Education foundation skill, A-F, and the ZULO alignment are outlined in Table II.

The General Education Foundation Skills Assessment method and measurement tool

The GEFSA is a performance assessment. Performance assessments are designed to elicit and measure complex thought processes necessary for deep learning by asking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II</th>
<th>GEFSA rubric skills, definitions and alignment with university learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill A [CTQR]</strong> Demonstrate competence in understanding and evaluating information (qualitative and/or quantitative) to solve problems and propose solutions</td>
<td>Definition: Students clearly frame the problem(s) raised in the scenario with reasonable accuracy and identify approaches that could address the problem(s). Students recognize relevant stakeholders and their perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill B [LS]</strong> Interact within a group to accomplish shared goals</td>
<td>Definition: Students (guided by supplied prompts) work to understand the task and develop a solution. Students work together to address the problems raised in the task by acknowledging, building on, critiquing and clarifying each other’s ideas to come to consensus and attain a group solution. Students encourage participation and respect of all team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill C [TL]</strong> Understand and evaluate technologies and their use ethically, and where appropriate, securely in an evolving modern society</td>
<td>Definition: Students can understand the use, describe the responsibilities and have an awareness of the ethical issues of technology use in modern society, which may include, but are not limited to: the social and security considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill D [LA]</strong> Comprehend and communicate using academic and professional language conventions</td>
<td>Definition: Students adopt appropriate reading and writing strategies to communicate effectively. Students communicate clearly, coherently and concisely, with appropriate level of professional diction and tone. Students are able to develop main ideas with sufficient detail and explanation, drawing upon accurate comprehension of information. Students demonstrate accuracy of grammar and mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill E [GA]</strong> Examine a global issue, propose solutions, and assess impact locally on individuals, organizations, and society</td>
<td>Definition: Students analyze the local implications of both the problem and possible solutions on individuals, organizations, and society within the UAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill F [IL]</strong> Locate, evaluate and use relevant information to respond to a variety of situational needs</td>
<td>Definition: Students refer to and examine the information and reliability of sources. Students identify what they know and do not know and show an ability to provide additional sources (primary and secondary) to support the discussion and extend their knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participants to solve realistic or authentic problems. Participants in a performance assessment demonstrate evidence of their knowledge and application of it by developing a process or a product. A performance assessment typically has three components to measure the quality of the performance (Johnson et al., 2009):

1. a task that elicits the performance;
2. the performance itself (which is the event or artifact to be assessed); and
3. a criterion-referenced instrument, such as a rubric.

Accordingly, the GEFSA comprises:

- a scenario and prompts as an on-line discussion performance task;
- the student team discussion transcripts as responses; and
- the GEFSA analytic rubric as the criterion-referenced instrument to measure the quality of the student team performance of foundation skills.

To ensure the robustness of the performance assessment, four support instruments were developed:

1. scenario development guidelines;
2. scenario prompts;
3. a student survey tool; and
4. a faculty survey tool.

A scenario describes a current real-world issue, which is complex with many facets and has no clear solution. Credible news sources and academic articles are used as sources. The scenarios are carefully crafted in accordance with the GEFSA scenario guidelines (Table III) to ensure that each individual scenario elicits the GEFSA skills equally. The scenarios are checked against the guidelines by at least three reviewers and are amended if necessary before approval for use. Sample scenario topics include obesity and the economy; conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table III</th>
<th>Scenario creation guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not focused or dependent on one discipline</td>
<td>The scenario involves more than one discipline. The issue/problem in the scenario should be appropriate to be tackled by an interdisciplinary group at any level in the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>The complex and multifaceted scenario has multiple stakeholders including public, private and global groups, and individual constituents. The diversity of stakeholders is representative of a problem with ethical, societal/cultural, economic, environmental, and global concerns. Any solution requires all critical stakeholders to be on board with the solution(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real and relevant problem</td>
<td>The scenario has some kind of unresolved problem, tension, a disagreement, or competing perspectives on how to address the problem. The problem is not written in a way that intentionally bias readers or plays on their emotions. The problem will be relevant for five to 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>The scenario must be both local and global. The goal is to show students that the problem presented is a local/regional problem and also an international problem. Local/regional examples and international examples must be given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative data</td>
<td>The scenario includes some quantitative data for students to interpret as they tackle the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicits engagement</td>
<td>The scenario draws in the reader and engages the student group in deep discussions because the problem is complex and multifaceted without an obvious, quick fix solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>The scenario has references (around five) from varied sources such as refereed journal articles, solid news sources, and publications from professional societies. The selection of references is objective and balanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate for course use</td>
<td>The scenario is suitably complex for a 14-day online discussion. There should be no pictures or tables. Lists are acceptable. The written text must be no more than 1.5 pages, 12-point font, and 1.5 spacing, (600-700 words total, excluding references), and an F-K level not exceeding 12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
minerals; clean energy; cybersecurity; energy critical elements; water resources; e-waste; control of the Web; and privacy online. An example of a scenario may be found in Ater Kranov et al. (2014).

The GEFSA evolved as an adaptation of an existing performance task assessment—Computing Professional Skills Assessment (CPSA) (Danaher et al., 2016)—that was designed to evaluate the professional skills for both course and program assessment purposes in the field of computing. The GEFSA design steps and associated support instruments are outlined by Rhodes et al. (2016), and survey feedback from student and faculty is presented. The surveys showed that both students and faculty were convinced that the assessment method contributes to the improvement in foundation skills.

The GEFSA features four aspects that, together, make it unique in existing foundation skills assessments:

1. It is the only direct method in literature that can be used to both teach and measure the targeted learning outcomes for General Education students.
2. The scenario content language readability statistics are at or below 12 on the Flesch–Kinkaid scale so that it can be used for students entering tertiary education, as well as students of varying levels, abilities and backgrounds.
3. It asks students to connect global issues to the local country context (in this case the UAE).
4. It assists students in the process of moving from a rote learning approach traditionally taught in secondary schools in the UAE and many countries to a more active, problem-solving approach that enables greater success in increasingly global university settings.

In addition, discipline specific colleges and/or programs can use GEFSA data to inform curricula and facilitate student transition from General Education programs to individual majors.

The GEFSA task-specific analytic rubric was designed to be used by raters in evaluating the extent to which student groups attained the targeted foundation skills. As an example, one skill from the rubric is shown in Table IV in a slightly condensed form where definitions of the outcomes and rater comment fields are omitted.

Implementation and findings

Spring 2016 pilot study process

During Spring semester 2016, the GEFSA was implemented twice for 14-day periods in two General Education courses, totaling 47 third semester students using scenarios on clean energy, and obesity and the economy. To ensure participation, the activity was a mandatory course requirement and was graded. Students (males and females of 18-20 years of age) were placed randomly in groups of five-six and were required to make between four and six posts to an online discussion board. Students were given instructions and prompts to guide their discussion.

Revised discussion board prompts. Imagine that you are part of an interdisciplinary team working together for a government organization on the issues raised in the scenario. Consider the following guiding questions as your team reaches a consensus to identify possible solutions:

- Identify the primary and secondary problem/s.
- Who are the major stakeholders and what are their perspectives?
- What are some of the ethical, social and security issues involved?
- What are possible approaches to address the problems? Do these approaches have their own disadvantages?

- What are the local implications/impacts of both the problem/s and possible solutions (on individuals, organizations and society)?

- What, if any, additional information would you need to effectively address the problem/s?

The first run of the activity was primarily to familiarize the students with the process because they had not previously experienced discussion boards or problem-solving in teams in a similar manner. This practice intervention, often referred to as scaffolding, is considered essential and is an excellent learning activity as the students get to practice the foundation skills.

Following completion of the task, the student transcripts were distributed to each member of the rating team. The rating team participated in a calibration session where the goal was to come to a common understanding of the GEFSA rubric’s individual dimension descriptors and agree on what constitutes evidence of a given descriptor and scale level as represented in the student work. Calibration of rating teams is a critical aspect of ensuring both the reliability of the raters’ scores and accuracy of the rubric to differentiate between outcomes, as the process of calibration typically leads to refinement of the rubric (Holmes and Oakleaf, 2013; University of Hawaii Manoa, 2013). Because the rubric was in its developmental stages, complete rater consensus was not expected. During the calibration process, scores from each of the raters were recorded and the mean was calculated (rounding up was applied if necessary) to generate the overall score for each of the outcomes.

Rubric development and use experts tend to agree that the levels of agreement between raters should be 70 per cent or greater, so this was the target for both the complete instrument and the individual outcomes (Stemler, 2004). Inter-rater reliability was calculated through the simplest of methods – a simple count of cases receiving the same ratings divided by the total number of cases.

The discussion board transcripts were analyzed for both student performance and refinement of the rubric. The rating process was conducted as follows: each team member

---

Table IV  GEFSA rubric for Skill B: interact within a group to accomplish shared goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 – Missing</th>
<th>1 – Emerging</th>
<th>2 – Developing</th>
<th>3 – Practicing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task orientation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discussion and consensus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Task orientation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discussion and consensus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are totally off task</td>
<td>Students do not acknowledge or encourage participation of others</td>
<td>Students use only a few of the prompts to guide their discussion Students are unaware that they have gotten off task</td>
<td>Students begin to acknowledge other students’ ideas Students begin to notice who is and who is not participating Students may make attempts to bring others into the discussion Students may pose individual opinions without linking to what others say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use most of the prompts to guide their discussion Students occasionally get off task. They are aware that they have gotten off task and may work to get back on task</td>
<td>Students acknowledge and build upon and/or clarify other students’ ideas</td>
<td>Students use the entire set of prompts to guide their discussion Students are nearly always on task, and are able to recognize when they are off task and work to get back on task successfully</td>
<td>Students weigh different ideas, evaluate effectiveness of each leading to some successful attempts at reaching consensus Students thoughtfully acknowledge, build on, critique and clarify others’ ideas with some success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scored the discussions of the groups on the skills, making notes on the transcript and the rubric page; then the team compared scores and discussed all differences at length to reach consensus; during the discussion, notes were made on areas for rubric improvement.

**Spring 2016 pilot findings**

The attainment levels on the rubric are: 0 – missing; 1 – emerging; 2 – developing; and 3 – practicing. Our rubric was designed with the expectation that by the end of their General Education studies (third semester), students would score around 2 or be in the lower end of the range 2-3. The results obtained in Spring 2016 are as follows and reveal lower levels of skill achievement than expected: A (critical thinking and quantitative reasoning) – 1.7; B (leadership) – 1.5; C (technological literacy) – 1.1; D (language) – 2.0; E (global awareness) – 1.5; F (information literacy) – 1.0.

These results were not necessarily surprising as this was the first time the GEFSA had been used by students and faculty. We see the results as a baseline measure, and the scores revealed areas for improvement in student learning, curriculum and teaching practice that need to be addressed. For example, in information literacy, the students scored particularly low, so the reasons for this should be investigated and interventions should be planned and enacted.

The rating team observed that constraints imposed by the first drafts of both the scenario prompts provided to the students and the rubric used by the raters could also be factors contributing to the lower ratings. To determine the necessary interventions, we first investigated the scenario prompts. When a scenario is given to students, it is necessary to provide prompts to guide the students in their work. The prompts are designed so that they follow typical steps in problem-solving, and particularly that they elicit responses that are indicative of performance on all six skills. We noticed a number of misalignments between the prompts and the rubric. The rubric prescribes that students work toward reaching a consensus to identify possible solutions; students identify, where possible, any social and security issues; students consider possible disadvantages for proposed solutions; students should identify the local impacts of the scenario problem on various constituencies. These aspects were not clear in the scenario prompts given to the students in Spring 2016, so the prompts were revised to those shown in revised discussion board prompts.

Next, we investigated the GEFSA Rubric. When using the rubric, we found that it was difficult for the raters to apply it consistently to students’ posts with confidence. This was due to two factors:

1. Attainment levels 1 and 2 shared a common criterion for the performance indicators, making it difficult for a rater to decide whether to assign a 1 or a 2.
2. Wording of the criteria at any or all attainment levels for the respective skills and their performance indicators was sometimes ambiguous and sometimes insufficient for a rater to confidently assign a rating.

To address these issues, which are an integral part of establishing the basic reliability and validity of rubrics, specific criteria were written for each of the levels and were reviewed to ensure vertical alignment across rubric outcomes and levels, as well as horizontal alignment as articulated across the levels 0, 1, 2 and 3 for each outcome and performance indicator. This was done for each of the six foundation skills outcomes of the rubric. One skill on the revised GEFSA Rubric is shown in Table IV.

**Fall 2016 findings**

In Fall 2016, the GEFSA was conducted twice over 14-day periods in two classes, totaling 45 third semester General Education students with scenarios on e-waste and cybersecurity,
by using the same methodology previously described for the Spring 2016 pilot process. As before, the discussion board student transcripts were analyzed for student performance, as well as to determine whether the modifications made to student discussion board prompts and to the rubric, as described above, were effective and/or whether further refinements were needed. We expected results to be around 2 or in the lower end of the range of 2-3 – essentially, most students to be at the developing stage (2) of each of the foundation skills, with some perhaps at the practicing stage (3). The results from the revised GEFSA rubric, presented in Table V, reveal higher levels of skill achievement compared to Spring 2016.

The attainment levels are in the target range for Skills A, B and D (problem-solving, leadership and language). Attainment levels for Skills E and F are still low, indicating areas for improvement in global awareness and information literacy. This indicates that a pedagogical intervention is needed to investigate a possible underlying curriculum gap causing the low achievement. Skill C, technological literacy, at an attainment level of 2, is at the low end of the target range. This could indicate that students are using technology to acquire information, but not necessarily than building upon it.

As students in the Spring 2016 and Fall 2016 groups were all from Semester 3, we interpret the higher levels of attainment as a positive reflection of the interventions applied to previously identified constraints with the task prompts supplied to the students and the refinements/improvements made to the rubric. These revisions facilitated a more consistent application of the rubric by the raters.

**Spring 2017 findings**

The method was conducted with first semester students in Spring 2017. It was expected that there would be noticeable differences in attainment levels of first semester students compared to the third semester students. We expected average ratings for foundation skills of first semester students to be around 1 – emerging. The activity was conducted twice over 14-day periods in two classes, totaling 30 students using scenarios on obesity and the economy and cybersecurity. As before, the student transcripts for the second discussion were analyzed using the same version of the rubric as for Fall 2016. The results from our rubric are given in Table V and reveal, as expected, lower levels of skill achievement compared to third semester students.

**Limitations and future work**

The results of this trial suggest that the GEFSA can consistently elicit and measure the foundation skills of students in a General Education program. While the sample size was small and the rubric is in the early stage of its development, the results suggest that this approach promises to be an effective way to measure the foundation skills. As the results to date are encouraging, work is continuing on the refinement and improvement of the method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill (with ZULO counterpart in brackets)</th>
<th>Spring 2016&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (third semester)</th>
<th>Fall 2016&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (third semester)</th>
<th>Spring 2017&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (first semester)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. (Critical thinking and quantitative reasoning)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. (Leadership)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. (Technological literacy)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. (Language)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. (Global awareness)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. (Information literacy)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: <sup>a</sup> Results from the pilot study; <sup>b</sup> Results from the revised GEFSA rubric
and rubric. While the scenarios appear to be working in that they foster discussion and are linguistically accessible to the students, the degree to which the discussion prompts are emphasized is still being evaluated. In addition, the scenario development guidelines were adapted from CPSA, so further examination and possible amendment of these guidelines is required to ensure a best fit for a General Education program. The rubric itself continues to undergo modification as part of the calibration and assessment process. Where there are inter-rater differences, discussions occur to come to rating consensus or to offer suggestions for ways to improve the rubric. Further rounds of implementation of the GEFSA are required to establish more robust reliability and validity of the method and the measurement tool as applied in this specific setting. In coming semesters, the method will be used with a larger number of first, second and third semester students.

Other future work will be as part of a new research project to develop a University Foundation Skills Assessment (UFSA) framework by extending the core analytic rubric of GEFSA and building upon the experiences of past years. As previously mentioned, the GEFSA is an adaption of the CPSA used for major students in the discipline of computing. The CPSA rubric, developed by a team from the same university, has a continuum of six levels (0-5) to indicate student attainment of the professional skills within the context of computing majors. The GEFSA rubric has a shorter continuum of four levels (0-3) to indicate student attainment of foundation skills within a General Education program context. Our research will examine each level and will include adding two attainment levels – maturing and mastering – as in the CPSA. The maturing level is where students are generally expected to be at graduation. The mastering level is the expectation for postgraduate students. Additionally, the research plans to identify minimal attainment foundation skill levels for all students at relevant checkpoints during their baccalaureate program. Suggested levels are shown in Table VI with comments.

The proposed attainment levels will provide additional data points as input for college-wide curricular development and pedagogical practices. The vision is that these levels can be realized across the institution, as the proposed UFSA framework is migrated to the various colleges in the university.

Conclusion

This paper outlined how the GEFSA can provide an opportunity for a concurrent direct assessment of student attainment of foundation skills in a General Education program. The results from the most recent GEFSA implementations have suggested that the method can measure the skills. The method will be further refined to inform recommended skill attainment levels at entry and exit points in the university’s General Education program to indicate expected progression in skill attainment over time. This

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement point in Baccalaureate</th>
<th>Skill level expectation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 – beginning of general education (Semester 1)</td>
<td>1.0–</td>
<td>Students mostly in the lower end of the emerging band with some weaker students in the missing band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 – end of general education (Semester 3)</td>
<td>2.0–</td>
<td>Students mostly in the lower end developing band with some weaker students in the upper end of the emerging band as they complete their General Education requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 – Semester 6</td>
<td>2.5+</td>
<td>Students mostly in the upper end of the developing band and some in practicing as they complete the third semester in their major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 – Semester 8</td>
<td>3.5+</td>
<td>Students mostly in the upper end of the practicing band and some in maturing as they graduate from their major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will enable General Education courses to begin to address shortcomings identified in foundation skills through application of the GEFSA. Further work is being planned to develop an institutional foundation skills assessment framework by extending the GEFSA rubric. This would be used to identify and measure attainment of foundation skills levels for students at various points during their baccalaureate program.
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Abstract
Purpose – International terrorism affects various areas of society. This paper aims to determine whether fear of terrorism is a barrier to international student mobility based on the opinions of representatives from four universities of the European International Business Week network.

Design/methodology/approach – Data were obtained through interviews with representatives of four universities. Two universities are located in relatively “safe” countries (Czech Republic and Finland), whereas the other two are located in countries recently hit by terrorist attacks (Brussels and Paris). The interviews were conducted between December 2016 and April 2017.

Findings – Terrorist attacks affected international student mobility in the two universities recently hit by terrorist attacks.

Research limitations/implications – The research findings are relatively significant because they show how terrorist attacks can influence international student mobility. However, data are still limited. Data from other universities are necessary to verify causality.

Practical implications – The internationalisation of higher education is a strategic goal for many higher education institutions (HEIs). However, international terrorism may affect this goal. Understanding the impact of terrorism can be valuable in preparing policies for promoting the internationalisation of HEI.

Social implications – International terrorism is increasingly an issue for many people and organisations, including HEI. Understanding how terrorism affects economies and societies can be crucial for policymakers and for citizens living in or visiting areas endangered by terrorism.

Originality/value – The paper describes the immediate impact of two terrorist attacks on international student mobility. The paper presents the fear of terrorist attacks and the shock caused by terrorism as major barriers to international student mobility.

Keywords Fear, Higher education, Internationalisation, Brussels bombings

Paper type Research paper

Introduction
There has been recent unprecedented development in human mobility. Some people migrate because of serious problems such as wars or natural disasters; others migrate seeking a better life (Beck et al., 2013). Altbach and Teichler (2001) noted that academic mobility, as part of the internationalisation of higher education institutions (HEIs), is increasing significantly. Indeed, the international activities of HEI have expanded dramatically in volume, scope and complexity in the twenty-first century (Brooks and Walters, 2013; de Wit, 2011; Pesik and Gounko, 2011). As Gacel-Ávila (2005) state, internationalisation strategies are crucial for modern education and represent a central focus of HEI worldwide. This process can be defined as “integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of (postsecondary) education” (Knight, 2003, p. 1).

In the past, several studies have been conducted on the internationalisation of higher education. Teichler (2009) focused on three areas related to HEI internationalisation: knowledge transfer, international education and research and cross-boarding communication.
Other authors have focused on the internationalisation strategies of universities and colleges, notably academic programmes, including exchange programmes, cross-cultural training, joint/double degree programmes and visiting lecturers; research and scholarly collaborations, such as research projects and agreements; and extra-curricular programmes, such as domestic and international student associations (Knight, 2008; Maringe and Foskett, 2010).

Various recent studies exploring student mobility emphasise the complexity of the motivations, as well as the barriers. The most important motivators include improved foreign language skills, personal growth, potential employability and even intention to emigrate (Altbach, 2016; Brooks and Walters, 2013; Deakin, 2012; Van Mol, 2013). Carlson (2015) highlights the role of specific psychological and personal traits. Various studies related with student mobility (Jahr and Teichler, 2002; King et al., 2010; Van Mol, 2013) have repeatedly revealed that the likelihood of the decision to study or work abroad is influenced by the students’ socio-economic background, previous travel experiences and family members and friends who are or have lived abroad.

Traditional barriers to student mobility include insufficient language knowledge and financial limitations (Findlay et al., 2006; González et al., 2011; Verbik and Lasanowski, 2007). Souto-Otero et al. (2013) identified five types of barriers: financial barriers, barriers related to conditions of the mobility programme, barriers related to higher education system comparability, personal background and lack of awareness. Sawir et al. (2012) focussed on the role of English-language proficiency as an important factor in human security in all domains of mobility. Linguistic skills and the differences between academic language skills and real English ability were investigated by Andrade and Evans (2014). As current challenges for HEI and their international dimension, de Wit (2017) identified three main processes: the UK’s withdrawal from the European Union (Brexit), increasing political instability (e.g. in the USA, an important destination for students) and the surge of national populist appeal around the world, as well as the refugee crisis and the recent terrorist attacks in Europe.

Ward et al. (2001) highlight the psychological aspects of studying and living in a foreign country. Mesidor and Sly (2016) explore factors that contribute to the academic, cultural, social and psychological adjustments of international students. Smith and Khawaja (2011) address acculturation, stress and problems with adjusting to the host country’s environment. Poyrazli and Lopez (2007) deal with issues of discrimination and homesickness among international students. The results of their study show that European students are less concerned with discrimination than students from other parts of the world, and that the level of homesickness is higher for younger students and students with lower English skills.

More recently, Choudaha (2017) has investigated changes in international student mobility, analysing key events and trends affecting international student mobility in three overlapping waves spanning across seven years between 1999 and 2020. The first wave was shaped by both the enrolment of international students at institutions seeking to build research excellence and, conversely, the terrorist attacks of 2001; the second wave was shaped by the global financial recession; and the third wave was shaped by the slowdown in the Chinese economy, the Brexit and the American Presidential elections.

Researchers have highlighted several interesting connections between higher education and international terrorism. The first connection relates to location: where the universities provide education and which places terrorists select for attacks. Universities have historically been founded in important cities, and today, many universities are in areas that are very popular for tourists and that represent their nations, such as London, Paris, Berlin and Brussels. Terrorists usually attack these same cities, as they attract publicity and cause societal shock. For this reason, future terrorist attacks will very likely be planned for cities or areas with HEI. The second connection concerns human capital. The internationalisation of
higher education should lead to improving and developing human capital; therefore, terrorists use the destruction of human capital (through deaths or serious injuries) as a measure to cause shock and to achieve their goals. Terrorists use fear to lower rational human behaviour and achieve political goals (Johnston and Nedelescu, 2006).

Terrorist attacks have focused on the destruction of trade centres, such as the World Trade Center (WTO) in New York City in 2001. Terrorist attacks also significantly affect economy and society, as well as fears and expectations at both individual and institutional levels. The literature records the impact of terrorist attacks on the financial sector (Chesney et al., 2011; Johnston and Nedelescu, 2006); on tourism (Korstanje and Clayton, 2012); and on investments, savings and consumption, foreign trade, the urban economy and national income and growth (Frey et al., 2007).

This paper addresses a specific aspect of the effect of terrorist attacks on society: the internationalisation of higher education. In particular, the paper focuses on the European International Business Week (IBW) network, which involves several HEIs. The IBW network was established 17 years ago by the Belgian Leuven University College (University Colleges Leuven-Limburg since 2015) and by the University Paris-13 in France. The project reflected the situation in the late 1990s: the two universities addressed low student interest in Erasmus mobility by partnering on the first IBW in Leuven in 1999. The number of universities/colleges in the network increased over the years. In 2015, there were 15 partnering universities or colleges from Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Finland, Germany, Greece, Latvia, The Netherlands, Poland, Portugal and the Ukraine. Each IBW network member regularly organises a week of student activities, during which students work in international groups on an international business case (Chalupová et al., 2016). The number of students involved varies between approximately 20-40 students. The average student age is 21; most participants are full-time bachelor degree students. The current trend is a multidisciplinary assignment with students coming from various fields of study cooperating with each other. Still, business students predominate because the network was established with them in mind.

This paper investigates four HEIs from the IBW network: two of them are located in countries considered to be relatively “safe” (the College of Polytechnics Jihlava in the Czech Republic, and Satakunta University of Applied Sciences in Finland); the other two universities are located in countries affected by terrorist attacks (L’école pratique des hautes études commerciales (EPHEC) in Belgium and the Institut universitaire de technologie (IUT) in France, part of the Paris-13 University). The paper uses the experiences of these institutions, particularly through analysing the voices of their representatives, to investigate whether fear of terrorism is a barrier to international student mobility.

Material and methods

This paper poses two research questions:

RQ1. What barriers limit international student mobility in select universities/colleges, according to their representatives?

RQ2. What was the impact of terrorist attacks on international student mobility in universities located in cities that were directly affected by them?

The research focus was on the investigation and comparison between two universities located in countries that are considered relatively “safe”, and two universities located in countries recently affected by a terrorist attack. The term “relatively safe” means that there had been no terrorist attack prior to the data collection. Data availability was a decisive factor; the interviews took place during the IBW, between December 2016 and April 2017.
One representative from each institution was interviewed. The representative was either the head of the international department or an IBW coordinator. The interviews were conducted in English; they were audio-recorded and transcribed by the interviewer. Three semi-structured interviews (in Belgium, Finland and France) were conducted by one researcher; the fourth interview (in the Czech Republic) was conducted by a second researcher. The interview questions were designed based on literature review and considering the recent terrorist attacks in Europe. All of the respondents were informed about the aim of the research and signed informed consent forms allowing audio recording of the interview.

Six types of questions were asked to the representatives of the four universities:

1. questions about student exchange programmes at the university;
2. questions about the development of student exchange programmes at the university;
3. questions about actions undertaken by the university to boost student mobility;
4. questions about barriers to international student mobility at the university (in both directions);
5. questions about factors supporting international student mobility at the university (in both directions); and
6. questions about the future development of international student mobility.

Considering the focus of our research, the second and fourth type of questions appeared as the most significant. Therefore, we have focused only on aspects that are crucial from the point of view of the IBW school organisation and mobility. Further information is only complementary and not essential to identify the links between terrorist attacks and short-term mobility.

Within these themes, the following questions were asked:

Q1. Have you noticed any significant changes in the number of participants in IBW or any other programme?

Q2. In your opinion, what influence do the present security threats have on international student mobility at your university, if any?

Q3. In your opinion, what are the biggest barriers to international student mobility for your students (traveling abroad)?

Q4. In your opinion, what are the biggest barriers to international student mobility in your university?

Additional questions were asked to elicit more information from the interviewees, for instance, if the respondents mentioned terrorist attacks as a barrier to mobility.

Data were treated according to the principles of thematic analysis. According to Fugard and Potts (2015), thematic analysis has been one of the most commonly used methods of data analysis within qualitative research since the nineteenth century. Before the research itself, the text topics and categories to be examined are defined. The information obtained is then reduced according to these predefined categories. Various approaches can be used in qualitative research to code the predefined categories. Saldaña (2015) asserts that the most suitable approach for this type of research is grounded coding.

In this study, open coding was used. Rewritten interviews were divided into analytical units (words, sentences, and phrases). Then, codes were assigned to individual segments. Open coding was done using pencil and paper and codes were grouped according to similarities and internal contexts into classes, categories and subcategories. Classes, categories and subcategories reflected research questions and included the number of participants in the IBW, present security threats and barriers to international student
mobility. The data were analysed in two ways. First, the barriers to international student mobility were identified. Second, the descriptions of the two attacks (Paris 2015 and Brussels 2016) and their consequences for the IBWs were reviewed. Finally, relevant information concerning the focus of the research was identified.

Results and discussion

The representatives of the four chosen universities/colleges identified several barriers to international student mobility. The representative of the College of Polytechnics Jihlava in the Czech Republic highlighted language barriers related with the level of English proficiency of the outgoing students and sometimes also the incoming students, the lack of information translated into the English language and limited offer of courses in English. The representative also mentioned problems related with the study programme’s incompatibility with partnering schools, which can result in additional years of study:

- We have a limited selection of courses in English (except for economic subjects), so that the students from other types of study programmes have trouble choosing courses, especially in health and technical study programmes. There is quite high interest from the students of partner universities and colleges, but we have to reject them.

This reflects a barrier to international student mobility that could be directly addressed by the school, namely, through the creation of an English version of the course information and through establishing a broader offer of courses in English in different study programmes.

The representative of Satakunta University of Applied Sciences (SAMK) in Finland regarded financial constraints as the crucial barrier to mobility. In reference to SAMK students, the representative said:

- I think it is how they are going to get money for that. That is perhaps the most difficult barrier, and another is that, for example, about 80% or even more of our students are working alongside their studies, so that is also a challenge.

This statement reflects some interesting facts. Most of the university students bear opportunity costs; they miss out on the money they could earn at home and are in danger of losing their job if the employer does not allow them to take a semester or two abroad in a mobility programme. In talking about incoming students, the representative mentioned the distance to Finland, and especially to Pori, as a barrier, as it might take significantly longer to get to Pori than to other partner universities or colleges.

The representative of IUT Saint Denis in France identified two major barriers for IUT students wishing to study abroad. First, a language barrier, given that some of the students were not accepted because of their lack of language skills. The second major barrier identified by this representative was money. Alongside these two barriers, the IUT representative also mentioned a religious barrier, although with a minor effect:

- The fathers of some of our female Muslim students did not want them to go alone to a foreign country for a student mobility programme. However, this was a minority, and it was not the case for every Muslim girl; therefore, this is the minor issue.

Concerning barriers for students wishing to study at IUT, the representative also mentioned a financial barrier for students coming from the Czech university; and both political and financial barriers for students from Russia and the Ukraine.

For students from EPHEC in Brussels, Belgium, wishing to study abroad, the barriers identified by the representative of this institution were money and fear of missing important courses or assignments because of being abroad. Other barriers included incompatible holidays in other countries. In the spring 2017, for instance, IBW took place at some partner
universities/colleges during a national holiday in Belgium, and not all of the Belgian students, according to the EPHEC representative, were willing to sacrifice a week’s holiday.

For students wishing to study at EPHEC, the first barrier mentioned by the representative was a language barrier or fear to communicate. The second barrier reported was related with difficulties in finding accommodation because of the many international organisations and associations operating in Brussels, although this situation has improved slightly in recent years. The third barrier, according to the EPHEC representative, was fear after the 2016 Brussels bombing:

[The students] may be a little bit afraid after what happened last year. This image of Brussels may last for a few years. Even if in my opinion the mobility is returning, maybe in some minds there is still an association that Brussels is a dangerous place.

Considering that two of the biggest European terrorist attacks affected the IBW at IUT in France in November 2015 and at EPHEC in Belgium in March 2016, these will be discussed in more detail in the following sections.

Paris December 2015 attacks

IUT is in Saint Denis, a suburb of Paris, a city affected by several recent terrorist attacks. On 7 January 2015, multiple assassinations were carried out on Charlie Hebdo offices, followed by a hostage situation at a Jewish supermarket two days later. These events led to the deaths of 17 people and 22 casualties (Bigo et al., 2015; Randolph and Valmary, 2015). The next attacks were on Friday, 13 November 2015, when several orchestrated multisite terrorist attacks were followed by suicide bombings and mass shootings, with 130 deaths and 368 casualties (Bajpai, 2015; Nail, 2016). The global media reported on the brutality of the attack with pictures, witness testimonies and government statements.

The IBW at IUT Saint Denis took place approximately one week after the attacks. Consequently, about half of the foreign students cancelled their attendance, even though all the procedures were completed and everything was prepared. Based on the information from the IUT representative, the participants of the IBW at IUT are usually in the following distribution: 10 students from Belgium, 5 from The Netherlands, 2 or 3 students from Denmark, about 5 from the Czech Republic and several students from Germany.

The IUT representatives were actively communicating with the partner institutions; however, the cancelations still took place:

We tried to explain [to the partner universities] that Paris was safe, maybe even more than before because of the military and all the security measures. It is maybe psychological, it is very difficult, and essentially the foreign press like to maximise things.

What happened, according to the IUT representative, was:

They [the representatives of the schools whose students had cancelled their attendance] clearly said to us that some families didn’t want to send their children here. This was the case with Zweibrucken [in Germany] and with some students from the Czech Republic. The Dutch came, some of the Czech students came, Denmark cancelled. It was the first time […].

For the first time in the 17-year history of the IBW network, a massive cancelation happened at the last moment. The strong parental role in the decisions to cancel was probably related with the fact that these students, mostly in their second year of the bachelor’s degree study programme, were about 19 years old, living in a common household with parents, who significantly influenced their decision-making process, while adhering to their adult children with protectionist and strong emotions.

Becker and Rubinstein (2004) argue that shock can affect peoples’ choices in the “risk channel” and the “fear channel”. The shock of terrorist attacks in Paris affected these
channels, meaning that the students, and possibly their parents, had to re-evaluate the weight of the “safe” and the “dangerous” student mobility destinations.

Becker and Rubinstein (2004) also state that fear can be managed. They claim that this is accomplished by accumulating the necessary skills; however, like other investments in human capital, it does not equally reward everyone. Perhaps managing this fear is one of the biggest challenges for the internationalisation of higher education in the twenty-first century. There is no evidence that the trend of large terrorist attacks in the centres of higher education is about to change. At the same time, the trend towards fear of those attacks is affecting university student mobility programmes. If Becker and Rubinstein are right, the education system itself can influence the situation by focusing on handling the fears of the students. In that case, it should be possible to diminish the impact of the recent terrorist attacks in the relatively secure area of the international student mobility programmes.

The immediate impact of a terrorist attack on a university event intended to promote international student mobility, the IBW, is a very interesting phenomenon. It is interesting that this effect did not happen after the Paris January 2015 attack, even though there was an IBW in March 2015, just two months after those attacks. There was also no recorded impact on IBW in December 2016, one year after the November 2015 attacks. There are several possible explanations. First, the November 2015 attacks were more devastating and maybe even more shocking. Second, the November 2015 IBW took place right after the November 2015 attacks, while the March 2015 IBW took place two months after an attack. Third, one of the November 2015 attacks took place directly in Saint Denis, and one of the suspects was arrested in Saint Denis. The fourth explanation could be that it was the second attack of the year. It could also be a combination of the four possibilities.

Our data show that the timing of the attacks could be a factor. Almost immediately after the attacks, the students were preparing to leave for Paris, and all of their documents were in order. The students and their families had to decide immediately whether to go to Paris despite the attack. Because terrorist attacks can change people’s behaviour through initial shock and fear, it is understandable that this shock probably influenced people’s decisions. The decision-making process is also influenced by the media (Wirth and Schramm, 2005), which often affect emotions, thus contributing to decisions based on momentum, not rational arguments and a righteous consideration of the situation. It was very difficult for students and their families to make this decision; this is why some of them wanted their college to make this decision for them. As the IUT representative stated, because of all the security measures, the city itself was probably safer than before.

Brussels 2016 bombings

On Monday 21 March, the IBW in EPHEC in Brussels started with about 30 students in attendance. The first day had the usual welcoming presentations and opening activities, but the next day everything changed following a terrorist attack in the city that morning. On Tuesday 22 March 2016, three coordinated bombing attacks occurred in Brussels, with two explosions at the Zaventem airport and a further blast at the Maalbeek metro station. This attack led to the deaths of 32 people and more than 300 casualties (Chad et al., 2016). The EPHEC representative described the steps taken by EPHEC after they learned about the attacks:

First of all, we had to make sure that all the students arrived safely, which fortunately was the case. Second, we had to cancel all the activities. And third, we had to find out how to secure the return of each student to their home county, which was very complicated because the airport was closed, the train stations and everything were blocked, so we had to find alternative solutions.

Suddenly, all the planned activities, including the business game, were replaced by activities meant to ensure that all the students were safe and on their way home. The
internationalisation of higher education was heavily hit by the internationalisation of terrorism. The IBW was cancelled and there was a decline of about 20 per cent in the number of incoming students (study/traineeship mobility students) in the following months, including for the long-term mobility programmes. The EPHEC representative noted a hidden extra cost of the attack connected to the IBW:

Some teachers who are part of the organisation team spent their own money to drive the students back to the hostel. They stayed hours and hours with the students in the hostel, they called the parents of the students on their own phones to try to organise buses and things. One teacher drove to the Netherlands or something like that with one or two students. I guess that he got paid by the school for that.

This statement shows that the staff of EPHEC made special efforts to handle the situation, very likely beyond the duties stated in their job contracts. Because of their efforts, there was no panic amongst the students, according to the EPHEC representative:

The students behaved very well, they were very brave, but the teachers of the organisation team were very good, I mean they took time, they took a lot of time and energy to spend time with the students, they stayed with them in the hostel, they tried to explain, to listen to the students' testimonies, just listen to them, just for the psychological help. There were young women who really took care of the students, and took their own time. So I think that the students were a bit terrified, but at the same time they were reassured by the organisation of the school.

Any teacher or university staff connected in some way to a student mobility programme could be in a situation like this. Information about any possible psychological impact on the students after they returned home is not available, but the support students receive in the initial moments after a shock like this could be crucial. This suggests that HEI staff should be prepared to handle extraordinary and difficult situations like this.

After the attacks, some students left directly to their homes, and some had parents who came to pick them up even over long distances, like the parents who drove from the Czech Republic to Belgium. Other students found suitable bus connections to get home and still others waited until the airport opened a few days later.

One quite uncomfortable question is whether the impact on the mobility programmes of the universities will continue to be a short-term effect if the university itself is the target. Estrada and Koutronas (2016) suggest that counter-defensive policies need to be multi-faceted and flexible, empirical and evaluative and cost-effective. According to Dorn (2007), even though terrorist attacks at schools are relatively rare, there are several reasons to take the risk of such terrorist attacks seriously. Dorn argues that educational facilities are a symbolic target, so attacks on them attract a lot of media attention because of mass casualty potential. Therefore, HEI should seriously consider protection against such events.

It is quite possible that the impact on the mobility programmes at IUT or EPHEC would be even greater if the attacks had happened directly on the campus and the deaths and casualties included participants in a mobility event. Taatila (2017) notes that we are currently living a major paradigm shift in the history of higher education and, thus, there are many possible outcomes. It is possible that the larger adaptability of terrorist threats to internationalisation will become part of the paradigm shift. Korstanje (2016) mentions symbolical milestones starting a new era in which fear predominates. The future will show whether the recent rise in terrorist attacks in regions previously considered relatively safe initiate an era in which international student mobility is more often affected by the rise of violence and international terrorism. In other words, time will tell whether the recent terrorist attacks discussed in this paper cause changes in
the internationalisation policies of higher institutions because of the internationalisation of terrorism.

Conclusion

Terrorism is a widespread phenomenon affecting various areas of society, including the internationalisation of higher education. Fear of terrorist attacks, as well as the attacks themselves, can serve as barriers to international student mobility, along with traditional barriers such as language, financial costs and incompatibility of higher education systems in different schools or countries.

We investigated four universities or colleges that are part of the IBW network, a European network of HEI from various countries. Two of the HEIs were in countries that were not attacked by terrorists, the College of Polytechnics Jihlava in the Czech Republic and Satakunta University of Applied Sciences in Finland, and two HEIs were located in countries recently hit by terrorist attacks, IUT Saint Denis in France and EPHEC in Belgium. All four universities experienced traditional international student mobility barriers. In the universities located in cities hit by terrorist attacks, the attacks affected the attendance of IBW, a short-term mobility event. The first recorded impact was on IUT Saint Denis and in the IBW that took place in November 2015, about a week after the November 2015 attacks in Paris. About half of the students who had all their documents ready to attend IBW cancelled their participation in the event at the last minute. Another terrorist attack had an even more significant impact on a short-mobility programme: the 2016 bombings in Brussels happened on the second day of the March 2016 IBW at EPHEC. The IBW was cancelled immediately, and all the efforts of EPHEC shifted focus to assure the security of their students and their return home as soon as possible. The shift incurred additional costs and took hours of the free time of the university staff.

These research findings are relatively significant because they show how a terrorist attack can influence international student mobility, diminishing the number of participants after the attacks in Paris and IUT Saint Denis, and cancelling a short-term mobility event at EPHEC after the Brussels attacks. Our data reflects just four universities, only two of which were affected by terrorist attacks. Data from other universities affected by terrorist attacks are necessary to verify the causality between the attacks and student mobility. There are many HEIs in Brussels and Paris, each presumably with their own international student mobility programmes. Investigating international student mobility programmes in these institutions is desirable, although the impact of the terrorist attacks could be similar to that of the institutions covered by our research.

Our study shows that a terrorist attack can have an immediate impact on international student mobility. The impact of the terrorist attacks on IBW was immediate; however, the situation quickly returned to normal. While the internationalisation of higher education is a common strategic goal of these institutions, the internationalisation of terrorism counters this goal, as many terrorist attacks have been committed in centres of higher education. Should the traditional barriers to international student mobility, money and language be extended to include another one: fear? This question is important because recognising fear of terrorist attacks and terrorism itself as serious threats to the internationalisation of higher education can lead to changes in policy focus for governments and HEI. In short, the long-term impact of the internationalisation of terrorism on the higher education sector is unknown; however, it is possible that a new era is beginning in which international terrorism will have a strong effect on higher education because of the interconnection of HEI in different parts of the world. The ongoing investigation of the phenomenon of the clash of these two kinds of internationalisations, the internationalisation of terrorism and the internationalisation of higher education seems inevitable.
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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to analyze the self-perceived influence of short-term exchanges in schools abroad on future foreign language teacher’s professionalization, regarding professional values and pedagogy and practice. It grasps students’ changes in the perception of values attached to short-term exchanges in a professional setting.

Design/methodology/approach – In the scope of the European project SPIRAL, four prospective foreign language teachers attended a two-week internship at schools in another country. This paper explores, resorting to a combined content and discourse analysis, their letters of motivation (two months before the exchange), emails sent individually to the local coordinator (one week after the arrival) and a focus-group interview (two months after the arrival).

Findings – Future foreign language teachers change their focus when referring to the values attached to their experiences at schools abroad: from an initial focus on language skills improvement, they come to value the intercultural pedagogic experience they lived, focusing on differences and similarities between professional values and pedagogical practices across the contexts.

Practical implications – A generalized introduction of professional exchange programs, both in pre-service and continuing teacher education, could improve teachers’ perceptions of global structural, educational, political and curricular contexts and demands. It would also help the teachers decenter from educational practices and professional habitus taken for granted, and raise their awareness of what it means to be educated and professionalized in other contexts.

Originality/value – Few studies have focused on short-term exchanges and their impact on teachers’ professional development. The present paper highlights the pedagogical, intercultural and identity-building potential of short-term exchanges in foreign language teacher education.

Keywords Professional development, Pre-service teacher education, Foreign language teachers, Short-term exchanges

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

According to Mahon (2010, p. 8), “study abroad has become one of the top 10 trends in higher education”. Research on study abroad outcomes tends to focus on students’ intercultural learning (much in terms of the “savoirs” and “savoir-faire” attached to a target culture) and on the L2 gains, both in short- and long-term sojourns (Almeida et al., 2016; Anderson et al., 2006; Jackson, 2008; Llanes, 2011; Van de Berg et al., 2012). The same is true regarding research on the influences of studying abroad on future foreign language teachers’ identity and competences, which tends to focus on the improvement of linguistic and intercultural skills. From a biographical approach to teachers’ professional development (refer Hericks et al., 2017, for a complete account of this perspective; Pinho and Andrade, 2015), experiential learning from single individuals and, more specifically, the experience of observing and teaching abroad may have a huge influence on how teachers see themselves...
as professionals in specific contexts, how they assess, perceive and commit to their (future) functions and on how they engage with different teaching and learning cultures (Goodwin, 2010; Mahon, 2010). So, besides understanding how the development of teachers’ linguistic and intercultural skills occurs, it is of foremost importance to comprehend how study-abroad impacts the construction of (future) teachers’ identities. Indeed, little research is available regarding the influence of observing teaching practices in a foreign context on teachers’ professional development (Mahon, 2010, for a synthesis). Areas worth investigating in the field of foreign language teacher education could be, apart from the improvement of linguistic and intercultural skills and savoirs, changes in professional values and reconsideration of teaching methods and classroom practice. These are the areas that will be covered in this paper. Therefore, crisscrossing content and interaction analysis, this paper analyzes the value attributed to short-term exchanges by future language teachers who participated in the European project SPIRAL.

After a brief literature review about the professional development of foreign language teachers, we describe the context and the methodological design of our empirical study. We will then present the results, which reveal the pedagogical gains related to the short-term exchanges, as they are perceived by the teachers. Issues related to the incorporation of short-term placements abroad into teacher education curricula will be addressed. Our contribution goes beyond a quantitative evaluation of students’ satisfaction and embraces a more holistic view that considers future teachers’ professional development (Pedersen, 2010).

Professional development of foreign language teachers

It is commonly accepted that quality teachers have to possess knowledge, skills and dispositions that allow them to act, react, reflect and negotiate in situated but hybridized and chameleonic educational contexts. These contexts are characterized by changing communities and shifting global milieus (Goodwin, 2010), which posit new professional norms, knowledge and new cultures of action. These new norms and dispositions have significant consequences for pre-service teacher education. As highlighted by Goodwin (2010, p. 22), “we need to conceptualize teaching skills and tools, to develop in our students ways of thinking about and approaching teaching and learning that promote the application of a professional repertoire to a vast array of problems and dilemmas, most of which cannot possibly be anticipated beforehand” (see also Pinho, 2015).

According to the synthesis elaborated by Mahon (2010, p. 9), engaging in study abroad is an efficient way to impact teachers’ professional development, as it has positive effects on pre-service teachers’ identity. The author refers to four areas of benefits in both short- and long-term experiences:

1. long-term impact on career advancement and personal accomplishment;
2. increased confidence;
3. respect for differences; and
4. importance given to communication.

As the author claims, “in addition to being exposed to differing educational philosophies and new pedagogical techniques, overseas student teachers gain a significant amount of self-knowledge, develop personal confidence, professional competence, and a greater understanding of both global and domestic diversity” (Mahon, 2010, p. 9). These positive effects of study abroad thus transversely impact the five domains of knowledge a quality teacher should develop, according to Goodwin (2010, p. 22): personal knowledge (autobiography and philosophy of teaching), contextual knowledge (understanding children, schools and society), pedagogical knowledge (content, theories, methods of teaching and curriculum development), sociological knowledge (diversity, cultural
relevance and social justice) and social knowledge (cooperative, democratic group process and conflict resolution). Put in other terms, (future) teachers’ exchanges in professional settings abroad may impact the construction of a professional identity, namely, by reassessing past professional experiences and by envisioning new ways of being and becoming a teacher, fostering self-knowledge and knowledge of all the ingredients of the teaching context (students, school, and community). From this perspective, those experiences abroad may become a turning point in teachers’ professionalization, i.e. they may induce a period of “ecological transition” in teachers’ identity (Bronfenbrenner, 2005).

Ecological transitions, in Bronfenbrenner’s perspective, are attached to periods when reflection is fostered by new experiences, dilemmas and crises prompted by changes in the professional ecosystem, at micro (classroom), meso (school) and/or macro (educational system) level. One of those periods is, according to Hericks et al. (2017), entry in the profession. Other important periods, specific to foreign language teachers, are teaching in the framework of content and language integrated learning (Bonnet and Breidbach, 2017), contact with pluralistic approaches to languages and cultures (Melo-Pfeifer, 2018; Pinho, 2015) and collaborative work with other language teachers (Pinho and Andrade, 2015). One more, we could add, is the confrontation with different teaching and learning cultures as well as professional values and, thus, the experience of professional alterity in the process of becoming a teacher. The contact with other professional ways of being a teacher and the turmoil caused by this otherness may lead to the resignification of personal experiences (both as a student and as a teacher) and to the “unravelling” of professional beliefs.

Context of the empirical study

International student mobility has been a key element of the educational reforms following the Bologna Process – a key reform in higher education in Europe, dating from 1999, and aiming at establishing a comparable higher education system across all the EU member states. Despite this and of the theoretical and empirical findings presented above, surprisingly little has been done so far to include a stay abroad as an integral part of teacher education curricula. On the contrary, this largely remains a voluntary, albeit highly recommended, option even for students studying to become foreign language teachers (one possibility is the Erasmus mobility period, which is not specifically designed to accommodate foreign language teachers’ needs). Our research is related to the outcome of SPIRAL (https://spiral-euproject.eu/), a European Erasmus-Plus project, established to directly tackle this issue. It aims to investigate the effects of short-period exchanges on trainee teachers’ identity and professional development and, as a result, on teaching quality.

The students who participate in this project complete a two-week mobility phase in which they visit one of the partner universities, are acquainted with the country’s educational practices and standards, attend classes at local public schools and are encouraged to actively contribute to the lessons with a follow-up evaluation conducted by a foreign trainer. It is expected that students acquire experience in intercultural and multilingual environments (an essential competence not only for foreign language teachers) and reflect on foreign professional practice as well as their own. In this way, SPIRAL fosters trainee teacher professionalization at two levels: first, through the acquisition of experience-based knowledge (i.e. being in a foreign country, experiencing communication difficulties, coping with multilingual classroom settings, etc.), and second, through “reflection-on-action” [Schön (1983), i.e. evaluation of teaching methods, classroom settings, etc.]. The mobility phase is accompanied by an interview, a questionnaire and other forms of assessment to further stimulate prospective teachers’ reflection and assess the impact of the program on their professionalization processes. SPIRAL also pursues the development of a common reference framework, which would be adaptable to local procedures and standards and enable higher education institutions to permanently and successfully implement such a mobility phase in their teacher education curricula.
Methodological design

In this contribution, which assumes a qualitative design, we will analyze the professional development of four future (Spanish) foreign language teachers. These were studying at the University of Hamburg and voluntarily participated in a SPIRAL student mobility period (two weeks during the month of March 2017). The students, three female and one male[1] between the ages of 22 and 25, were attending the seminar “Pluralistic approaches to languages and cultures”, a course unit included in the Master’s curriculum of future Spanish teachers, when they got in contact with SPIRAL. All the students were studying to obtain a Master’s degree in Education, which would allow them to teach at a secondary level. Three out of four students already had the experience of being in Spain in the scope of other mobility programs (i.e. Erasmus program), but none had made the experience of observing classes at a school level.

Before leaving for Spain, they were briefly familiarized with the goals of the project, and were acquainted with all the logistic aspects of their stay abroad, which were facilitated by the SPIRAL local partner. The students were placed in several schools in a Spanish town, where they engaged in classroom observation (they could also participate in class preparation and teaching). They were accompanied by local teachers who acted as mentors. We should also note that the four students actively engaged in cultural programs together, having visited sites of cultural interest for them.

The corpus of analysis consisted of:

- the motivational letters, which students had to write before the exchange in order to participate in it;
- students’ evaluation emails written right after their arrival; and
- a semi-structured focus-group interview (Barbour, 2014), conducted two months after their return.

These three discursive objects of analysis were originally produced in German and then translated into English. It should also be stated that the focus-group interview was conducted by a fellow student to facilitate an unbiased, open and sincere discussion. Before leading the focus-group interview, the student was acquainted with the guidelines and the predetermined (but flexible) structure of the interview, which was elaborated by a SPIRAL partner and discussed with the team. The topics covered by the focus-group interview were:

- organization of the sojourn;
- motivation and perceived benefits;
- accreditation and integration of the stay abroad into the training program;
- language and interculturality; and
- pedagogy and professional practice and learning (Edmond and Castanheira, 2016).

The transcription of the interview was made by the same student, who could better follow the conversational strand.

As categories for our analysis, we assume two domains of professional development addressed by SPIRAL: professional values and pedagogy and practice (the other domains, not covered by this paper are “linguistic competence” and “intercultural understanding”). Table I provides a definition of each of those domains and the competences attached to each one.

The domains and the categories attached to them were co-constructed through collaborative meta-analysis of regulation documents on school teacher education in the several SPIRAL-Partner-Teams. They reflect core and transversal competences mentioned
in the legislation of the five countries: France, Germany, The Netherlands, the UK and Spain (complete document available at https://spiral-euproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/SPIRAL_O2_Annex-1_Competence-cards.pdf). Even if the analyzed legislation covers primary school teachers, the competences they refer to are transversal to professional acting in other school contexts. We will analyze the corpus presented above according to these categories to understand the importance pre-service language teachers assign to them before and after their journey in Spain.

Results

Results point toward a shift of priorities in students’ discourses from a predominant initial focus on developing linguistic abilities to a reconsideration of professional and educational cultures, taken for granted before engaging in classroom observation abroad. The analysis of the motivation letters sent to the local German coordinator shows an immediate concern with the development of linguistic and intercultural skills. A common trend is starting the motivation letter with detailed linguistic concerns and then referring to professional issues, such as different methodologies, programs and school organization. Indeed, all the students declare, as a top priority, the desire to develop their competences in the language that they will be teaching in the near future:

The opportunity to sit in a Spanish school would be great. So far, for various reasons, I have not had the opportunity to spend a semester abroad in a Spanish-speaking country. […] With regard to teaching Spanish in the future, it is essential for me not only to convey vocabulary and grammar, but also something of the Spanish culture and society (JG).

It is very important for me to have good Spanish language skills and to gather experience in Spanish-speaking countries before I work as a Spanish teacher myself. […] For me, a good foreign language teacher is a person who loves and masters the language to be taught. However, not only the language skills are important, but also experiences made before (JB).

So, before departing, the expectations were closely related to the linguistic proficiency, showing that the command of the language (object of teaching) seemed to surpass the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I Analytical categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domains</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: “SPIRAL competence cards”
values of other dimensions of professional development. This linguistic expectation is, in the case of JG, far stronger and specific than other expectations regarding professional development; these are mentioned in the last paragraph of his motivation letter and in quite unspecific terms. Despite this lack of specificity, we observe a clear desire of getting to know and discovering a foreign school system:

Certainly, I will also be able to observe different, new didactic methods and manners, whereby I can compare and reflect my own methods and manners that I have learned thus far (JG).

Just after returning from Spain, the analysis of the emails reveals a shift in the linguistic value attached to the exchange toward other priorities. Indeed, ME and JB alluded only to professional values and pedagogy and practice, focusing on positive and negative aspects of their observations and experiences. These were related to greeting rituals and the atmosphere at school, collaborative work with the local mentor teacher, the organization of the school day and the value attached to grades, to textbooks and to teacher-centered instruction. JG, writing his email in Spanish, highlighted pedagogy and practice and intercultural learning (“we visited the birthplace of Cervantes”).

Generally, the German students positively evaluated professional values attached to interaction with peers, children and parents, as well as pedagogy and practice related to being integrated in the school practice. On the other hand, trainees were critical of classroom practice, often referred to as being monotonous, not diversified enough and not encouraging reflexive practice or even a desire of co-constructing subject knowledge. Classes were described as teacher- and textbook-centered and, thus, not implying abilities of building and managing learning environments. JB commented on the two-week observation as follows:

Only the textbook is used, everything in the teacher’s version of the book is given and the teachers do not prepare a lesson but work through the book. Without methods, without much explanation; instead the students read texts, copy texts and solve tasks (JB).

Thus, we can observe that, shortly after the period of discovery of “professional otherness”, the trainee teachers were able to recognize differences in professional values as well as in pedagogy and practice. Still, they remained attached to what could be called an ethnocentric observation of classroom abroad, valuing the methodologies and materials used in the home country (and the self-vivid practice) as being more diverse, and without reflecting on the structural and political reasons and constraints that could explain and relativize the differences observed.

The one-hour focus-group interview, on the other hand, is very rich in terms of representations attached to the exchange and in terms of assessment of the experience. The students were not only able to compare educational contexts and practices in-depth, signaling differences and similarities between them, but also trying to provide explanations for the way they assessed the practices of the “other”. Once again, the discussion focuses on professional values and pedagogical practices observed and lived in Spain and in Germany, respectively. Furthermore, apart from the differences observed, pre-service teachers also come forward with some explanations about the differences – although not in a systematized manner. Table II presents a categorized overview of students’ interpretations of the observed differences.

Therefore, it is important to notice that, while engaged in a discursive–collaborative situation, pre-service teachers are able to co-construct a framework that helps them to interpret the differences in practices and pedagogy. In Table II, this framework is made of explanatory elements at micro-, meso- and macro-levels. Future teachers recognize the differences regarding classroom management, school culture and educational values, as well as educational system. They also acknowledge the conditions under which learning
takes place and the challenges children face in other contexts. Hence, being abroad raises pre-service teachers’ consciousness of what it means to attend other school systems:

They [children] also had to do their homework after school or during their lunch break which was about two hours and a half long – or two hours?, so two hours, and sometimes they also had language classes, sports or other activities, so they didn’t even have a break in between. Then they went home, did their homework, learned for their tests. I always wondered how they did this (laughter). I was always so tired and so exhausted. They really need to do a lot, everybody goes to school from 9am to 5pm. From year one. (P3)

It is striking to observe that the students engage in a very emotional talk during the focus-group interview and attain a high level of consensus regarding the positive and negative dimensions of their experiences abroad (expressions like “right”, “absolutely” or “I was going to say something similar” were quite frequent). It is remarkable, however, that they maintain a shared image of the superiority of the national pedagogical and methodological culture and that this shared image seems to prevent them from engaging in more significant pedagogical experiences abroad:

But – and this is what we discussed a lot within our group – you don’t want to make the mentor look like a fool by giving a perfect lesson from a didactic point of view as we would do it in Germany, saying “This is how we teach and the pupils like it a lot more”. You don’t want to show the pupils what they are about to miss. (P3)

I saw a lot of things I did not expect in the first place and I know now that we are lucky to have a school system that is much more organized and also student-friendlier as I believe. (P4)

Despite this self-centered perspective, which prevailed throughout the weeks abroad and the time that passed by (we recall that this focus-group interview occurred two months after the return to Germany), the students provide similar examples of their empirical observations, and they all value comparison of the educational systems to grow as a professional:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II</th>
<th>Explanations of pre-service teachers regarding the observed differences in pedagogies and practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different relationship patterns between school actors</td>
<td>The connection between pupil and teacher, that is what inspired me a lot, since it does work differently, it’s more intimate in a way. On the one hand, it is more intimate, on the other hand, it is also reserved, but it is lovely and that’s nice to see (P4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different pedagogical cultures</td>
<td>That’s how classes look like, no matter the subject or the year, at least up to the 6th grade (P3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different expectations about teaching and being a teacher</td>
<td>For them (our mentors) it was just how they are supposed to teach, and we teach the way we teach in Germany, so normally you don’t really question it (P3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration between teachers at school</td>
<td>There are two teachers, so they see which teaching methods are used, they see how the pupils react, but still, they won’t change anything (P3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different teacher education practices at the university</td>
<td>According to him (the mentor), the problem already starts at university (P2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different parental beliefs</td>
<td>The parents always say that if teachers don’t work with the books, there’s always trouble because they were paid by the parents (P1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different pedagogical beliefs</td>
<td>Everyone creates a poster, . . . and on the presentation day, the children stood there and couldn’t read a word. . . . And then I asked my mentor “Why would you choose this method?” and she replied “The pupils should learn how to give presentations” Well, I don’t really need to understand that (P2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different practices according to school typologies</td>
<td>We quickly became aware of the differences between public, half-private and private schools (P4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different daily organization and routines</td>
<td>And then we had a certain timetable . . . We got to school at half past eight in the morning and we came back at half past five in the evening . . . (P3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-established expectations</td>
<td>I expected too much of the system and its structure, so it was like a slap in my face in the first day (laughter) Unfortunately, in a negative way, because we literally thought “what is going on here”? That’s why you first develop a kind of an “anti-attitude” since you were expecting something different If you know right from the start that everything is different, definitely not like in Germany, if you know how the school system works, how classes work, if you’re open to everything, it won’t be that shocking at the beginning (P3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So now you are able to reflect about how classes in Germany look like. [...] So it allows a comparison, and without a comparison you can’t assess a system, the strengths and weaknesses of a system. [...] If we didn’t have that possibility of comparison, we wouldn’t have started to discuss it. We discussed this every single day after school for about half an hour (laughter). About what we observed, about what could be different, about what went well and so on. (P3)

This process of talking about the other, as we see, uncovers a process of production of a teaching identity, and a process of mirroring that constructs the professional self to be through comparison with the professional other. This mirroring can produce a negative or a positive image of the professional other and this image will influence pre-service teachers’ plans of professional development:

After all, we learned a lot about what we wouldn’t do in the future, hopefully, and that’s a very important thing. (P4)

It encouraged me to pay more attention to the teaching methods that I use, to how pupils react to it, to the pupils’ feedback, to what they are able to do, at what time. Sitting in class, I noticed who was mentally present, who was absent, how much energy was left. And I want to keep an eye on that, trying to put myself in the position of the children. And what really made me think a lot was the relationship between the teachers and their pupils. (P3)

What inspired me a lot was the kind and loving way my mentor worked with the pupils and this is what I would also like to focus on in the future. I became aware of how important it is to be friendly and kind and to make every pupil feel comfortable in the classroom, and they really felt comfortable the whole time. And he was also very focused on values like respect and social interaction in class. (P1)

So, while P4 focuses on the aspects she does not want to reproduce in her practices, P3 and P4 emphasize the aspects that they want to retain for their future practice. P3 gives more careful attention to the conditions attached to learning and to pupils’ feedback; while P4 gives more attention to an increased consideration of affectivity in teacher-pupils’ relationship and of broader education values in the classroom.

In this sense, collaboratively and discursively reconstructing the shared experience(s) abroad, both during and after the period abroad, creates the conditions to analyze how experiences were produced and processed in pre-service teachers’ minds (Bonnet and Breidbach, 2017, p. 271). The value of a shared space of reflection, both to enrich personal perspectives and to enlarge the professional potential of the stay abroad, is acknowledged in the following terms:

We talked for hours, and that’s how we got different perspectives on everything, and if I’d only had my own perspective, I would have been quite frustrated. The fact that we exchanged our views and also recognized things that worked out well at our school, maybe even better than at the other school, allowed us to have more than a tunnel vision and to compare the different types of schools. (P3)

Conclusions and perspectives

This study shows that the future foreign language teachers change their focus when referring to the values attached to their experiences at schools abroad. From an initial focus on the improvement of language skills, they come to value the intercultural pedagogic experience they lived, focusing on differences and similarities between professional values and pedagogical practices across the contexts (in this case, Germany and Spain). This may suggest that, from a focus on the specific teaching subject content (Spanish as a foreign language taught in the curriculum), future teachers move toward a closer perception of what it means to be a teacher, both from a pedagogical and a methodological
perspective. They evolve from what to teach toward how, when and whom to teach and under which circumstances. This evolution seems to confirm that being placed abroad as a pre-service teacher could be a part of an ecological transition, fostering a change in pre-service teachers’ professional perspectives and a calibration of professionalization priorities.

It has been shown that, while in the first moment after their arrival, trainees were reporting on the differences, they then moved to a period of collaborative interpretation of those differences. It is thus plausible to infer that temporal, geographical and even emotional distance, accompanied by the opportunity to reflect with peers that lived the same experience, offers the occasion to improve reflexivity and, therefore, promote professional growth. This does not automatically mean that pre-service teachers more readily accept the differences they observed. Our analysis shows how perception of hierarchies regarding pedagogical practices and pedagogies (more or less valid and valuable, more or less sophisticated and more or less “professional”) can be reinterpreted, maintained and reinforced. As one teacher stated, “the stay abroad didn’t really change the way I think about my role as a teacher” (P2). From this perspective, it is important to recognize that teachers’ previous experiences (as a pupil and as a university student) and “professional socialization” leading to the choice of the profession, play a role on the perception of the “professional otherness”.

Hence, it is conceivable that classroom preparation, management and assessment are not the only central processes that influence the development of teachers’ development (Hericks et al., 2017); the classroom observation, and particularly in different settings, has the potential to cause perplexities, dilemmas and crises, as well as reflections about ones’ national, regional and local professional practices and values. This means that, “experiences that question a person’s existing relation to self, world and others can destabilize routines” (Bonnet and Breidbach, 2017, p. 272). The surprise effect that comes with the systematic observation of the “professional otherness” has plausibly the potential to destabilize beliefs and representations about teaching and learning, leading to innovation, fostering criticality and changes in educational structures.

Studying abroad, as has already been shown, has a considerable impact on how foreign language teachers conceive their professionalization and their legitimacy as teachers of a certain “target language” (Appel, 2000; Caspari, 2003). A generalized implementation of professional exchange programs, both at pre-service and continuing teacher education, could, besides this linguistic dimension, improve teachers’ perceptions of global structural, educational, political and curricular contexts and demands. It would also help to decenter from educational practices as well as from a professional habitus taken for granted, and raise awareness of what it means to be educated and professionalized in other contexts.

Note

1. Students’ names were anonymized. For the motivation letters and emails, we used abbreviations because we had access to the authors’ names. For the focus-group interview, because it was not conducted by the researchers, the names were completely anonymized and the students are identified by the order of participation (P1 for Participant 1, for example).
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Emancipatory education and the preparation of future teachers

Eny Winarti

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to explore the possibilities and impact of emancipatory education in the preparation of future elementary school teachers.

Design/methodology/approach – To serve the purpose of the study, emancipatory education was introduced to the student teachers of an elementary school teacher education program in the Curriculum and Learning Development course. The researcher then observed them during their learning activities and analyzed their portfolios providing feedback during their poster presentations. A classroom experiential model was applied.

Findings – The results of the students’ activities indicated that most of the students were able to develop the twenty-first century skills needed to conduct the activities and avoid the tendency to follow directions from someone in authority. After the implementation of this study, the student teachers revealed higher-order thinking skills and were also able to develop learning materials and assessments that were appropriate to elementary school pupils. Still, the “old tendencies” (e.g. not thinking out of the box and waiting for direct instructions) sometimes emerged.

Research limitations/implications – The study was applied to a single course in one out of five parallel classes in a university in a particular area in Indonesia, a developing Asian country with a collectivist culture.

Originality/value – This paper exemplifies how learning and teaching activities in a higher education institution in a developing country can be designed to help future teachers prepare themselves to function and teach in a globalized society.
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Introduction

The speed of globalization phenomena has created an impact not only in the economic, social and political dimensions of human life but also in the area of education (Winarti, 2011). As companies become multinational, people become more mobile and vice versa. This requires schools and teachers to be able to accommodate children from various backgrounds and prepare them for life in a complex and diverse world.

Responding to that complexity, the Partnership for 21st Century Skills (www.p21.org/) indicates that the basic knowledge expected by students in this new millennium should include: English language, reading comprehension, writing English, mathematics, science, government/economics, humanities/arts, foreign languages and history/geography. Meanwhile, the applied skills needed are critical thinking/problem solving, oral communication, written communication, teamwork/collaboration, diversity appreciation, information technology application, leadership, creativity/innovation, lifelong learning/self-direction, professionalism/work ethics and ethics/social responsibility. While these twenty-first century skills are urgently required by the modern students, these requirements are often challenging for future Indonesian teachers studying in elementary school teacher education programs. Years of
learning experience under the centralized government has resulted in the students being in the mode of the blue-collar workers' mentality, requiring detailed instructions for every single project (Winarti, 2012).

Being in such a condition, the researcher, who is simultaneously a lecturer with curriculum development responsibilities, was motivated to introduce emancipatory education, which is known to be used widely in developing countries (Gerdes, 1985; Gordon, 1986; Zeuner, 2013), to deal with the gap between the required and the present mode of teaching and learning. This type of liberation education was introduced in the Curriculum and Learning Development course, which is a compulsory subject for future teachers, especially future elementary school teachers known in Indonesia as the student teachers of Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar (PGSD). For a detailed description of this study’s theoretical framework, the sections that follow discuss the concepts and goals of emancipatory education and the design of the PGSD Curriculum and Learning Development course. The paper, then, considers research methods, results and discussion and conclusions and recommendations.

Emancipatory education

The main goal of emancipatory education, advocated by Paulo Freire, Ira Shor and Henry Giroux (Nouri and Sajjadi, 2014), is to play a fundamental role in creating a just and democratic society. Freire (1970), in his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, clearly states that in the unjust society, there are two diametrically opposing sides: the “oppressors” and the “oppressed” between whom the acts of humanization and dehumanization are continuously exchanged and sometimes even reversed. He emphasizes that none can help the oppressed to liberate themselves from the oppressors except the oppressed themselves by transforming their way of thinking and acting. Macedo (1994) continued Freire’s legacy of liberation pedagogy by addressing “literacies of power” and suppressing of critical thinking in current education. Emancipatory education, then, provides a means and a venue for socio-political action and change.

In the context of teaching and learning processes, the teacher–student relationship can at times be like the oppressor–oppressed relationship. In Freire’s dialogue with Shor and Freire (1987), Freire mentions that the liberation process can be done through liberating dialogue, in which the teachers and students can communicate to reflect on their reality. In such a dialogue, students and teachers obtain a level of conscious awareness of their relationship with the world that allows them to transform their experience and finally liberate themselves. Such a liberation pedagogy is described by Nouri and Sajjadi (2014) as “emancipatory education”.

In a more practical way, we can explain that understanding with the following situation. For example, in Javanese culture, people are taught to obey their teachers and to never interrupt or question anything they say. This tradition provides a potential for teachers to abuse their power when they do not critically understand and constructively use this authority, and as a result, the students might follow whatever they are told without questioning. This obedience stems from the belief that questioning the teachers or people in authority means degrading them, which might lead to students being punished.

Generating a concrete description of liberation pedagogy, Nouri and Sajjadi (2014) underline that the central aims of emancipatory education are:

- a contextualization of social and political processes;
- development and implementation of negotiated curriculum;
- curriculum focus on the students’ investigation of everyday, informal and popular culture, as well as historical patterns of power that develop individual subjectivity and identity;
teachers’ role as the facilitator that helps students transform their world and make political and social reforms; and

application of learning assessment in an integral way that provides opportunity for both teachers and students to critically analyze and reflect on their knowledge and experience.

Emancipatory education entails methods of teaching and learning that encourage the students to become aware of their individual reality by investigating their daily life. The results of their investigation will expectedly stimulate their questioning of “reality” and propose changes to the status quo. In a more explicit way, Shor (1988) emphasized that to promote critical training, education should be participatory, the materials should present problems for critical inquiry, the pedagogy should be situated, desocializing and democratic, and the course should be interdisciplinary. This is essentially the process of “conscientization”.

Curriculum and learning development course

To get a more detailed picture of how this research study was developed, it is important to know the design features of the PGSD Curriculum and Learning Development course. For this purpose, this section includes the aims and time allocation of the course, the program of study background, the students’ background and the current Indonesian Elementary School Curriculum.

In the institution where this research was developed, the PGSD Curriculum and Learning Development course is delivered to undergraduate students at Semester 5, considering that they will have an internship training (Program Pengalaman Lapangan – PPL) at Semester 7. One of the internship programs is planned for Semester 7, when the students are allowed to have PPL at the related elementary schools. One of the goals of the PPL programs is to prepare students to teach elementary school pupils under the supervision of the classroom teachers and the appointed supervising lecturers from PGSD. It is important to underline that to prepare their teaching the students are required to develop a lesson plan and learning materials with appropriate objectives and assessment instruments.

Other information that is important to note is that in an elementary school in the surrounding area, an elementary school teacher is a classroom teacher. This means that an elementary school teacher is not teaching subjects separately from each other, but most of the time, s (he) should teach the integrated subjects thematically (2013 Indonesian Curriculum). Furthermore, when the PGSD students become “real” teachers, their ability to develop a lesson plan (an “instructional curriculum” in this context) becomes one of the professional criteria to determine their ability to teach (Standar Kualifikasi dan Kompetensi Akademik Guru, 2007). This condition requires that the PGSD course and PPL prepare the students for such a condition.

The Curriculum and Learning Development course is aimed at helping the undergraduate students prepare themselves to be an elementary school teacher. By the end of this course, the students are expected to master the concept of curriculum planning procedures and curriculum implementation. The students are also expected to be able to understand the concept of curriculum, learning approaches, models, methods, strategies, materials and media. In addition to that, the students are also required to be able to analyze, reconstruct and modify the curriculum, the learning approaches, models, methods, strategies, materials and media innovatively.

Elementary school teacher education students in this institution are usually from middle class or lower class. Based on the data collected so far, some of them get scholarship support either from the government or from a particular congregation. This entails an obligation to go back to the donor institution by the time they finish their education. It is
important to note that the schools that the donor institution own range from schools for middle to lower class as well as middle to upper class. Additionally and occasionally, some other PGSD students are relatively financially independent, meaning that they have more options about where to work later.

Because the students of elementary school teacher education are required to have PPL at an elementary school nearby, a description about the curriculum implemented in these schools might help picture the nature of the PGSD Curriculum and Learning Development course, which is at the center of this study. The current curriculum implemented in the surrounding schools is the Indonesian Ministry of Education's Kurikulum 2013 (K-13/Kurtilas, 2013 Curriculum). To implement the curriculum, the government provided Standar Isi (Content Standard), Standar Proses (Process Standard) and Standar Penilaian (Learning Assessment Standard). These standards contain what to teach, how to teach and how to measure the teaching and learning and are listed in Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia No 16 tahun (2007) or National Ministry of Education Regulation (Salinan Lampiran Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No 21 Tahun, 2016a; Salinan Lampiran Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No 22 Tahun 2016b; Salinan Lampiran Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No 23 Tahun 2016c).

Methodology

As mentioned previously, the purpose of the study was to explore the possibilities and impact of emancipatory education in the preparation of future elementary school teachers. Emancipatory education itself entails methods of teaching and learning that encourage the students and lecturers to become aware of their individual reality by investigating their daily life. This study, therefore, was sustained on an action research methodology according to the four common steps: planning, acting, observing and reflecting.

Planning and acting: the teaching program

The researcher, a lecturer in the Curriculum and Learning Development course, planned and implemented the teaching program in an undergraduate classroom setting from February until June in the academic year 2015-2016. The classroom included 40 PGSD students (3 male students and 37 female students) with different levels of abilities and from different areas of the country, most of them from Java, Indonesia, either from the rural or urban areas with various types of socioeconomic and religious backgrounds.

In the planning step, a Rencana Pembelajaran Semester (Semester Learning Plan) was designed containing learning outcomes, learning materials, learning activities and learning evaluation. The way to design this plan was by following the steps in curriculum development described by Oliva (2009), which covers identifying the learners’ needs, formulating the learning objectives, identifying learning materials, identifying learning activities and determining learning evaluation.

The materials developed in the PGSD lesson plans included four main topics – Curriculum Theory, Curriculum Change in Indonesia, Current Curriculum Implementation in Indonesia and Curriculum Development. Curriculum Theory covered the definition of curriculum, types of curriculum, curriculum development, curriculum implementation, curriculum evaluation and curriculum change and aimed to provide knowledge about the dynamics of the curriculum. Curriculum Change in Indonesia considered the curricula that had been used in Indonesia – how they were developed, decided, implemented, evaluated and finally changed – and was offered to contextualize the dynamics of Indonesian education. Current Curriculum Implementation in Indonesia, comprehending 2013 Indonesian curriculum and its implementation, was given to help the students contextualize the challenges they would face as future teachers. In Curriculum Development, the students developed their own curriculum after reflecting upon their field experience.
The learning activities conducted in the class varied based on the learning objectives and the learning materials. In Curriculum Theory and Curriculum Change in Indonesia, the students were required to make a summary of the main curriculum changes in their country by analyzing them based on concepts developed in Curriculum Theory. In other words, to be able to analyze the curriculum change in Indonesia, the students should understand curriculum theory first, because the curriculum change in Indonesia is presented historically in the form of the sample of curriculum documents, i.e. *Kurikulum* 2006 and *Kurikulum* 2013. Their summary could be presented in any form, as a cartoon, a picture or a poem to accommodate the differences in students’ learning styles (Denig, 2004). Most of the time, students were accustomed to their teachers in general presenting the materials in the form of lectures instead of letting them learn independently by themselves, and usually after that, the teachers would use traditional evaluation and assess the students’ learning by giving them written tests (Guild, 1994). Therefore, this type of activity was meant to develop the students’ critical thinking skills, written communication, diversity appreciation, information technology application, leadership, creativity/innovation and self-direction skills.

For the last two topics, the students developed projects. For Current Curriculum Implementation in Indonesia, the students observed and studied learning activities at the school carried out by the elementary school classroom teachers including teaching preparation (which are in line with the implementation of *Standar Isi*, *Standar Proses* and *Standar Penilaian* provided by the government). This activity was integrated with another course in the program of study, namely, student teachers’ *Program Pengakraban Lingkungan* (*Probaling*, Internship Preparation 1), the actual internship. Integrating the courses in this case helped the student teachers to understand what to focus on when they observed classroom teachers and what to consider when they developed their own lesson plans.

For Curriculum Development, the students were expected to develop their own instructional curriculum (lesson plans and learning materials) based on their reflection of the implementation of the current curriculum in the field. If needed, the students could interview either the teachers or pupils or even both. These activities were meant to develop the students’ critical thinking skills, especially problem solving, oral and written communication, leadership, creativity/innovation, self-direction, professionalism/work ethics and ethics/social responsibility skills.

The results of the student teachers’ field study were presented in the form of poster presentations. Instead of having traditional evaluation, poster presentations were selected considering that such kind of learning activities allowed chances for feedback from other learners and not just from the lecturers (Rowe and Ilic, 2009). Another benefit was that this type of activity allowed the learners to update the materials themselves. In addition, this type of assessment activity allowed the students to practice their questioning abilities considering that, in general, Indonesian students are trained very less to ask questions and share innovative ideas with their teachers and peers. This type of activity was selected after discussion and negotiation with the students at the beginning of the semester, which reflects another important point of emancipatory education.

### Observing and reflecting: data collection and analysis

To observe the implementation of the teacher education program, the researcher took personal notes during and after her teaching. The anecdotal reports contained how the student teachers responded to the learning activities and what challenges were met by either the researcher or the student teachers. In addition, the researcher also collected the student teachers’ assignments, such as the summary of Curriculum Change in Indonesia, reports on Current Curriculum Implementation in Indonesia and the project of Curriculum Development. These sources became the main data to understand the impact of the implementation of the emancipatory education program in assisting the student teachers to
be more adaptable and responsive to their surroundings. When needed, further interviews were also conducted.

Based on the data collected from the anecdotal reports and students' assignments, and using thematic analysis of the values of emancipatory education, namely, manifestation of humanization, critical conscientization and development of problem-solving skills, the researcher then analyzed and reflected on the impact of emancipatory education in the preparation of future teachers. The following section presents and discusses the results of this analysis.

Results and discussion

**Manifestation of humanization**

The manifestation of humanization, which is defined as the awareness of a personal relationship with a bigger world by Nouri and Sajjadi (2014), could be seen in the forms of summary that the students made, which varied based on the students' interests. One of the students, for example, decided to make a summary in the form of a cartoon. All students usually made the summary in the form of note taking without considering their talent and ability. It is important to note that in a collective community, a person has the tendency to cover up their interests or opinion so that they appear to be the same as the others. This innovation indicated that this type of learning provided chances for the students to express their talent. The content guidelines seemed to become the direction for the students about what to put in the summary. The benefits of this type of learning assessment were that the students became more independent in making their summary. None of the students had an exactly similar summary. This emancipatory and participatory approach had the potential for the students to practice higher-order thinking skills, which involved critical thinking with deeper understanding.

Another manifestation of humanization appeared mostly when the students considered the background of the pupils in determining the learning materials and activities in the curriculum. For example, although PGSD students developed the same theme in the curriculum – “trash” – some students could capture that the way to treat the trash could be different from place-to-place depending on the context of the pupils. This at the same time stimulated students' critical conscientization.

**Critical conscientization**

The challenges for the students appeared in the second and the third assignments, namely, the study on the implementation of the current curriculum in Indonesia and students' curriculum development, where the researcher found that the students in general still had problems in writing a report. The tendency to use judgmental words still appeared in the reports. For example, the students expressed that guru tidak memperhatikan latar belakang siswa (teachers did not consider the pupils' background). When the students were confronted with the way they described the elementary school classroom teachers, they failed to explain scientifically how they could arrive at such a conclusion. Based on the interviews, the confrontation helped the students to become more aware of the potentially negative effects of not accurately presenting the details to others with sufficient justification and explanation.

Another challenge was related with curriculum development. The students still had a challenge to use operational words in generating Kompetensi Inti (main competencies) and Kompetensi Dasar (basic competencies) into learning indicators. For example, most of the students still used the word memahami [understanding], which is unobservable and unmeasurable. In addition, the students also had the tendency of using lower-level thinking-order verbs such as menyebutkan [mention], regardless of the basic competencies
required in the study. Even the word *menunjukkan*, which is taken from Bloom’s taxonomy and should mean “identify”, was used as “show”, which is at the same level as the word “memorize.” As a result, they provided the idea of *menunjukkan* that they claimed as “identify” with “show” learning activities, which is at remembering level. This pattern resulted in failure to select appropriate activities that directed the learners to obtain the basic competencies required. As a further result, this gap also caused failure to develop a valid and reliable learning assessment instrument. These findings helped the researcher to realize that the PGSD students still had not understood the relevance of writing appropriate learning objectives.

To respond to such a challenge, the researcher decided to provide extra materials especially related with the introduction of word choices that they might use in developing higher-order levels of critical thinking indicators. The researcher also introduced them to a more comprehensive learning assessment by explaining that in the context of learning practice, in which the learning assessment was considered as formative evaluation, it was not necessary to have one activity for only one of the learning indicators. It was possible that one type of learning assessment captured more than one of the learning indicators.

Another example of critical conscientization appeared in the learning activities chosen in the development of the curriculum. Still focused on the theme of “trash”, the students’ activities in the village were different from the ones developed by the students living near the market. It appeared that such kind of activities proposed a problem-solving activity, which was applicable in their daily life.

It was unavoidable that some students had the tendency to use the old style of curriculum development. Some students did not go through any needs analysis. Instead of considering the students’ background, they used their own mindset to work on needs analysis. For example, one of the students was required to teach in a relatively middle to high class elementary school, in which the children’s parents did not have enough space for gardening. While the PGSD student teachers had been able to identify the children’s background, instead of leading the children to think about an alternative garden, the students introduced the need to have a garden and how to garden in a regular way without any regard to the children’s actual situation.

**Development of problem-solving skills**

The development of problem-solving skills could be seen in the students’ efforts in designing their curriculum development projects. One student developed learning activities that introduced elementary school students to artwork using materials that cannot be recycled such as plastic bags, plastic bottles and plastic containers that can be sold. Some students found alternative materials which were kids friendly, such as mixing tapioca flour with wet unused pieces of papers to make play dough.

Another student designed an elementary students’ science experience project using *Tapak Dara* [*Catharantus roseus*] leaves to replace Cassava leaves. Further, she explained that her reason to use *Tapak Dara* was that she wanted to protect Cassava. Despite the fact that everytime we take the leaves of cassava, its roots become bigger, the reason she presented indicated the development of problem-solving skills.

**Conclusions**

After analyzing the data, the researcher concluded that emancipatory education had the potential to help the PGSD students shift their approaches from the old mode of learning and teaching to being more sensitive and responding to the challenges of teaching and learning in the twenty-first century. The learning activities with the three main projects in the PGSD Curriculum and Learning Development course helped the students to develop critical
thinking skills including: problem solving, oral communication, written communication, teamwork/collaboration, diversity, information technology application, leadership, creativity/innovation, lifelong learning/self-direction, professionalism/work ethics and ethics/social responsibility. Although some “old tendencies” still emerged, the PGSD students became more aware of what they did out of habit and what more they could do.

Recommendations

Considering that emancipatory education has the potential to help the students respond to the challenges of teaching and learning in the twenty-first century, it is the researcher’s recommendation that emancipatory education should be implemented in other courses in developing countries such as Indonesia. Emancipatory education has stimulated the researcher as a lecturer to go beyond “teaching to the test” in the course content and to start teaching for higher-order thinking skills. This type of skills will help future teachers to better respond to what is happening in their surroundings, especially in response to the elementary students they will be teaching. It cannot be avoided though that these new teachers need time and courage to change. There is no study yet about how these student teachers will keep cultivating their ideas when they become “actual” teachers. Therefore, further studies are needed to see the dynamics of these students in their future teaching methods and practices.
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Teacher’s feedback in teaching science in a bilingual Bruneian primary classroom

Roslinawati Roslan, Siti Munawirah Panjang, Norashikin Yusof and Masitah Shahrill

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this study is to analyze the use of feedback to students by a primary teacher teaching the science topic “Life Cycle” in a Year 5 bilingual Bruneian science classroom.

Design/methodology/approach – This study used a discourse analysis of one primary science teacher’s use of feedback to his students when teaching the topic “Life Cycle.” The participant was a male primary science teacher who taught a Year 5 science class in one of the government schools in the Brunei-Muara district. Direct observations and video recordings of the teacher’s three consecutive lessons on the topic “Life Cycle” were collected. The transcripts were developed from the teacher–student interactions in the three lessons. The “Questioning-based Discourse” approach (Chin, 2006) was used to analyze the different types of feedback, and the students’ cognitive processes that emerged from the lesson transcripts. The frequencies of the feedback and students’ cognitive processes were calculated using percentages.

Findings – The findings from the three lesson observations indicate that the teacher’s feedback showed a range of strategies which consisted mostly of accepting students’ answers and feedback to elicit, to focus, to probe, to clarify and to extend, respectively. The findings also reveal that the cognitive processes of the students ranged from recalling, predicting, hypothesizing, evaluating and explaining. The analysis shows that the teacher only practiced low-level questioning and the feedback given to the students was mostly for accepting the students’ answers rather than challenging students’ ideas.

Practical implications – The findings reported in this study provide useful insights into the importance of teacher–student interactions in the teaching and learning of science. The “Questioning-based Discourse” analytical framework is worthwhile to analyze the science teacher’s talk and consequently to improve teachers’ skills in giving feedback that fosters productive students’ responses.

Originality/value – This paper highlights the need for science teachers to analyze their classroom talk and it recommends how to give useful feedback to students to promote higher cognitive processes amongst students. Brunei has been described as a country where there is a linguistic divide determined by the quality of the school that a student attends (Deterding and Salbrina, 2013). Improving the quality of interaction between teacher and students in such circumstances is essential.
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Introduction

In Brunei, “there is a substantial linguistic divide between those who attend good schools and become proficient in English and those who go to less fashionable schools and only develop a rudimentary knowledge of English” (Deterding and Salbrina, 2013, p. 19). Nur Azam et al. (2016) explained that although well-educated Bruneians are proficient in English, Brunei Malay (the native language of Bruneians) tends to be the choice of language to be used in their everyday conversation, “often substantially exhibiting code switching with English” (Nur Azam et al., 2016, p. 9). The adoption of the bilingual system of education mandates that all core subjects in Bruneian primary schools be taught in English except the Malay Language and Islamic Religious Knowledge subjects, which are taught in
Malay (the national language of Brunei). This includes the teaching of science, which uses English as the medium of instruction. Teaching science in English has raised some challenges for Bruneian students who are not proficient in English.

Science teaching consists mostly of classroom talk between the teacher and the students. Research on language in the science classroom has shown that the most prominent modality in use is the teacher-student verbal language (Kress et al., 2001; Roslan, 2014). Thus, classroom talk plays an important role in facilitating students’ development of scientific concepts. The development of students’ understanding of scientific concepts may be achieved when teachers ask questions during the lessons and provide useful feedback to students’ responses to those questions as means to challenge students’ thinking. The critical role of the teacher in stimulating students’ dialogue and discussion, as well as encouraging students’ engagement and participation, is strongly emphasized in classroom research (Alexander, 2008; Mercer and Littleton, 2007). In addition, the teacher’s role is crucial in addressing the diverse learning needs of students, especially in the use of language to facilitate students’ understanding of science concepts. In this study, the use of language is explored as one of the important tools for promoting students’ higher-order thinking skills in learning science. This study outlines the use of feedback by one teacher in teaching a science concept in a bilingual classroom.

The objective of the study is to analyze a primary science teacher’s feedback in teaching the topic “Life Cycle” in a Year 5 science classroom, and to identify the different cognitive processes the students used in responding to the teacher’s questions. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research question:

*RQ1.* What patterns will emerge in analyzing the teacher-student talk using the “Questioning-based Discourse” framework by Chin (2006)?

**The relationship between teachers’ talk and students’ learning**

This study is founded on Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory of teaching and learning, which postulates that knowledge is built in the social environment (the classroom) through language and other semiotic means. Vygotsky (1978) explained that a teacher transmits scientific knowledge to students on an interpsychological plane (the science classroom). Subsequently, the students will internalize the scientific knowledge on an intrapsychological plane. Following the notion of the “zone of proximal development,” the teacher can support the students’ scientific understanding through classroom talk that happened on an interpsychological plane. This is where classroom talk between the teacher and the students plays an important role in facilitating the meaning-making processes of science (Chin, 2006; Edwards and Mercer, 1987). Recent emphasis on inquiry-based science teaching and learning encourages effective classroom talk that promotes students’ understanding of science concepts (Riga et al., 2017; Smart and Marshall, 2013). Smart and Marshall (2013) argued that the facilitation of effective discourse supports the development of students’ understanding of scientific concepts.

Earlier research on classroom talk studied the way a teacher’s use of language in teaching science could constrict students’ ability to talk science (Lemke, 1990). For example, one of the ways teachers used talk in science was to ask questions that only encouraged the triadic dialogue of initiation-response-evaluation (I-R-E) (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975). Previous research on classroom talk shows that teacher-led recitation often consists of these three moves, initiation-response-evaluation. Initiation is usually in the form of a teacher’s question. In response, a student attempts to answer the question, and the teacher provides an evaluation of the student’s response (Alexander, 2000; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975). It was observed that the triadic I-R-E patterns of discourse were heavily used in the science classrooms. Lemke (1990) argued that the triadic patterns of discourse typically limit the students’ thinking, as their responses are
usually short and “teacher-framed.” Instead of using the triadic I-R-E patterns of discourse, the teacher could use feedback or a follow-up in response to the students’ answers. For example, in the pattern of discourse initiation-response-feedback (I-R-F), the teacher could use feedback to challenge students’ responses or to invite the students to extend their scientific understanding. This present study attempted to elicit the different kinds of feedback a science teacher used in teaching science concepts to the students in a primary school setting. Therefore, the project is centered on classroom talk.

Scott (1998) defined classroom talk as authoritative or dialogic discourse. The authoritative discourse usually refers to the scientific point of view and is often used to “deliver” scientific ideas to students. Dialogic discourse, on the other hand, refers to the exploration of ideas between the teacher and the students through active discussions, debates and arguments. In authoritative discourse, the teachers usually ask questions to demand the correct scientific point of view from the students, and it often involves the triadic I-R-E patterns of discourse (Roslan, 2014). In dialogic discourse, students’ ideas are explored and discussed and often the teacher uses a series of I-R-F patterns of interaction (Mortimer and Scott, 2003). The feedback given by the teacher may vary, and usually demands the students to elaborate or extend on their responses.

In classroom talk, teacher questioning plays a vital role to engage students in their learning. Teacher’s questioning lets students explore an issue, an idea or something that is interesting to them. Therefore, questioning may help to promote students’ thinking and build their understanding of a particular concept. According to Cotton (1988), in a classroom setting, teacher’s questions can be seen as instructional cues or stimuli related to the content elements, requiring students to learn the directions for what they are going to do, and how they are going to do it. In addition, using questions in teaching has been found to motivate students, challenging the processes in their thinking and learning that subsequently leads to classroom interactions (Salam and Shahrill, 2014). In inquiry-based science classrooms, teachers’ questioning is different to the traditional science classroom. In the latter, teachers ask questions to evaluate the students’ answers, whereas in inquiry-based science classrooms, teachers use questions to encourage students’ thinking, challenge their answers and extend their responses. Chin (2006) emphasized the use of questioning in inquiry science classrooms to diagnose and extend the students’ ideas and to scaffold their thinking. Morge (2005) suggested using questioning that encourages students to self-evaluate their answers and justify their claims, rather than ending the questioning cycle with an evaluative statement from the teacher.

According to Johnson (2012), to improve the effectiveness of teaching, the teachers would need to start by improving their questions. He shared three specific actions that can be taken to improve the teachers’ questions. First, the teacher needs to get students talking rather than the teacher talking. Second, the teacher needs to prepare the questions when planning the lesson. Third, the teacher should scaffold the questions being asked to the students. Moreover, preparing students to ask and answer questions is critically important if they are to learn to talk and reason effectively together. This is particularly true during inquiry-based science lessons where they are required to investigate topics, consider alternative propositions and hypotheses and solve problems together to propose answers, explanations and to make predictions (Gillies et al., 2014). Importantly, the teacher who asks meaningful questions to students “stimulates the use of various cognitive processes” (Chin, 2006, p. 1343), and promotes higher-order thinking skills among students.

Methodology

For this study, Chin’s (2006) “Questioning-based Discourse” analytical framework was used to analyze the teacher–student interactions. In the lesson excerpts (Tables I-III), the teacher asked questions to frame and guide the classroom talk. The lesson excerpts also provided a clear description of the patterns for a range of possibilities in the I-R-F teaching exchange.
## Table I | Excerpt of Lesson 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Type of utterance</th>
<th>Purpose of utterance</th>
<th>Cognitive process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Animals. Okay. You know what is animals. What is animals?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Accept, elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Binatang! (Animals!)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Ahh .. Animal is binatang (animals). So on page 118. Animals, like all living things, reproduce to make sure their own kind lives on. All of the stages in an animal’s life make up its life cycle. So life cycle in Bahasa Melayu (Malay) is putaran kehidupan (life cycle.) For example, you can see three kinds of examples on both pages, 118 and 119. One example on page 118, the life cycle of a?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>S-Q</td>
<td>Accept, Focus</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Sparrow!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Ahh .. Sparrow. What is a sparrow?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Accept, probe</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Birds!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Hypothesize/recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>The next example you can see here is the life cycle of a?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Ladybug!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Ladybug. Okay. And the third example is the life cycle of a?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Accept, elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Grasshopper!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Grasshopper. Okay. So, the first one first. Sparrow. How is the life cycle? Okay. Hmm .. Look at page 118. Which picture do you think comes first?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Accept, elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Sparrow egg!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Hypothesize/recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Sparrow egg. Hmm .. After that is the sparrow chick. And the other one is the?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-S, Q</td>
<td>Accept, elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Adult sparrow!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Adult sparrow. So the first one should be from the?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Accept, elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Egg!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>From the egg. So the egg hatches, apa yang keluar? (what comes out?) from the egg?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Accept, probe</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>The chick!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Predict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>The chick. la punya anak. (The chick has offspring.) You can see from the picture, how many sparrow chicks can you see?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Accept, elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Two!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Ahh .. Only two. From the first picture there are four eggs. Here only two chicks in the picture. So after they become a sparrow chick, they become adult what?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>S-Q</td>
<td>Accept, probe</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Sparrow!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Hypothesize/recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Adult sparrow. So how many stages does it take for the life of the sparrow?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Accept, elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Chin’s (2006, p. 1337) framework was used to represent the possible range of purposes underlying the teacher’s utterances during the initiation and the feedback moves in facilitating the I-R-F iterations. In this study, the term “utterance” is used instead of the general term of “teacher-talk.” The term “feedback” is used to indicate teacher’s feedback given to the students’ responses.

In Chin’s (2006) framework, teacher–student interactions consist of “initiation,” “response” and “feedback.” In the initiation moves, the set termed “Draw out” consists of teacher’s questions that aim to elicit, probe and extend students’ thinking. These work in cycle with “Cue and Provoke,” where teacher’s questions are designed to clarify, prompt and challenge students’ responses. As for the feedback move, this consists of teacher’s utterances that affirm, restate and consolidate students’ correct ideas with the purpose of reinforcing the key scientific concepts involved in the lesson. Evaluation takes place when the teacher evaluates the students’ responses to the teacher’s questions (both in initiation and feedback moves).

The participants in this case study were one male primary science teacher and sixteen Year 5 students of mixed ability in a government school in the Brunei-Muara District in Brunei Darussalam. The teacher had more than 10 years of teaching experience and possessed a diploma in primary education from the University of Brunei Darussalam. During the time of this study, he taught science at the upper primary levels (Years 4, 5 and 6). The class involved in this study consisted of mixed ability Year 5 students with ten boys and six girls. The students’ age ranged from 10 to 12 years old. During the lessons, the teacher and the students often used code switching between English and Brunei Malay when the students’ English language ability became an obstacle to communication.

This study adopted Chin’s (2006) discourse analysis to study the primary science teacher’s use of feedback to his students and to identify the cognitive processes the students’ used in the lessons. Data for the study were collected in the form of direct lesson observations, video recordings of three science lessons and field notes. Three consecutive lesson observations were conducted to study the teacher–student interactions during teaching of the topic “Life Cycle.” In addition to observations, writing field notes was a useful way to record all the events and actions related to the teacher–student interactions in the classroom for the three lessons. The three lessons, which comprised approximately 3-h duration, were video recorded by a research assistant to capture the teacher–student interactions.
The video clips of the lessons were observed and transcribed verbatim. Subsequently, the transcripts were coded using the “Questioning-based Discourse” developed by Chin (2006). To ensure the inter-coder reliability of the data, two coders coded the transcriptions from the lessons. The data from the teacher talk on the purpose of feedback and students’ cognitive processes were converted into percentages as shown below:

\[
\text{The percentage of Purpose of Feedback} = \frac{\text{Purpose of Feedback i.e. Accept} \times 100}{\text{Overall Purpose of Feedback}}
\]

\[
\text{The percentage of Cognitive process} = \frac{\text{Cognitive process i.e. Recall} \times 100}{\text{Overall Cognitive processes}}
\]

The percentages indicated the frequency of the feedback used by the teacher in each lesson. The cognitive processes of the students were also calculated in percentages to indicate the frequency of the cognitive processes used in each lesson. The results were then represented in the forms of bar graphs and pie charts.

**Results**

The teacher’s feedback and the corresponding students’ cognitive processes are discussed lesson by lesson below.

**Lesson 1**

The first lesson started at 10.50 a.m. and continued until 11.40 a.m. The excerpt presented in Table I was taken from the beginning of the lesson where there was a whole class discussion on the life cycle of a sparrow. In the excerpt, the teacher first elicited the students’ ideas on the life cycle of animals. The students’ responses were based on their recall of previous knowledge or experiences. The teacher then posed questions which consisted of a series “comment question” (C-Q) couplets and a few “statement question” (S-Q) couplets where his questions built on the students’ earlier responses. The purposes of feedback found in the discourse move by the teacher were to accept, to elicit, to probe, to focus, to extend and to clarify.

The graph in Figure 1 shows the frequencies of the teacher’s purposes of feedback for Lesson 1.

Figure 1 shows that the teacher mostly accepted the students’ answers and asked a series of related questions that extended students’ thinking (which comprised mainly C-Q couplets). These questions were used more to elicit, and to probe students’ thinking but
less to focus, to clarify and to extend. In response to the teacher’s questions, the students were engaged in the cognitive processes of recalling, hypothesizing, predicting and evaluating (Figure 2).

The pie chart in Figure 2 shows that in Lesson 1 more than half of the students’ cognitive processes involved recalling (51 per cent). About 30 per cent of the cognitive processes were analyzed as students hypothesizing, about 12 per cent as predicting and about 7 per cent were analyzed as provoking the students to evaluate. The results show that the teacher provoked questions mostly by asking students to recall scientific concepts.

**Lesson 2**

The second lesson observed started at 8.10 a.m. and continued until 9.00 a.m. The excerpt in Table II was taken from the middle of the lesson when there was a whole class discussion on the life cycle of a cockroach. From the excerpt, the teacher prompted the students’ ideas about what type of animal the cockroach is. The students’ responses were based on recalling from their previous knowledge of the science syllabus. The teacher then posed questions, which consisted of a series of C-Q couplets and S-Q couplets, where his questions built on students’ earlier responses and from his explanations of scientific facts. The purposes of the feedback found in the discourse move by the teacher were to accept, to elicit, to probe, to focus and to clarify.

The graph in Figure 3 shows the frequencies of the teacher’s purposes of feedback for Lesson 2.

The results in Figure 3 indicate that the teacher mostly explained the discourse and accepted the students’ answers. Then he asked a series of related questions that promoted students’ thinking (which comprised mainly of S-Q couplets and C-Q couplets). These questions were used more to focus, to probe and to elicit students’ thinking; while fewer questions were asked to clarify. There was no evidence of feedback given to extend the responses by the students in Lesson 2. In response to the teacher’s questions, the students were engaged in the cognitive processes of recalling, hypothesizing, predicting, evaluating and explaining (Figure 4).

The pie chart in Figure 4 shows that almost half of the students’ cognitive processes involved recall (43 per cent) for this particular lesson. About 25 per cent of the students’ cognitive processes were hypothesizing, 22 per cent prompted students to predict, 9 per cent provoked students to evaluate and only 1 per cent asked students to explain. The results show that the teacher provoked questions mostly by asking students to recall when responding to his questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Type of utterance</th>
<th>Purpose of utterance</th>
<th>Cognitive process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>[Teacher write title on the board] So, the first animal?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Elicit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Cockroach!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Cockroach. [Teacher write again]. So, cockroach. What type of an animal is a cockroach?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>Accept, probe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Insect!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Okay. Cockroach is an insect. It’s an insect. Ladybug you can remember, not amphibian, not katak. (frog.) It is an?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>Focus, elicit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Insect!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>It is an insect. Okay. So, a female cockroach lays its eggs in an egg case. Okay. The case contains many eggs. So, which cockroach lays eggs? The female or the male?</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Female!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Female lay eggs. So as you can see on page 120, stage 1, the first stage, sama jua macam kelmarin. (the same as yesterday.) From an egg. Tapi? (But?)</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>Focus, elicit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student:</td>
<td>Tapi dalam (But it is in) egg case.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Hypothesize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Ahh. .. It lays its eggs in an egg case. Macam kotak penyimpanan telurnya atu. (Like a box to keep the eggs.) Bukan nya ia betelur berjurut, sana sini. (It doesn’t lay its eggs scattered everywhere.) It has a case bersusun (arranged.) Cockroach lays its eggs in a case. So, after lay eggs in a case, the young cockroach called a?</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Cockroach nymph!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Hypothesize/ recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Ahh .. Nymph. Kelmarin ada nymph kan? (Yesterday do we have nymph, right?)</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>Accept, elicit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Awu! (Yes!)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Which animal?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Elicit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td>Grasshopper!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Grasshopper nymph. Cockroach pun di panggil (also called) nymph. Young cockroach called nymph hatches from each egg. The nymph look similar to an adult cockroach, but it is smaller and does not have wings. So, what does it called? The young cockroach? Cockroach?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>Focus, elicit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student:</td>
<td>Cockroach nymph!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Cockroach nymph. N-Y-M-P-H ... So, how does it look like?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>Accept, probe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student:</td>
<td>Macam (Like) ..</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>How does it look like? Look here. [Teacher points to the textbook]</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Probe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student:</td>
<td>Insect!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Macam (Like) insect. Lurus pulang (it’s correct) insect. Macam apa? (Like what?) Ladybug? Grasshopper?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>Accept, elicit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Lesson 3

The third observed lesson ran from 10.50 a.m. until 11.40 a.m. The excerpt in Table III occurred toward the end of the lesson where there was a whole class discussion on corrections for the unit review. In the excerpt, the teacher invited his students to read the questions first. The teacher then posed questions that consisted of a series of C-Q couplets and S-Q couplets, where his questions were built on students’ earlier responses and from recalling explanations of scientific facts. The students’ responses were based on recalling from previous knowledge of the topic learnt. The purposes of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Type of utterance</th>
<th>Purpose of utterance</th>
<th>Cognitive process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Everyone, read question number 1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Which of the following shows the correct stages in the life cycle of a cockroach?</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Okay, So, which one?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: C!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Who answer C?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: [All students raise their hands]</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: [Teacher counts] Everyone. Everyone answer C. Look at the arrow. Which one is stage 1, which one is stage 2, and which one is stage 3? .. So the correct answer is?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>S-Q</td>
<td>Focus, clarify</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: C!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: C. Okay .. So number 2. Everyone read question number 2</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-S</td>
<td>Accept, focus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: What is the name given to a young cockroach?</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Okay. What is the name given?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: B! Nymph!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Okay. Any other answer than B, Nymph?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Accept, elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: No!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: So, what is the name given to a young cockroach?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Nymph!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: A, Caterpillar, B, Nymph, C, Tadpole, D, Pupa. So the answer?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>S-Q</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Nymph!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: B. So the correct answer is nymph, young cockroach .. Okay. Number 3</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-S</td>
<td>Accept, focus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: What is the name given to a young frog?</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: So, what is the name given to a young frog?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: A!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: What is the name given to a young frog? A? The answer is?</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Probe</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Tadpole!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Okay. Tadpole .. Okay. Number 4</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-S</td>
<td>Accept, focus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: How many stages are there in the life cycle of a tiger?</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: How many stages?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: C!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Two!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Three!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: How many stages?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Clarify</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Two!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Ahh .. B. jawapannya (is the answer) .. Okay, Number 5.</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>S-Q</td>
<td>Accept, focus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Which of the following shows the correct stages in the life cycle of a butterfly?</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: So which one is correct?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Elicit</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: A!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: A. Macam mana tu? (How?) Egg ..</td>
<td>F-I</td>
<td>C-Q</td>
<td>Accept, probe</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Egg, caterpillar, pupa and butterfly!</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: I, initiation; R, response; F, follow-up; Q, teacher question; A, student answer; C, teacher comment; S, teacher statement (for type of utterance); C-Q = comment-question; S-Q = statement-question; and C-S = comment-statement
feedback found in the discourse move by the teacher were to accept, to elicit, to probe, to focus and to clarify.

The graph in Figure 5 shows the frequencies of the teacher’s purposes of feedback for Lesson 3.

The results in Figure 5 reveal that the teacher mostly accepted the students’ answers. He then asked a few related questions that prompted students’ thinking (which comprised mainly of S-Q couplets and C-Q couplets). These questions were used more to elicit and to focus on students’ thinking. The teacher used fewer questions to probe and to clarify. However, there was no evidence found of teacher’s feedback intended to extend the students’ responses in Lesson 3. In response to the teacher’s questions, the students were engaged in the cognitive processes of recalling, predicting, hypothesizing and evaluating (Figure 6).

Figure 6 shows that a higher percentage of the students’ cognitive process in this lesson was on recalling (58 per cent). About 8 per cent of the cognitive process was on students’ hypothesizing, 31 per cent promoted students to predict and 3 per cent focused on provoking students’ evaluation. The results show that the students were engaged in the cognitive processes mostly of recalling and predicting for answers, and less on the cognitive processes of hypothesizing and evaluating.

Discussion

From the analysis of the transcripts of the teacher–student interactions using the “Questioning-based Discourse” analytical framework (Chin, 2006), it was found that the teacher used questions to frame and guide classroom interactions and provided explanations and feedback within the I-R-F teaching exchanges.

![Figure 5](image-url) Teacher’s purposes of feedback in Lesson 3

![Figure 6](image-url) Students’ cognitive processes in Lesson 3
From the three lessons, the feedback move (F-move) of the teacher was mostly evaluative and provoked recall questions. Edwards and Westgate (1994) stated that the F-move in the I-R-F cycle is not just evaluative but also supportive, embedding a further question that provokes deeper thinking beyond recalling and which can engage students to be more cognitively active. Furthermore, Chin (2006) suggested that a teacher should ask more questions that stimulate students to draw up hypotheses, predict outcomes, brainstorm ideas, generate explanations, make interpretations and conclusion, self-evaluate and reflect on their thinking.

From the lesson observations, a common feature observed in the teacher’s comments in the F-move was that he often rephrased the students’ responses. According to Edwards and Mercer (1987), restating a student’s answer is not only used to affirm the student’s response but also to make their ideas available to the whole class, therefore, making it “common knowledge.” The teacher in this present study should be recommended to work on asking questions that extend students’ thinking as this was only used at a minimum of 1 per cent within the three lessons described above, and specifically it was found only in Lesson 1. Questions that extend students’ thinking may encourage students to think critically, and extend their thinking still further, which is essential in the science classroom. The students’ cognitive processes resulting from the teacher’s feedback mostly demanded them to recall only, and it is evident that not much opportunity was given to the students to use higher-order thinking skills. Often in science classrooms, teachers ask questions that have predetermined answers and simply demand the correct scientific concept to be recalled (Lemke, 1990; Roslan, 2014). This may hinder further discussion and dialogue if questions are only used to check students’ understanding, or recall, of science concepts. Teachers’ feedback may also determine the kinds of responses the students give. When teachers give feedback that does not challenge students’ thinking, the students will not have the opportunity to extend their thinking and expand on their responses. These findings concur with Chin (2006) who found that “by changing the third turn of an I-R-F questioning sequence from explicit evaluation to one that includes ‘responsive questioning,’ teachers can make their classroom discourse more thought-provoking and stimulate more elaborate and productive responses” (p. 1340).

Using Chin’s (2006) framework revealed the nature of the teacher–student interactions in this teacher’s classroom. The outcome has to be seen against the background of the requirement for Bruneian students to learn science in English, a language in which they may be less than proficient. This adds to the demand placed on them to respond to the teacher’s questions. It may be hypothesized that the nature of feedback the teacher revealed in this study was due, in part, to the language issue faced by the students.

Conclusions

In the present study, it was found that the teacher used questions to frame and guide classroom interactions and provided explanations and feedback within the I-R-F teaching exchanges. From the three consecutive lessons, the F-move of the teacher was mostly evaluative and provoked questions to recall students’ cognitive processes. It is possible to say that the teacher should ask more questions that stimulate students to hypothesize, to predict, to provide explanations, make interpretations and draw conclusions, particularly at the primary level, so that the core knowledge of the content will be developed throughout the learning process as they proceed to a higher level of education. This study also raised a bigger question in terms of helping students to learn, as language remains a critical issue for students to learn science, as well other subject areas in English. This question is not only faced in Bruneian classrooms but also in other classrooms where students have diverse multicultural backgrounds and diverse English language needs. In this context, teachers have to provide linguistic scaffolding during the “teacher’s questioning and feedback” and develop skills in eliciting, prompting and extending students’ thinking during the I-R-F patterns of interactions to guide students toward higher levels of cognitive processing (Chin, 2006, p.1343).
Recommendations

The findings from this study showed that there were different kinds of feedback the teacher used within a primary science classroom and revealed its relationship to the students' cognitive processes. Three major recommendations follow from this study.

First, it seems important that teachers analyze and reflect on their classroom practice (Clayton and Ash, 2005). Analyzing teachers’ discourse in his or her classroom may provide opportunities for a teacher to reflect on their discourse and questioning skills. If teachers are aware of the way they ask questions and analyze the students’ responses to their questions, they will be more likely to focus on their discourse. Smart and Marshall (2013) suggested that teachers should write specific questions in their lesson plans. This will help teachers to ensure that they have included questions that could be used in promoting higher-order thinking skills among their students.

Training pre-service and in-service teachers to plan for and give formative feedback is one of the ways to encourage teachers to practice effective classroom discourse to their students. The “Questioning-based Discourse” framework by Chin (2006) could be used in exposing both the pre-service and in-service teachers to the different kinds of feedback and cognitive processes found in the classroom discourse. Videos of exemplary lessons with teachers asking higher-order questions and productive teacher feedback could be used as a model for effective classroom discourses. This way, teachers could learn from examples of how to use effective feedback that not only encourage critical thinking skills but also develop students' conceptual understanding.

Teachers might also be encouraged to video record their lessons and analyze them using the discourse analysis described here as part of a collaborative Lesson Study (Wood and Sithamparam, 2015). This could provide an opportunity for self-reflection in carrying out their own research into primary science students’ linguistic capabilities with a view to improving the teaching–learning experience.

With the recent emphasis on the use of Content Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (Coyle et al., 2010; Piacentini et al., 2017; Yusof, 2013), science teachers in Brunei and other countries could use this approach to help English as Second Language learners and English as Foreign Language learners to develop their knowledge of science and English proficiency simultaneously. CLIL has proven to be useful in improving science education in Europe (Grandinetti et al., 2013) and this approach offers a promising future in improving current science education in Brunei and other countries with various English language needs.
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Abstract

Purpose — The purpose of this study is to diagnose and understand Portuguese academics’ perspectives on the components of intercultural competence and on the importance of its development by higher education students.

Design/methodology/approach — Academics’ perspectives were identified during two discussion and reflection sessions included in the overall training program Intercultural Competence in Higher Education: building proposals with academics that took place at a Portuguese public university. Data were collected through audio recordings of the two sessions and observation notes and were subject to content analysis, drawing on Deardorff’s process model of intercultural competence (2006).

Findings — Academics recognize the multidimensionality of intercultural competence, acknowledging that it comprises attitudes (acceptance and respect; curiosity and openness), knowledge (others’ cultural contexts; self-knowledge and cultural self-awareness) and skills (observation and listening) that altogether will lead to individuals’ desired internal and external outcomes. The development of intercultural competence by higher education students, regarded in close relation to higher education internationalization, is considered crucial for changing prejudiced attitudes, preparing students to live in a global world and empowering them professionally.

Originality/value — The study sheds light on an issue that has been insufficiently addressed by research: academics’ perspectives on intercultural competence development, namely, in the Portuguese higher education context.

Keywords Intercultural competence, Higher education, Academics, Internationalization

Paper type Research paper

Intercultural competence: a focus and outcome of higher education internationalization

One of the most pressing concerns currently faced by higher education institutions (HEIs) is the development of transversal skills by students, in addition to technical and scientific ones, to enhance their integration in national and international job markets, their mobility and their ability to live in a diverse world (Deardorff, 2015; Griffith et al., 2016; Stier, 2006). In this framework, and in the context of a current rise in nationalism, populism and isolationist tendencies, the development of intercultural competence (IC) in higher education assumes a crucial significance as shown by extensive research (Deardorff, 2004, 2006; Deardorff and Jones, 2012; Dimitrov et al., 2014).

IC has been perceived as a higher education transversal learning outcome, whose importance is twofold: the need to prepare graduates who are able to address global challenges, acting in an integrated world system, and to resolve intercultural conflicts (Council of Europe, 2008; Deardorff and Arasaratnam-Smith, 2017); and the need for HEI internationalization, which has increasingly become a key theme at global level (Deardorff and Arasaratnam-Smith, 2017; de Wit et al., 2017; Egron-Polak and Hudson, 2014). Within internationalization, IC acquires a relevant position as perceived in Knights’ (2004, p. 11) definition: “Internationalization at the national/sector/institutional level is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose,
functions or delivery of post-secondary education." This dimension is also present in the social/cultural rationale, which along with political, economic and academic rationales may drive HEI internationalization. According to Knight (2004), the social/cultural rationale is related to the importance given to knowledge of the other, his/her language and culture, assuming that intercultural dialogue and peace are dependent on intercultural understanding and communication. In this sense, the development of graduates’ IC is considered one of the strongest rationales for internationalizing higher education.

The concept of internationalization at home, which has been receiving more attention in the past 15 years, also puts an emphasis on (home) students’ IC: “Internationalisation at Home is the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments” (Beelen and Jones, 2015, p. 76). Likewise, internationalization of the curriculum, as defined by Leask (2015, p. 9), underlines this intercultural dimension in HEI internationalization, and is defined as “[…] the incorporation of international, intercultural and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum, as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods and support services of a program of study,” so as to develop students' international and intercultural perspectives as global citizens.

The way higher education internationalization has been related to the development of students’ IC assigns academics a central role, presenting them with the challenge of being drivers of intercultural education as “a pedagogy – aims, content, learning processes, teaching methods, syllabus and materials, and assessment – of which one purpose is to develop intercultural competence in learners of all ages in all types of education as a foundation for dialogue and living together” (Council of Europe, 2014, p. 27). Indeed, the success of this pedagogy is very dependent on academics who, regardless of their disciplinary areas, have a responsibility in the development of their students’ IC.

For them to fulfill this responsibility, they need to:

- become aware of the importance of developing their students’ IC (Ouellett, 2005);
- attain IC themselves (Cushner and Mahon, 2009; Deardorff, 2009);
- be supported by their institutions in the construction of clear educational policies that meet the development of IC (Hiller, 2010);
- have opportunities to explore IC frameworks and ways in which they can be translated into intercultural learning outcomes within the curricula (Gopal, 2011); and
- have training within intercultural skills programs to develop their intercultural teaching competence and to help them model and guide students’ IC development (Deardorff and Jones, 2012; Dimitrov et al., 2014).

Some universities worldwide have been taking long-term holistic approaches to support staff and academics in achieving this transformation (Leask, 2009, for the Australian context; Jones and Killick, 2013, for the United Kingdom; Childress, 2010, for the USA; van Gaalen et al., 2014, for The Netherlands). Usually, these approaches begin with an analysis of institutional policies and afterwards opportunities for sharing, joint learning and reflection are created.

Acknowledging the relevance of the approaches undertaken by these universities, it is important to pay more attention initially to academics’ perspectives on IC development. As highlighted by Paige and Goode (2009), literature on intercultural training overwhelmingly views IC from the perspective of the students, and there remains insufficient conceptualization of intercultural learning on the part of the teachers. In addition to this, a growing body of research literature shows that teachers' beliefs and perspectives directly affect their perceptions of both teaching and learning in the classroom, and therefore, affect their practices as highlighted by Borg (2003, p. 81): “[…] teachers are active, thinking
decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex practically-oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs.” Hence, more studies focused on academics’ perspectives concerning IC development are needed, as these perspectives may influence practices and discourses. The aim of this study is, therefore, to shed light on this issue.

The study: Portuguese academics’ perspectives on intercultural competence

**Discussion and reflection sessions: intercultural competence in higher education**

Between November 2016 and December 2016, a set of four 2-h sessions of discussion and reflection entitled “Intercultural Competence in Higher Education: Building Proposals with Academics” took place at a Portuguese public university. These sessions, supported by the Rectory, were aimed at academics (an invitation was sent to all academics via the Rectorate and online registration was required) and were based on collaborative work that could boost the (re)construction of knowledge and practices regarding the development of students’ IC. The following overall goals were pursued: to deepen knowledge on how to promote and assess IC development, to analyze existing practices of IC development in higher education, and to collaboratively build strategies contributing to the development of higher education students’ IC.

Each session also included specific objectives and involved diverse activities as presented below:

1. **Session 1. IC in higher education: what and why?**

   - **Objectives:** Stimulate reflection and share perspectives on the concept of IC and deepen knowledge about IC and its components.
   - **Activities:**
     - Brainstorming on the concept of IC.

2. **Session 2. Curricula and the development of IC**

   - **Objectives:** Stimulate reflection on the importance of developing higher education students’ IC and on the intercultural attitudes, knowledge and skills they need to develop and to analyze and reflect on intercultural learning outcomes.
   - **Activities:**
     - Brainstorming on the importance of IC development by students
     - Analysis of intercultural learning outcomes from different courses/universities.

3. **Session 3. Development of IC: proposals for curriculum design**

   - **Objectives:** Design intercultural learning outcomes for their own course units and reflect on the need to align intercultural learning outcomes with course contents, pedagogical strategies, activities, resources and assessment.
   - **Activities:**
     - Analysis and reformulation of courses learning outcomes.
     - Redesigning courses syllabus (alignment of learning outcomes, contents, strategies, activities, resources and assessment).
4. Session 4. Sharing proposals of curriculum (re)design

- Objectives: Discuss and reflect on the potentialities and difficulties of integrating IC in courses syllabus.
- Activities: Presentation and discussion of the proposals for curriculum (re)design.

Given the issues raised in the first section of this paper and considering the identified research gap concerning academics’ perspectives about IC, this paper will focus on data collected in the first two sessions. These allowed:

1. diagnosing academics’ perspectives concerning the components of IC; and
2. understanding the importance given by academics to the development of IC by higher education students.

**Participants**

In total, ten academics participated in the two sessions. These academics (seven female and three male academics, between 35 and 60 years of age) conducted teaching and/or research activities in diverse disciplinary areas (Table I).

This diversity of disciplinary areas shows that, somehow, intercultural education is a concern shared not only by academics teaching “about the social world and/or the world of the individual human being,” but also by academics who “teach about the natural world” (Council of Europe, 2014, p. 33).

Apart from their teaching and research duties, some participants performed other roles in the institution: one was a doctoral program director, one was a Master Program vice-director degree and one was a pro-rector of the University. Furthermore, three participants were Post-Doctoral Research Fellows at the University. All signed informed consent forms prior to their participation in the study.

**Data collection and analysis**

Considering the research objectives, the following data sources were used: audio recordings of the two sessions and observation notes taken during the sessions. The session transcripts were analyzed using the principles of content analysis (Bardin, 2001; Krippendorff, 2013).

Acknowledging that in the past 15 years, much scholarly effort has been invested in the definition of IC and that several models and frameworks have been designed according to disciplinary areas (Arasaratnam-Smith, 2017; Griffith et al., 2016) and considering that this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I</th>
<th>Participants’ disciplinary areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fictional names</td>
<td>Disciplinary area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreia</td>
<td>Accountancy and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatriz</td>
<td>Educational sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td>Accountancy and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>Language and cultural studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacinta</td>
<td>Language and cultural studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>João</td>
<td>Civil engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge</td>
<td>Mechanical engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Educational sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>Educational sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Health sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
study focuses on the higher education context, data will be analyzed drawing on Deardorff’s *process model of IC* (2006). This (grounded research-based) compositional model achieved consensus among 23 top experts on IC and was validated by higher education administrators. For these reasons, and because it focuses on identifying and assessing IC as a student outcome of HE internationalization, it has been widely influential in higher education.

Deardorff (2004, p. 194) defines IC as “the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one’s intercultural knowledge, skills and attitudes.” *Attitudes* are considered the fundamental starting point in developing IC, having an impact on all other aspects and comprise respect (valuing other cultures, cultural diversity), openness (to intercultural learning and to people from other cultures, withholding judgment), curiosity and discovery (tolerating ambiguity and uncertainty). *Knowledge and comprehension* comprise cultural self-awareness, deep understanding and knowledge of culture (including contexts, role and impact of culture and others’ world views), culture-specific information and sociolinguistic awareness. *Skills* of observation and interpretation, analysis, evaluation and relation are not only necessary to acquire knowledge but also to make meaning of that knowledge and then apply it in specific situations.

These three components lead to *desired internal and external outcomes*. Desired internal outcomes involve “an internal shift in frame of reference” (Deardorff, 2004, p. 196) and comprise adaptability (to different communication styles and behaviors, adjustment to new cultural environments), flexibility (selecting and using appropriate communication styles and behaviors, cognitive flexibility), ethnorelative view and empathy. These outcomes, which occur within the individual as a result of the acquired attitudes, knowledge and skills, will lead to desired external outcomes that can be described as “behaving and communicating appropriately and effectively in intercultural situations” (Deardorff, 2004, p. 196).

This model, which perceives IC development as a lifelong process, reveals the developmental nature of IC that starts with appropriate individual attitudes, emphasizing a movement from the personal level to the interpersonal one.

**Results**

According to the outlined research objectives, results are presented and discussed according to two main themes: academics’ perspectives on the components of IC and importance of developing higher education students’ IC. Participants’ names were changed to preserve anonymity, and their statements are illustrated by quotations, translated into English, providing representative perspectives of the participants.

**Academics’ perspectives on the components of intercultural competence**

Academics emphasize the complexity of IC, highlighting that it may undertake different “nuances” according to one individual’s experiences and life stories: “It is a complex concept that can be and mean many things, depending on each person’s life experiences and on the contexts people move in” (Andreia).

Recognizing the complexity inherent to the concept, they highlight that it is composed of different interrelated components – attitudes, knowledge and skills – that altogether will ideally lead to change in an individual’s internal frames of empathy and adaptability, as well as to effective and appropriate communication in intercultural situations. Although emphasis is highly placed on attitudes and knowledge, academics also recognize the importance of skills, underlining that, for instance, “Knowing foreign languages and knowing different cultures does not mean that you have intercultural competence. Having intercultural competence is much more than that […] it is being, knowing and acting” (Francisco).
Attitudes are considered as the foundation of IC because they are “The basis for someone to behave interculturally because they have an impact on the other features of intercultural competence” (Jacinta). Attitudes toward otherness are the most valued by academics and are related to the relationship that individuals establish with others. In this sense, academics highlight the fundamental need to accept and respect people from different cultural backgrounds: “If we are not able to respect people from different parts of the world and their viewpoints, we will not be able to communicate with them” (João). They also underline the importance of curiosity toward others and openness, emphasizing that “Having an open mind is crucial for individuals to engage in intercultural dialogue” (Marta). Hence, the notion of “otherness,” which is at the core of IC, is strongly stressed by academics.

Concerning knowledge, our data show that academics put emphasis on the need to “Know different realities and contexts” (Andreia) and “Know the history, customs, perspectives and ways of being and living of the Other” (Gabriela). Hence, knowing others’ cultural contexts and worldviews, which includes knowing historical, political and social contexts and goes beyond conventional surface-level knowledge of foods, customs and festivities, is highly valued. This type of knowledge is considered essential in the sense that it can avoid misunderstandings in intercultural interactions: “If we do not know other people’s customs and the realities they live in, we risk making mistakes and misinterpretations” (Francisco). Academics also highlight the need for self-knowledge and cultural self-awareness that may help individuals to better understand others:

> It is important to know ourselves, to understand our own ways of doing things and how we react to situations […] It is important to question our principles and our knowledge […] only then will we be able to understand others (Jacinta).

Regarding skills, the least mentioned component, academics emphasize the importance of observation and listening: “It is important to see, to really see the Other and listen to him/her so that we can know more about him/her” (Marta). This shows that they believe that observing and listening, which are part of critical thinking skills, are important to acquire knowledge to be mobilized in intercultural situations.

Concerning desired internal outcomes, academics believe that the above attitudes, knowledge and skills are crucial for individuals to be able to show empathy toward others and to adapt to different cultural environments:

> Having intercultural competence means that you are sensitive to ‘difference’, that you know other realities and that you are able to interpret those realities; only when you do that, will you be able to adjust yourself to the Other, not imposing our own perspectives and being able to put yourself in others’ shoes (Gabriela).

Moreover, academics believe that the combination of attitudes, knowledge, skills and desired internal outcomes is demonstrated through the visible behavior and communication of the individual (desired external outcomes): “When we interact with foreign students in our classes, it is important to make use of the intercultural attitudes, knowledge and skills necessary to communicate with them” (Jorge).

This analysis shows that academics perceive IC as being multidimensional and articulating different dimensions that are intimately interdependent within a holistic approach, therefore, meeting what is underlined by Deardorff (2004, 2006, 2015). Within these dimensions, they identify foundational attitudes to further develop the knowledge and skills needed for IC. Moreover, academics stress that the development of IC is an ongoing process and that “students do not develop it just because they study abroad or because they engage in intercultural encounters sometimes” (Gabriela).
Importance of developing higher education students’ intercultural competence

All academics consider that developing higher education students’ IC is increasingly important, underlining reasons that can be grouped in three interrelated categories: changing prejudiced attitudes, preparing students to live in a global world and empowering them professionally.

Academics believe that higher education students must develop IC so as to change prejudiced attitudes into attitudes of respect, openness, curiosity and discovery. This attitude change becomes more important because, as academics underline, interaction between people from diverse backgrounds and cultural contexts is greater than ever because of technological advances that increase physical and virtual mobility. Hence, they emphasize that enhancing students’ IC will “contribute to an openness of mind towards the world and knowledge which is crucial to make societies work” (Beatriz), enabling them to “Better deal with constraints and cultural differences and to interact with different people in diverse cultural contexts” (Andreia).

Changing prejudiced attitudes is intimately related to the need for students to be prepared to live in a global world that is characterized by linguistic and cultural diversity. This preparation includes acquiring “knowledge and understanding of different cultures and social contexts” (Maria) that will contribute to make students more “sensitive to difference, to other ways of thinking and acting allowing them to reflect not only about others but also about themselves” (Jacinta). Thus, academics underline the need for students to develop an ability to see things from others’ perspectives so that they can act in a global world. This will, in turn, help them learn and reflect critically about their own cultural positioning, beliefs, discourses and values. So, academics believe that IC not only enhances students’ knowledge and understanding of other people but also promotes self knowledge and self understanding.

Moreover, it is worth noting that academics place an emphasis on the importance of developing IC by home students who do not participate in study abroad programs:

It is important that students who never engage in mobility have the chance to develop their intercultural competence “at home” because they will also have to act both locally and globally (Gabriela).

In this line of thought, academics emphasize the need to teach their students to understand the interdependencies between local and global contexts so as to become citizens “able to address global challenges and live in an interconnected society” (Deardorff and Jones, 2012, p. 283). These perspectives show that academics believe that IC “enables people to interact and cooperate effectively and appropriately in situations where cultural ‘otherness’ and ‘difference’ are salient” (Council of Europe, 2014, p. 23), relating it to concepts such as social cohesion and civic engagement.

Being able to work effectively across cultures as a way of achieving professional empowerment was also identified as an important reason for higher education students to develop IC: “It is important to prepare our students to be able to work in the global market, to be competitive professionally” (Sandra); “They must understand that without this kind of competences they will not have the tools to work neither in Portugal nor abroad” (Andreia). Again, academics focus on students who do not participate in study abroad programs underlining that “those students will also need to be interculturally competent to be successful in their professional future […] internationalization is not only aimed at those who study abroad” (Sandra).

These perspectives are in accordance with the results of several reports focusing on required professional skills by employers, which have identified IC as a crucial competence.
in today’s intercultural workplace (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2015; British Council, 2013). Indeed, academics are aware that

Many jobs today, regardless of location, require working with other people who are quite different from each other. While technical knowledge and subject knowledge are certainly important for success, they are not enough (Deardorff, 2015, p. 137).

Considering the importance attached to the development of students’ IC, academics underline that they should be given diversified opportunities to develop this competence overtime: study abroad, on-campus interaction with foreign students, course work (which implies that teachers are able to introduce the development of IC in their course units) and initiatives taken by the university that foster relationships between Portuguese and foreign students. Thus, academics point out two main strategies to develop students’ IC: through the curriculum and co-curricular activities (organized by the university), which when combined together may bring an intercultural dimension to students’ educational experiences. When talking about the curriculum, academics admit that it is hard for them to integrate the development of IC in their course units because they believe that they do not know the concept well enough “Being hard to translate attitudes, skills and knowledge into clear and assessable learning outcomes” (Andreia).

Discussion and concluding remarks

This study allowed diagnosing Portuguese academics’ perspectives concerning the components of IC and understanding the importance they attach to the development of IC by higher education students. Regarding the first aspect, results suggest that academics acknowledge the complexity of IC, referring to it as multidimensional and considering its development as an ongoing process. They recognize that it is composed of attitudes (acceptance and respect; curiosity and openness), knowledge (others’ cultural contexts; self-knowledge and cultural self-awareness) and skills (observation and listening), which altogether will lead to individuals’ desired internal and external outcomes.

As what concerns the importance they attach to the development of IC by higher education students, results show that all academics believe that this is crucial for two main rationales: a more “humanistic” one related to the need to change prejudiced attitudes and prepare students to live in a diverse world and a more “economic” one related to the need to empower students professionally. They believe that IC can be taught, and students should be given diversified opportunities to develop it within curricular and co-curricular activities. Nevertheless, they do not feel prepared to integrate this dimension in their teaching practices, namely, in their course units.

Acknowledging the role of HEI as agents of intercultural understanding and the need to embed an international and intercultural perspective in their overall activities (Egron-Polak and Hudson, 2014), results highlight a crucial issue concerning policy and practice in Portuguese universities: the need to recognize academics’ central role in intercultural education and, consequently, in institutions’ internationalization. Recognizing this role implies that universities take on the responsibility of contributing to the development of academics’ intercultural teaching competence (Deardorff, 2009; Dimitrov et al., 2014).

If academic staff plays a key role in developing students’ IC, it is fundamental that institutions “implement intercultural skills training programs to help prepare staff to model and guide students’ intercultural competence development” (Deardorff and Jones, 2012, p. 280). Moreover, as highlighted by Murray (2016, p. 168), “It is
incumbent upon institutions to ensure that their teacher-training and professional development programs foster the intercultural competence of teachers."

Indeed, in a context where most academics have no formal teacher training (Borralho et al., 2012), providing them with possibilities of developing their own IC and learning how to embed it in curricula is imperative. Hence, it is important that Portuguese universities create spaces of reflection and collaboration (Marcelo Garcia, 2009), integrating academics from different disciplinary areas, which potentiate experience-sharing and the reconstruction of knowledge and practices concerning the development of IC by higher education students.

This was the main goal of the program *Intercultural Competence in Higher Education: Building Proposals with Academics*, which allowed academics to jointly discuss and reflect on some central questions. Therefore, following Deardorff’s (2011, 2015) recommendations, this space was an initial trigger for reflection on some crucial questions, such as: what is IC and why is it important? What intercultural skills and knowledge should our students have in the present globalized world? What role can academics and institutions play in mentoring students in IC development? This joint reflection, highly valued by the academics who participated in the program, can function as a prior stage to support them and HEI in embedding IC development not only into the core of the curriculum but also into their overall activities, within a comprehensive approach to internationalization.
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Internationalisation in higher education – an internationalist perspective

Michael Byram

Abstract

Purpose – This paper aims to argue for the significance of internationalism for the internationalisation of higher education. It analyses some conceptualisations and definitions of internationalisation before explaining the concept of internationalism, and variations of it, to demonstrate that internationalism has a moral dimension which could, and the author argues, provide a normative value base for the processes of internationalisation.

Design/methodology/approach – This paper is a cross-disciplinary, conceptual exploration.

Findings – The argument concludes with a listing of principles which should give a moral direction to internationalisation.

Research limitations/implications – The approach proposed is the basis for evaluations of different aspects of internationalisation such as the design and implementation of curricula.

Practical implications – The approach taken here, if implemented, would lead to changes in curricula and processes of internationalisation.

Social implications – The impact of internationalisation, and particularly of student mobility as an aspect of it, is already significant, and the perspective presented here would lead to more coherent interactions in mobility situations.

Originality/value – Using the neglected concept of internationalism brings a new perspective and challenge to internationalisation.
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Introduction

“Internationalisation” in higher education[1] is a worldwide phenomenon (Egron-Polak and Hudson, 2014). Although there are variations in practices and definitions – Yemini (2015) provides a recent overview – there is much similarity in the rhetoric and an avid interest on the part of researchers, who are themselves part of the process. Their writings on the topic are most often conceptual and theoretical; empirical investigations are less frequent. Furthermore, in the earlier phases, as Sanderson (2011, p. 661) points out, research “focused on activities at the organisational level and the social and academic experiences of international students”. In some recent work, a new emphasis has been placed on curriculum and pedagogy (Ryan, 2013) with the interest in strategy or in the relationship between research and practice (Streitwieser and Ogden, 2016)[2] continuing. There is much less attention paid to the educational purposes of internationalisation, and I shall in the following argue that internationalisation needs a morality, a direction, which would not only be most evident in curriculum but also present in structures and administrations, and that such direction can be given by “internationalism”. I shall first analyse some existing conceptualisations of internationalisation, before discussing how it differs from “internationalism” and how the latter can be the basis for a moral direction.
Conceptualising and evaluating “internationalisation”

The conceptual and theoretical activity has produced many reviews of “internationalisation” and its evolution, as writers apparently feel obliged to put their own interpretation on existing discourse. They usually begin with the relationship of “internationalisation” and “globalisation”. They often include reflections on previous attempts to define “internationalisation”, and sometimes they analyse the strengths and weaknesses of taxonomies of internationalisation practices. Among the more interesting reviews are Vinther and Slethaug (2013) who use three pairs of opposites – unification or diversification, convergence or divergence, symbolic or transformative – to categorise different responses to internationalisation. Unification and convergence are produced by the desire to attract students from many parts of the world and offer them the kind of courses they recognise with certification processes which will be subsequently recognised in their own countries[3]. In this case, any change in curriculum processes will be “symbolic”, Vinther and Slethaug argue, but there is a potential for the diversity of students to lead to true or “transformative” change through diversification and divergence. Gacel-Ávila (2005) starts with definitions and concepts, as is found in other reviews, but she considers purposes other than the usual ideas about preparing students for work in a globalised economy. She draws on systems theory and critical pedagogy to suggest that there is a potential for internationalisation to become “a new paradigm” for higher education with new educational purposes and curricula. Like Vinther and Slethaug (2013), she sees internationalisation as a force for change, and here we see a more precise statement about the values which should be pursued in internationalisation:

The international curriculum should therefore focus on developing in university graduates respect for humanity’s differences and cultural wealth, as well as a sense of political responsibility, turning them into defenders of democratic principles of their society, and true architects of social change (Gacel-Ávila, 2005, p. 125).

We need to turn our attention away from managerial practices, she says, and from arguments about the relationship to economic “drivers”, to consider the values which internationalisation can embody.

Rizvi (2007) is another author who criticises instrumental economic thinking, and the reification of cultures, a “neo-liberal imagery” based on human capital theory which distorts the purposes of education. The instrumental perspective should be complemented if not replaced – it is not clear which, in his view – by critical understanding of global change and a “critical cosmopolitanism that views all of the diverse people and communities as belonging to the same universe” (Rizvi, 2007, p. 400).

Stier’s (2006) analysis echoes Rizvi’s distinction between instrumentalism and what Stier calls “educationalism”, derived from the German concept of “Bildung”, the recognition of “the personal or societal value of learning itself” (2006, p. 5). He adds to this distinction a third perspective, “idealism”, which is a “normative assumption that internationalisation is good per se” because it will “urge students to actively demand a global resource-redistribution and to ensure every person in the world a decent living-standard” encouraging tolerance and respect, and “contribute to a democratic and fair world” (Stier, 2006, p. 3).

Woodin et al. (2011) also take their starting point in “educationalism” and operationalise it by using the concept of “Intercultural Dialogue”, defined by the Council of Europe as:

[...] an open and respectful exchange of views between individuals and groups with different ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic backgrounds and heritage, on the basis of mutual understanding and respect (Council of Europe, 2008, p. 46).

This is a concept useful for evaluating the discourse of universities and their documents, an opportunity, they say, to evaluate internationalisation policies in terms of their contribution to individual and social development, “thus moving from the discourse of instrumentalism to
that of educationalism” (Woodin et al., 2011, p. 129). They are, however, largely disappointed by what they find in three case study universities in three west European countries. There is still much to do and my argument here is that “internationalism” provides the direction needed.

Nationalism and internationalism in higher education

It is a commonplace to assert that internationalisation is not recent, that universities have long been “international”. For example, Jiang (2008, p. 347), citing previous scholars to demonstrate that his is a widely held view, begins his article with the assertion that:

[...] the internationalisation of higher education (HE) is not a recent phenomenon. Universities have always been international in character in terms of “the universality of knowledge” (Brown, 1950, cited in Knight and de Wit, 1995, p. 6) and by being an international community of scholars (Blok, 1995).

A similar emphasis on the “universality of knowledge” is found in Svensson and Wihlborg (2010, p. 597) but here formulated as a general, timeless statement: “universities are therefore by nature of their commitment to advancing human knowledge, international institutions”. In both cases, authors refer to previous writers who take the same view and accept the commonplace unquestioningly.

Enders (2004, p. 364) takes a more nuanced position. He too refers to the European medieval university and “grand notions of students moving freely from Bologna to Paris to Oxford”, to the significance of “international recognition and reputation” for universities, and to “the universal conception of knowledge”, but argues that there is here a degree of mystification. We should look more carefully at the modern university and its role in nation-building. He points out, writing over a decade ago, that “the contemporary university was born of the nation state, not of mediaeval civilisation”, that it was and still is funded nationally, contributes to the education of national functionaries (and, I would add, of national elites), to national military-industrial complexes (and, again I would add, acts as the repository of national memories in literature, music and other arts).

A decade or more later, there is undoubtedly a tension between national and international funding, as universities in Europe seek European Union funding for example through “framework” programmes such as the current “Horizon 2020”, and universities in many other countries seek to fund their teaching through higher fees for international students. Yet this too is not a new phenomenon, and Wittrock (2014) traces it to the nineteenth century and to the integration into the university of scientific specialisation in research. One might argue that the tension today seems to be resolved in favour of the international rather than the national, as funding for research is more international than national, but this may be only the effect of the highly visible rise in the internationalisation of research and its effects on funding.

At the same time, there is considerable doubt that such changes are having any impact on teaching and teachers. Sanderson (2011) echoes concerns cited above about the focus on the institutional, managerial level, in the much quoted work of Knight (1997, 2004), and the writings of other authors. His own focus on teachers refers to a “profile” of the qualifications or characteristics teachers need if they are to produce “internationalised learning”. One of these characteristics is to “understand the way one’s academic discipline and its related profession (e.g. physiotherapy) are structured in a range of countries” (Sanderson, 2011, p. 664). He does not develop this further, but this is a crucial issue since students from other countries, with other traditions in a discipline and its related professions, encounter a taken-for-granted and unquestioned induction into “our” discipline through an equally unquestioned teaching process. This is likely to be alien and potentially impassable hurdle for them, being a way of thinking which is “our way” and essentially “national”.

We have thus arrived in the midst of “curriculum”, a term used in varying ways to designate different aspects of the phenomenon of teaching-and-learning, for example, “learning outcomes”, “learning processes”, “teaching purposes”, “media of instruction” and so on. The notion of an “internationalised curriculum” – and “internationalised learning” to use Sanderson’s (2011) phrase – needs to be clarified if internationalisation is to have an impact beyond matters of institutional structures.

One view of an internationalised curriculum is that it should as far as possible be the same everywhere, following the trend to “unification” and “convergence” noted by Vinther and Slethaug (2013), but this is highly problematic because it is argued that it will lead to “Westernisation”. Jiang (2008, p. 5) is interesting because he writes from Asia and refers to internationalisation as being a process of Westernisation, but “Western” is silently synonymous with “US American”, and this silent equating of “the West” with the USA is widespread, though often unnoticed, in discourse in East Asia. Jiang’s position is also flawed in other ways. A “western” curriculum does not exist, any more than an “eastern” one does. Within “the West”, Vinther and Slethaug point out that, despite an attempt in the European Union to harmonise higher education through the Bologna agreement, there are significant differences from North to South:

Regarding typologies, it seems clear that southern Europe and northern Europe adhere to different beliefs and philosophies. In written and oral surveys at a Danish university, students from Spain and France note, for example, that class discussion and group work among students are common in Denmark but not usual in their home countries where the authority and dominance of the teacher are higher (Vinther and Slethaug, 2013, p. 799).

Yet this analysis too falls into the trap of generalising regions of “North” and “South”, and people within Spain and France would undoubtedly identify differences between the two national traditions of teaching-and-learning.

Perceptions are nonetheless powerful, and lead to resistance to perceived “Westernisation/ Americanisation” and intellectual colonisation. Palmer and Cho (2012) describe the shift in South Korea from an attempt in the 1990s to imitate “western” universities, as a means of gaining global status, to new policies in the 2000s where universities have sought – in a process of “glocalisation” – their own version of internationalisation. Others have noted this too. Svensson and Wihlborg (2010) cite Yang (2002) who in turn cites Pennycook (1996), and all are concerned with the detrimental effects of internationalisation, the potential for internationalisation to become a new form of colonisation and the one-sided adoption of “Western” values. They take up the old argument that universities should be “universal”, and that universities in Western countries should be looking to integrate into their worldview traditions of university teaching from “Eastern” countries, not least China.

“Glocalisation” and “universal” approaches to curriculum are thus two possible developments. A third is to argue that university graduates should have skills and knowledge fitting them for a career in a globalised economy following “Western” principles and should be taught intercultural competence, which has both instrumental and educational value (Stier, 2006). Intercultural competence is instrumental in that it permits more effective working in the global economy, but also humanistic because it prepares people to live in a multicultural environment and to identify themselves as “global citizens” (Haigh, 2002, p. 53) or “cosmopolitan citizens” (Osler and Starkey, 2003) or “intercultural citizens” (Byram, 2008).

Internationalism and its values

Whatever the nuances between “global”, “cosmopolitan” or “intercultural” citizens – an issue which cannot be pursued here – they need to be, I would argue, “internationalist”. But this too needs some further analysis. “Internationalism”, unlike “internationalisation”, has not been widely treated in research in education nor, as Kuehl (2009) says, in historiography.
Kuehl shows that this has led to a lack of clarity in definitions by historians and the same appears to be the case in education.

We need to return to 1960 to find an attempt by an educationist to venture a definition which he hopes will be uncontroversial:

What I mean by internationalism is a readiness to act on the assumption that mankind as a whole is the proper society to have in mind for matters that cannot with safety or with such good effect be left exclusively within the domain of smaller social groups such as nations. I think it will be agreed that this is not an extravagant definition (Elvin, 1960, p. 16).

The definition immediately indicates that “internationalism”, not only in its etymology but also in its nature, has to be analysed in relation to “nationalism”, which is indeed a logically if not historically prior concept.[4] Moving from educationist writing, where internationalism hardly appears, we can find in other sources a means of deepening the argument. Malkki (1994) considers nationalism and internationalism to be neither analytically separable nor antagonistic for “internationalism does not contradict or subvert nationalism, on the contrary it reinforces, legitimates and naturalises it” (p. 61). This is challenged, however, when different kinds of internationalism are considered.

The complexity of the different analytical types of internationalism and its connotations, which change over time, are, as Halliday says (1988, p. 188), best caught in the notion of the “cluster concept” where there is no single core meaning. Within the cluster, the most recognisable in the European tradition is “liberal internationalism”, described by Halliday as:

[... ] a generally optimistic approach based upon the belief that independent societies and autonomous individuals can through greater interaction and co-operation evolve towards common purposes, chief among these being peace and prosperity (1988, p. 192).

Holbraad too (2003, p. 39) links liberal internationalism with “confidence in the rational and moral qualities of human beings” and “faith in progress towards more orderly social relations”.

The second type of internationalism is what Holbraad (2003) calls “socialist internationalism”, in which he distinguishes “reformist” from “revolutionary”. Others also refer to the link with socialism (Kuehl, 2009) or to a “radical or revolutionary” internationalism (Halliday, 1988). Revolutionary and reformist are distinguished by different kinds of response to nationalism. Where all other types of internationalism, including reformist socialism, accept nationalism as an inevitability, revolutionary internationalism posits a basis in a non-nationalist solidarity of the proletariat, believing that class affinities are stronger than national allegiances.

Identifying another variety of internationalism, Halliday argues that liberal internationalism has been challenged by “hegemonic” internationalism, defined as:

[... ] the belief that the integration of the world is taking place on asymmetrical, unequal terms, and that this is the only possible and indeed desirable way for such an integration to take place (1998, p. 193).

The obvious manifestation of this has been colonialism and its “civilising mission”, but it is also present in contemporary international relations dominated by a very few states and symbolised in the omni-presence of the English language. As we saw above, some writers argue that the hegemony of a certain type of “westernising” internationalisation is inevitable, and others see it as a threat to diversity which has to be countered by “glocalisation”.

The cluster concept for internationalism is, then, complex, but Halliday (1988) suggests that all types of internationalism share three characteristics. The first two are descriptive. First, there is a recognition that there is an internationalisation of the world – which others would label globalisation – i.e. a binding together through communications and trade, begun in the
The second common characteristic is the management of the impact of economic internationalisation or globalisation on political processes. Whatever the convictions of national groups or entities – governments, trade unions, feminists or opponents of nuclear power or capitalism – all cooperate more closely as a consequence of the phenomenon of globalisation.

The third characteristic is of a different nature. It is the normative assertion that the first two are phenomena which should be welcomed, since they promote understanding, peace, prosperity “or whatever the particular advocate holds to be most dear” (Halliday, 1988, p. 188). The state and nationalism, in this view, are legitimate entities within internationalism only if they promote some set of moral values. There are similarities here with the “educationalist” hopes for internationalisation heard above from Stier (2006) and Woodin et al. (2011).

A fourth general feature of internationalism mentioned by other authors, is the association with democracy (Jones, 1998). Invoking both Immanuel Kant and Woodrow Wilson, Goldmann (1994, p. 54) suggests that internationalist agendas go hand in hand with democratic change at the domestic level and are “part of the tradition of internationalist thinking to consider law, organization, exchange, and communication to be more likely to lead to peace and security if states are democratic than if they are authoritarian”. Here too there are echoes of the hopes of Gacel-Ávila (2005) that internationalisation will be infused with democratic principles and of Stier (2006) that it will lead to demands for social change.

Halliday (1988) refers to the normative characteristic of internationalism as “aspirational”, and others link internationalism to a “moral dimension”. For Malkki (1994, p. 41), the analysis of internationalism can be carried out in two ways: “as a transnational cultural form for imagining and ordering difference among people, and as a moralising discursive practice”, the latter being a matter of “the ritualised and institutionalised evocation of a common humanity”.

Taking a historical analytical perspective, Lyons (1963) refers to “the humanitarian impulse” in his account of the appearance of many international organisations – including the International Red Cross – in the second half of the nineteenth century. Holbraad (2003) similarly refers to the humanitarian form of liberal internationalism in the nineteenth century which included the argument made by J. S. Mill and Gladstone that a new principle of international law allowed states to intervene to resolve conflicts within a state or between states. This is a principle which has become part of the thinking of some non-governmental organisations such as the concept of “ingérence humanitaire” of the organisation “ Médecins sans Frontières”. The principle also underpins interventions such as the one in Iraq by governments acting in consortia.

The moral dimension is thus also the basis for an emphasis on world peace which was realised in different ways at different periods and which is ultimately related to, and has stimulated the development of, “peace education”. For Kuehl (2009), another embodiment of this aspect of internationalism appeared in the post-1945 period in the form of “democratic humanism” exemplified in the Declaration of Human Rights. Malkki (1994, p. 56) takes a similar view, referring to the Declaration of Human Rights as a manifestation of the “internationalism of transcendent values”.

Internationalist values in internationalisation

A normative view of internationalism is thus available to give direction to the internationalisation of Higher Education. Internationalism involves:

- recognition of the benefits of globalisation because it provides the conditions for cooperation at all societal levels, be they governmental, employment-related, educational or leisure-orientated;
the pursuit, through cooperation, of understanding, peace and prosperity for all partners equally; and

- the implementation of democratic processes, based on Human Rights, through which equality in cooperation can be assured.

In terms of curricula and curriculum design, internationalism thus involves:

- recognition of the existence of many disciplines and traditions of university teaching and research, all of which need to be included in the curriculum;
- the development of an intercultural competence which enables all those who work in universities – i.e. academic staff, students, administrators and support staff – to understand each other and each other’s academic cultures; and
- the implementation of teaching and research processes which give equal voice to all involved and a rational, democratic approach to solving problems.

It is important to note that both administrators and support and service staff are included among the actors involved in internationalism because hitherto writings on internationalisation dealing with institutional and organisational issues have usually referred exclusively to administrators, whereas support and service staff are the implementers of policy. It is also important to note the significance of equality in cooperation to counteract the dominance of “Westernisation” which some writers quoted earlier fear, and wish to reject. “Glocalisation” is not the only option, provided the dominant Higher Education systems make an effort to understand others and include them in the education of their students.

Finally, although there could be a rejection of the importance of “democracy” and “human rights” as “Western” phenomena, their acceptance in some form is widespread enough (Gearty, 2008) – in “East”, “West”, “South” and “North” – for there to be no significant problem in their being fundamental to internationalism. The specific form they take will be the outcome of the cooperative work done by all actors involved. As Halliday (1988), quoted earlier, suggests, internationalism is aspirational. It may never be attained, but it will provide the internationalisation of higher education with much-needed direction.

To conclude, we can say that were internationalism to be taken seriously in the mode presented here, it would have three kinds of implications. First, there would be a basis for evaluating internationalisation: to what extent internationalisation processes introduce internationalism. Second, it would have impact particularly on curriculum design, including teaching and learning styles, content and assessment. There would for example be equal recognition of other traditions of disciplinary studies and other modes of learning than those current in a country of even in a continent, and therefore other modes of assessing the learning. Third, it would create a coherent basis and rationale to explain and justify the large-scale movement of university students and teachers, and the financial investment this involves.

Notes

1. There is surprisingly little about the internationalisation of schooling, with the exception of “international schools” (Cambridge and Thompson, 2004) and “elite schools” (Rizvi, 2017). Recent work in Israel has focused on the tensions in state/public schools between national curricula and cosmopolitanism (Yemini et al., 2014).

2. There is increasing evidence of this in websites which propose to help teachers internationalise (e.g. http://scu.edu.au/teachinglearning/index.php/83; www.brookes.ac.uk/services/cc/resourcekit.html; www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/teaching/curriculum/intcurriculum/).

3. The usual flow is from developing to developed countries, and it is interesting to note how Chinese universities are attracting international students from Asian countries less economically developed, as China becomes an international economic force.
4. According to Halliday (1988), the term “internationalism” was coined as a consequence of Marx’s focus on proletarian unity. However, Vincent (2002, p. 192) argues “internationalism” was coined by Jeremy Bentham in the 1780s “to name a part of his legal theory which was concerned with the “law of nations”.
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Internationalizing teacher education curricula: opportunities for academic staff development

Mónica Lourenço

Abstract
Purpose – The purpose of this study is to understand the impact of a collaborative workshop, aimed to support teacher educators in embedding a “global outlook” in the curriculum on their perceived professional development.

Design/methodology/approach – The workshop included working sessions, during a period of 13 months, and was structured as participatory action research, according to which volunteer academics designed, developed and evaluated global education projects in their course units. Data were gathered through a focus group session, conducted with the teacher educators at a final stage of the workshop, and analyzed according to the principles of thematic analysis.

Findings – Results of the analysis suggest that the workshop presented a meaningful opportunity for teacher educators to reconstruct their knowledge and teaching practice to (re)discover the importance of collaborative work and to assume new commitments to themselves and to others.

Originality/value – The study addresses a gap in the existing literature on academic staff development in internationalization of the curriculum, focusing on the perceptions of teacher educators’, whose voices have been largely silent in research in the field. The study concludes with a set of recommendations for a professional development program in internationalization of the curriculum.

Keywords Professional development, Internationalization, Teacher education, Curriculum development, Global education, Participatory action research

Introduction
Preparing tomorrow’s teachers to take their place as ethical citizens and professionals in a globalized world is complex and requires that academic staff is both engaged and committed to the task. However, academics often report feeling unprepared, underconfident and undersupported when it comes to (re)designing (i.e. internationalizing) the curriculum to reflect a more global perspective (Green and Whitsed, 2015). Some authors suggest that this might be related to unclear conceptualizations of internationalization of the curriculum (IoC) (Childress, 2010; Stohl, 2007) to insufficient skills, knowledge and attributes to do so effectively (Leask, 2007; Sanderson, 2008) or to disciplinary differences, with staff in science and technology being generally less open to innovation than those in the humanities and social sciences (Clifford, 2009; Sawir, 2011). This makes it important to create times and spaces for academics to (re)construct knowledge in a collaborative way and to ensure that IoC extends beyond those disciplines where staff have an existing interest or predisposition.

So far, there is little extant research on the professional development of academic staff in IoC (Leask, 2015) and more empirical studies are needed to shed light on this issue and foreground academic voices. This is the aim of this study, which sought to understand the...
impact of an IoC workshop on the professional development of teacher educators through analyzing their discourses on the workshop and on their teaching practices. The following sections describe the context and theoretical framework supporting this study. These are followed by a detailed description of the workshop, the participants and the methodology. Then, the main results are presented, supported by quotations of the teachers’ interactions in a focus group. The paper ends with concluding remarks, including recommendations for a professional development program in IoC.

Globalization, internationalization and teacher education

In a globalized world characterized by unprecedented technological evolution, transnational mobility and employment and large-scale migration, teachers face new and unexpected challenges. They need to keep pace with rapidly developing knowledge areas and approaches to learning and assessment, use new technologies, promote equality and social justice and respond effectively to children with different learning styles or behavioral problems, as well as to those with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Simultaneously, teachers need to be capable of preparing students (from or living in any part of the world) to engage with society and be autonomous lifelong learners (Darling-Hammond and Lieberman, 2013; Schleicher, 2012).

In light of this context, several authors (among others, Quezada, 2012; Zeichner, 2010; Zhao, 2010) have been advocating the need to integrate global education (GE) in teacher preparation programs to help prospective teachers respond to the needs of today’s classrooms and meet the imperatives presented by a global milieu. Despite being part of educational discourses and agendas since the mid-1960s, GE has gained relevance in recent decades, representing a new paradigm of the educational mission in the twenty-first century (Zinser, 2012). According to Tye (2014, p. 856), GE involves “learning about those problems and issues that cut across national boundaries, and about the interconnectedness of systems”. For the Council of Europe (2002, p. 66), GE is “education that opens people’s eyes and minds to the realities of the world, and awakens them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all”. Hence, GE is transformative learning that involves a deep shift in the basic premises of thoughts, feelings and actions.

Although there seems to be little disagreement about the need to include a global dimension in teacher education programs, there remains little consensus around what exactly globally competent teachers need to know and how teacher preparation might be best conducted (Goodwin, 2012). Zhao (2010) and Zeichner (2010), however, seem to agree on some of the necessary dispositions, attitudes, knowledge and skills to teach in globally competent ways. These include such things as knowledge and understanding of the international dimensions of teaching and a range of global issues; foreign language proficiency and a deep understanding of other cultures; pedagogical and didactic knowledge and skills to educate students from diverse backgrounds and to help them acknowledge multiple points of view; ability to develop local, national and international partnerships; intellectual curiosity and problem-solving skills; and a commitment to assisting students to become responsible citizens both of the world and of their own communities.

Nonetheless, these competences are not always sufficiently developed in teacher education programs (O’Connor and Zeichner, 2011). In part, this is because of the fact that teacher education is still widely considered a matter of national interest, an attitude that goes back to the construction of nation-states and the creation of education systems in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Thus, many teacher education programs still focus on preparing teachers for the national market, as well as on transmitting knowledge about methods and procedures appropriate to local contexts and groups. Although knowledge about the local is necessary, it is not sufficient to educate individuals to act and live in this
complex world. Therefore, and given the homogeneous profile that still characterizes the teaching candidates (Patrick et al., 2014), some higher education institutions have been internationalizing teacher education curricula through the intentional integration of an international, intercultural or global perspective in the content, learning objectives, methodologies, activities and assessment tasks of a program of study (Leask, 2015). Included amongst educational experiences to internationalize teacher education are overseas mobility, design and development of research projects in multicultural environments, international online collaboration and integration of the experiences and perspectives of mobile students. Hence, teacher educators are urged to move beyond their comfort zones to prepare prospective teachers for the globally interdependent world in which they will work and their students will live.

**Internationalization of the curriculum and academic staff development**

Academic staff play a pivotal role in IoC, as it is they who set the aims and objectives, design the course(s) of instruction, select the content and activities, determine the methods of teaching and set the learning tasks and assessments. Yet, academic staff are often uncertain what IoC means; do not have the required skills, knowledge and attitudes to do so effectively; or do not think it has anything to do with them. Academics often reveal to be puzzled as to how to connect institutional internationalization goals with their disciplinary research agenda (Childress, 2010) and tend to regard the process as being the exclusive task of international offices (Leask et al., 2013). Researchers have also observed a marked difference in engagement in IoC between disciplines. Sawir (2011) and Clifford (2009) both report that staff in humanities and social sciences are generally more open to innovation than those in science and technology, who tend to view their discipline as being inherently international in nature.

The requirement to integrate an intercultural or global perspective throughout the curriculum is also particularly challenging for academics because it involves epistemological change (Leask, 2015). Drawing on a sample of educators within a university with a high proportion of international students, Sawir (2013) reports a prevailing view that the latter form a positive resource but one from which “home” students tend not to benefit. This suggests that some staff are not equipped to realize the potential that exists within the international classroom. Hence, “internationalization of the academic Self” (Sanderson, 2008) is vital for IoC. In other words, IoC requires curriculum and personal transformation. If today’s “ideal graduate” is an interculturally competent, socially responsible and globally aware citizen, the “ideal lecturer” should also engage with, manage and learn from other cultures (Leask, 2007).

This calls for critically grounded staff development to foster the knowledge, skills and attributes many academics feel they do not possess. Some studies have offered ideas to support staff development for IoC. For instance, Beelen and Jones (2015) highlight the need to focus on helping academics internationalize existing discipline-specific learning outcomes within the home curriculum for all students. Leask and Bridge (2013) make the case for senior support for internationalized curriculum development, with appropriate time allowances and reward structures. Luxon and Peelo (2009) stress the relevance of bottom-up staff-led developments in pedagogic and curriculum thinking. De Wit and Beelen (2013) and Leask (2015), for their part, suggest that a contextualized approach to IoC, using participatory action research and conducted in disciplinary teams at department-level, may have better results. Still the number, scope and depth of studies focused on the professional development of academic staff for IoC is limited (Green and Whitsed, 2015). Therefore, more studies are needed to shed more light on this issue and foreground academic voices, particularly teacher educators’ who play a decisive role in the preparation of globally competent teachers. This was the aim of this study which sought to understand the impact of a collaborative workshop on IoC on teacher professional development.
The study

The collaborative workshop

The workshop took place in a Portuguese public university and aimed to support university faculty engaged in teacher education in embedding a “global outlook” in courses for prospective pre-primary and elementary school teachers. More particularly, it pursued the following goals:

- to stimulate critical reflection around the concepts of IoC and GE;
- to foster analysis and reflection around practices related with the internationalization of teacher education curricula and GE;
- to assist teacher educators in designing, developing and evaluating action research projects in their course units (the focus of IoC) to promote student teachers’ global competence; and
- to contribute to teachers’ professional development.

To achieve these goals eight 2-h sessions were conducted during a period of 13 months. These were structured as participatory action research (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2007), whereby teams of two or three academics responsible for a course unit actively inquired into their own teaching and their students’ learning to inform their understandings and make improvements. This methodology positioned the academic staff as equal and collaborative partners in research and placed the researcher as an “informed outsider” and a facilitator, encouraging, assisting and guiding the teacher educators through the process of IoC. The intention was to avoid the situation of an “outside expert” coming in to take over the curriculum review process, a situation that is often resisted (Leask, 2015).

The workshop was organized according to four stages (Figure 1), which roughly followed the diagrams of action research and their distinctive phases (Lewin, 1946). In Stage 1 of the project, “Knowing and Sharing”, three discussion sessions took place to share and construct knowledge around the concepts and practices of IoC and GE. The first session was dedicated to characterizing the working group and understanding their representations regarding the concepts of IoC, GE and teacher profile. The second session focused on establishing a common definition for an internationalized curriculum; discussing the knowledge, skills and attitudes that globally competent teachers should develop; and designing internationalized learning outcomes. In the third session, attention was drawn to the analysis of case studies describing IoC practices in teacher education courses in

![Figure 1 Key stages of the collaborative workshop](image-url)
different countries. During Stage 2, “Planning and Collaborating”, two group sessions were conducted to support teacher educators in planning the action research GE projects. Stage 3, “Acting and Developing”, covered a five-month period during which the participating teachers staged the projects in their course units. During this period, one group session was conducted to take stock of the projects and discuss the major constraints encountered by the teachers. Individual meetings with the teams were also carried out, where the researcher acted as a “critical friend” providing ideas and resources. Stage 4, “Evaluating and Reflecting”, which is still underway, marked the final stage of the workshop. It included a focus group session, which is at the heart of this study, and a final session, which will take place at the end of the academic year to allow the participants to present the results of the projects, evaluate the work developed by the group and think about possible lines of action, namely, a new cycle of action research.

Participants

A total of 12 female teacher educators from an education department of a Portuguese public university participated as volunteers in the workshop, but only seven planned and developed GE projects. These constituted the case to be analyzed. Despite having similar academic backgrounds and teaching in similar disciplinary areas, these teachers were very diverse in terms of working years (Table I). Considering the five professional development stages identified by Huberman (1989), one teacher was in the career entry stage (less than

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fictional names</th>
<th>Working years</th>
<th>Background area</th>
<th>Disciplinary area</th>
<th>Other roles at the University</th>
<th>International experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Language didactics</td>
<td>Language didactics</td>
<td>Course Director, Research Group Coordinator, Lab Coordinator, Member of the Scientific Committee</td>
<td>Conducted part of her PhD abroad; has coordinated and is a consultant for international research projects; regularly supervises international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Language didactics</td>
<td>Language didactics</td>
<td>Lab Coordinator</td>
<td>Married a French citizen and went regularly to France for 12 years; conducted part of her PhD abroad; has been and still is a member of international research teams; regularly supervises international students from Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatima</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Language didactics</td>
<td>Language didactics</td>
<td>Course Director, Member of the Direction Board</td>
<td>Reader for Portuguese Language at the University of Burgundy (France); secretary of the committee of an international association; has supervised international students and participated in international projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Practicum Coordinator</td>
<td>Was born and raised in Mozambique; coordinated a non-governmental organization for development in Sao Tome and Principe, where she lived for one year; has supervised international students; has an international family scattered across the globe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Accounting, Teacher education</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Was born and raised in Brazil, lived in Portugal for 9 years; has participated in international projects and scientific events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Language didactics</td>
<td>Language didactics</td>
<td>Course Director, Lab Coordinator</td>
<td>Conducted part of her postgraduate studies abroad; regularly supervises international students; has participated in international projects and scientific events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Language didactics</td>
<td>Language didactics</td>
<td>Course Vice-Director</td>
<td>Coordinated an international research project; has been and still is a member of international research teams; regularly participates in scientific meetings and events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 years in profession), another teacher was in the experimentation/diversification stage (7 to 18 years in profession), one teacher was in the serenity stage (19 to 30 years in profession) and four teachers were in the disengagement stage (31 to 40 years in profession). Apart from their teaching duties, six teachers performed other roles in the institution (e.g. as course directors, coordinators of research labs or members of the Direction Board). All teacher educators, except for Laura and Kate, were born and raised in Portugal. Nonetheless, they all had extensive international experience, mainly related with participation in international research projects and scientific events, supervision of international students and research/teaching periods abroad. The research focus of four of these teachers (Adelaide, Fatima, Laura and Rita) was on plurilingual and intercultural education. So, in general, teacher educators were predisposed to integrate a global/international perspective in the curriculum but were unsure of how this could be carried out. The focus of the IoC program was, then, to assist teacher educators in designing, developing and evaluating GE projects in their course units.

The global education projects

A total of four GE projects were designed by the seven teacher educators organized in groups of two (one teacher worked simultaneously in two groups) and staged in the following courses during the academic year 2016/2017:

- Educational Intervention Projects, BA in Basic Education (3rd year).
- Didactics of the Portuguese Language, Masters in Teaching (1st year).
- Linguistic Diversity and Education, Masters in Teaching (2nd year, optional).
- Seminar in Educational Intervention and Practicum, Master’s in Pre-Primary and Primary School Education (2nd year).

A total of 64 students were involved in the projects, the majority of whom were Portuguese nationals with no mobility experiences. In one of the subjects (Educational Intervention Projects), there was a Spanish student who was studying in Portugal under the Erasmus program.

The strategies and activities selected by the teacher educators for their students were mainly of six types:

1. attending guest lectures by foreign teachers or experts on GE;
2. reading, analyzing and presenting texts on GE or interrelated fields;
3. writing linguistic and/or intercultural biographies;
4. designing (and, in some cases, developing and evaluating) activities or action research projects on GE, often involving the local community;
5. presenting the projects in class; and
6. writing reports and/or reflections on the projects.

The learning outcomes were in alignment with these strategies, addressing critical thinking, communication, argumentation, reflection, collaboration and intercultural skills, and aiming to promote students’ sense of identity and self-esteem, valorization of diversity, concern for the environment, commitment to sustainable development and social responsibility. Hence, both strategies and learning outcomes are in tune with the literature on GE.

Data collection and analysis

Consistent with the methodology of qualitative case studies (Yin, 2009), a variety of data sources was used to facilitate exploration of the perceptions and experiences of the group
of the teacher educators who conducted these projects. Therefore, the following data were collected: audio recordings of the group sessions, including the one carried out as focus group, lesson plans and resources of the GE projects developed so far by the teacher educators and observation notes taken during the sessions. The focus of this study falls on the results of the focus group.

Focus groups are a form of qualitative research consisting of in-depth interviews using relatively homogenous groups to discuss and comment on, from personal experience, the topic specified by the researchers (Krueger and Casey, 2015). They are usually preferred to more conventional data collection techniques, as they reveal dimensions of understanding that other methods cannot reach. In a final stage of a study, focus groups are used to discuss with the participants the results obtained, accessing their perceptions and experiences. This was the goal of the focus group session carried out in this study, where participants were asked to share their perceptions, opinions and beliefs around questions related with the integration of a global perspective in their course units and the perceived impact of the workshop on their professional development.

The transcripts of the focus group were analyzed using the principles of thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Like most research methods, thematic analysis can occur in two primary ways – inductively or deductively. In an initial stage of this study, deductive coding was used to create a start list of potential codes that reflected the literature on teacher professional development, the ultimate goal of the collaborative workshop. These codes were then refined to create themes and sub-themes for more efficient analysis. In this latter case, inductive coding was used, drawing on the data. The coding process for each theme and sub-theme was initially conducted by the author and then checked for validity by another researcher through a peer debriefing process. The themes and results of the analysis were also shared with the participants in the study to elicit feedback. This process aimed at enhancing trustworthiness, credibility and resonance of the findings.

Thematic analysis resulted in the identification of three themes, professional knowledge, teaching practice and professional identity, which are considered areas of change in teacher professional development (Lourenço et al., 2014). Teacher professional knowledge is a combination of diverse types of knowledge (academic, institutional, practical, etc.) that teachers draw upon to respond to the needs of their students. According to Shulman (2004), it includes not only subject matter expertise and pedagogical knowledge but also knowledge about the historical and philosophical principles of education, as well as knowledge about the curriculum. Teaching practice includes the pedagogical and didactic repertoire of the teacher, which rests not only on teachers’ previous knowledge and experience, but also on cultural context and professional traditions (Porter et al., 2000). Teacher’s professional identity refers to the set of attitudes, beliefs, experiences and ideals that define teachers in their professional careers (Goodnough, 2011). For each of these themes, a set of sub-themes was also identified drawing on the data as outlined in Table II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge and understanding of global education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge and understanding of internationalization (Broader) understanding of the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching practice</td>
<td>Extension of the pedagogical and didactic repertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valorization of collaborative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional identity</td>
<td>Reflection about one’s academic and professional path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection about the aims of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification of pedagogical and didactic choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumption of new commitments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results and discussion

Results are presented and discussed according to each theme. In keeping with the aim to foreground academic voices, statements are illustrated by quotations, which provide fairly representative perspectives of the larger group of participants. All quotations were translated from Portuguese into English for purposes of clarity, and teachers’ names were changed to preserve anonymity.

Professional knowledge

Regardless of their working experience and roles, all the teacher educators who participated in this workshop mentioned that they had (re)constructed knowledge related with IoC and GE. For Laura, the workshop presented an opportunity to question previous conceptions she had. As she admitted, “internationalizing the curriculum through integrating a global perspective is more than welcoming foreign students, it is to rescue the link of what apparently divides us”. Concerning GE, teachers were initially unaware of this concept, envisaging it as a holistic form of education. During the sessions, however, teachers came to understand it as “a new educational paradigm” (Carla), “a way to see and “do” education” (Kate), which “does not add to the subjects [they] have to teach, but rather implies a change in perspective” (Miriam). For these academics, GE is better understood as an “umbrella term” for other themes that are already part of the curriculum, as well as a suitable perspective to guide and give meaning to their teaching practice. The following quotes illustrate these statements:

Fatima: One of the strengths of GE is the possibility to articulate themes that we already work with […] but which were not seen under this perspective, namely education for sustainability and plurilingual and intercultural education.

Carla: The greatest advantage I personally found in GE was the possibility it gave me to connect the course units I teach and all the work I do and put them inside a box […] Well, not quite a box. A box is a locked thing […] It gave me more comfortable glasses […] more comfortable, no […] you can see better…

Kate: Corrective lenses. [Laughs]

Fatima: To see both near and far. [Laughs]

Adelaide: To see the local and the global.

The workshop also contributed to a broader understanding of the curriculum as something that is flexible, that should be managed in a collaborative and cross-curricular manner and that can include other contents, methodologies and goals, as Adelaide and Laura emphasize:

Adelaide: I think that GE helps us manage the curriculum in a more flexible way and not to be “stuck” with certain things or working according to certain themes.

Laura: GE allowed me to look beyond my immediate space of action and to find in it connections with a planetary experience. In what concerns teacher education, this step was taken when we were provoked to think beyond the limits of the course unit, in order to understand how we could integrate this global outlook in the curriculum.

This is in accordance with Leask (2015), who suggests that a fundamental step in IoC is imagining other possibilities and new ways of thinking, challenging previous paradigms and conceptions and thinking “outside the box”. When conducted within a small group, she adds, this process stimulates creative thinking and experimentation, contributing to changes in teaching practice.

Teaching practice

To integrate a global perspective in the curriculum and respond more effectively to the current demands of their job, of their communities and of the society as a whole, teacher
educators felt the need to extend their pedagogical and didactic repertoire. In some cases, this meant that they had to “dig deeper and find broader and more diversified resources” (Fatima). In other cases, it meant finding pedagogical value in previously inconspicuous places, as Adelaide points out: “We now look at things and realize they have educational value. Before, I didn’t think that an exhibition of the painter Almada Negreiros was meaningful to discuss with students in teacher practicum”.

Another aspect of teaching practice that gained relevance, according to the teachers’ voices, was collaborative work. Although this was a group that had previously worked together in past projects, this particular workshop allowed teacher educators to strengthen their conviction in collaborative, integrated and cross-curricular work, for the benefit of students’ learning and the quality of their teaching. Adelaide and Carla present the most meaningful statements:

Adelaide: I think that a working group is important […] to see ideas. Because this is a broad education perspective. You can do many things, right? And move in different directions. So, maybe, it is useful to see other strategies.

Carla: What we are doing here takes time, of course […] it requires effort. But we like it because each one of us finds […] each one of us can make its contribution and receive something in return that we can use to improve our work. This dimension is very important.

Collaboration and the partnerships created both between the teachers and between the teachers and the researcher was a crucial aspect in providing the necessary support for reflection and change. Rita recalls how important it was for her to be in a group where teachers “exchanged ideas about resources and activities, shared stories about their students’ reactions and progress”, as it helped her overcome her initial anxieties and “conceptual confusion”. Kate shares the same point of view adding: “I’ve been alone for a very long time […] and from the moment I started to integrate this group and working with all of you, I felt different. I feel more supported now”.

Teachers also addressed the need to work together with other teacher educators in their department, particularly those in the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) area, to infuse a global perspective and ethos in teacher education curricula:

Fatima: We did this with our “mini-group”, but surely if we had math or science teachers here we could […] articulate the different areas and give them a sense according to a global perspective. And students could also take advantage of it, it would be beneficial for them if we were able to contribute to an education that is more […]

Miriam: […] integrated, is not it?

Fatima: Yes, more integrated […] To a real global education.

Professional identity

Regarding professional identity, participation in this collaborative workshop allowed teacher educators to reflect about and make sense of their own academic and professional paths, bridging past, present and future together. According to Laura, a teacher in an early stage of her career, taking part in this workshop gave her “access to theoretical frameworks and studies that helped [her] to reflect about [her] own path as a student and as a teacher”. Working within a GE perspective also encouraged teachers to reflect about the wider purposes of education in a globalized, multicultural and constantly changing world. Rita mentions how GE helped her “think about the true meaning of education, namely what teacher education and prospective teachers should be like”. Carla, for her part, discovered that this educational perspective is aligned with her own beliefs about the purposes of education, which made her feel “more comfortable and supported in [her] choices”.
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Hence, throughout this workshop, teacher educators worked on personal vision building and saw how their pedagogical and didactic choices were connected to the purposes of GE. This allowed them to give practical and moral meaning to their profession, as Adelaide explains:

GE makes me think and search for other things that justify what I do or what I want to do [...] because it allows me [...] it makes me think about the choices – what I have to think about when I choose a specific content, what is the most important thing to teach at that moment, what is more important for my students to learn [...] It makes me rethink the objectives of what is mandatory to do today, or what should be mandatory.

The workshop, then, stimulated a “psychological shift” (Rodgers and Scott, 2008) in how teachers thought about themselves as teachers, leading them to assume new commitments to their students, to their peers and to themselves as global citizens. Kate and Carla emphasized the role of IoC in welcoming students from other countries “in a more appropriate and inclusive manner”. Laura, in turn, highlights her responsibility to her peers, and the need to “continue the dynamics initiated here, to improve them, and to serve as a spokesperson for these experiences”. In more concrete terms, Fatima suggests that the teacher educators who participated in this workshop should act as drivers of change, organizing their own collaborative workshops in the future to include other teachers and support dissemination of IoC across the university:

Imagine that, at the beginning of the year, I would do some training sessions for other teachers on how to manage and internationalize the curriculum in this area. People would then be free to work with it or not [...] and to meet once a month to present the work or the difficulties they had. But it could open up horizons [...]

Finally, Kate introduces another important aspect related to teachers’ professional identity. In her own words, participation in this workshop “fostered confrontation between what we think and how we act, that is, in the coherence between principles that we stand for and what we do”. This statement suggests that the ethos that characterizes a teacher as being internationalized cannot be switched on during teaching and switched off once teaching is finished. As Sanderson (2008) underlines, it is a “whole-of-person transformation”. Therefore, if teacher educators want to educate globally competent and responsible teachers, they need to develop these competences themselves and act accordingly. This will allow them to better respond to the impact of neoliberal and market-driven forces on their profession and on education in general, contributing to an internationalization that has more global and intercultural interests at heart.

Concluding remarks

This study aimed to understand the impact of an IoC workshop on the perceived professional development of seven teacher educators. To achieve this goal, academics’ discourses in a focus group were analyzed according to the principles of thematic analysis. Results of the analysis suggest that the workshop presented a meaningful opportunity for teacher educators, regardless of their working experience and roles, to reconstruct their professional knowledge and teaching practice around new and relevant topics, to (re) discover the importance of working collaboratively and to change several aspects of their teaching identities, leading them to assume new commitments to themselves, to their students and to their peers.

These results, however, should be taken with a grain of salt. Not only is there a substantial amount of analysis still to be done but also many of the above findings need to be triangulated with the transcripts of the sessions, and the results of the projects that are still under development. It should also be noted that findings are based on teachers’ self-reporting. Classroom observation, for instance, could have corroborated or disproved these
results. This is something the teachers themselves are aware of, as evidenced by Adelaide, who says, “what we do and what we say to the students deserves to be analyzed. And maybe this is where we changed the most, from a professional point of view”. One should also bear in mind that this was an exploratory study that affected a small number of teacher educators and course units in one education department in Portugal. This means that results cannot be generalized. Furthermore, teacher educators were all working in the same disciplinary area, had similar professional backgrounds and had an extensive international experience, which seems to be beneficial for IoC. Hence, more studies with a more diverse group of teachers are needed to corroborate and inform these findings.

Another limitation of the study is related with the nature of professional development itself, which is a process over time and not a just-in-time training event. Teachers often alluded to the fact that GE is a complex perspective that requires more time (more cycles of action research) for them to incorporate it in their professional habitus. A more accurate and comprehensive evaluation would be a matter of whether there is evidence that the process of IoC becomes routine over some years and not just a one-off experiment as a consequence of the workshop. Therefore, a follow-up project would be useful to contribute to a more sustainable and sustained process that is embraced by the whole academic community.

Despite these limitations, we believe that these findings can shed some light on the professional development of teacher educators, an area that has been long neglected in educational research. In this respect, we offer some tentative recommendations that may hopefully inspire other researchers and educational developers working with IoC.

**Recommendations for a professional development program in internationalization of the curriculum**

The process of IoC seems to be more effective when:

- academics are not cast in the role of passive participants in a process but are recognized as the source of change and transformation;
- academics work in disciplinary teams and cultivate communities of research practice;
- transformative and emancipatory methodologies, such as participatory action research, are used;
- there is an environment of trust that not only promotes critical conversations about learning and teaching in higher education but also questions dominant paradigms and knowledge frameworks;
- there is an external facilitator who acts as a “critical friend”, providing tangible support and genuine encouragement, as well as ideas for exploration and experimentation; and
- participants in the process act as drivers of change, supporting further growth and improvement inside the academic community.
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Teaching in the moment: educational experience in the age of tomorrow

Christy McConnell Moroye and P. Bruce Uhrmacher

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to examine, from a curricular perspective, fresh ideas emanating from the USA that have potential to improve educational settings across the globe. As such, this conceptual undertaking begins by arguing that little attention is being paid to the quality of present experiences in schools and classrooms. Stated differently, there is too much focus on tests, standards, workforce development and college readiness. Subsequently, educators are ignoring present experiences, which in the authors’ view may lead to mis-education rather than education.

Design/methodology/approach – To assist the authors in understanding this problem, as well as remedying it, they examine John Dewey’s ideas about experience generally and his notions of continuity and interaction in particular. From there, the authors argue that to delve deeply into present experiences, educators might use ideas found in aesthetic and ecological education. They elaborate upon each based on their prior research into a style of aesthetic education called CRISPA, an acronym that stands for connections, risk-taking, sensory experiences, perceptivity and active engagement, and a mode of ecological education called ecological mindedness.

Findings – The authors suggest that educators use CRISPA. Further, they argue that attention be paid to ecological care, interconnectedness and integrity.

Originality/value – The authors believe that workforce development and college readiness are important goals, but to achieve these goals, as well as any others deemed important by educators in their local contexts, we must focus on the quality of present experiences for both teachers and students. Only then will we have an education worthy of the appellation.

Keywords Curriculum, Aesthetics, Ecological education, Educational experience

Paper type Conceptual paper

Introduction and rationale for curriculum as experience

We are curricularists. That is an unfamiliar term to many outside of education, although it means something quite simple. We look at schooling through a set of big questions such as the following: What should be taught? To whom? Toward what aims? And who decides? Curricularists also have attempted to describe but not define curriculum because, as you can imagine, the answers to our questions are fluid and contextual. What happens in Kuala Lumpur may or may not happen in Denver or Tokyo or London. So, to begin, it may be useful to have your own characterization or definition of curriculum in mind. What is it? How is it mediated? What are its potential outcomes?

Among the varied and multiple descriptions of curriculum that have been generated by scholars in the field, it is evident that one element is a recurrent theme: experience.

[...] it is that series of things which children and youth must do and experience (Bobbitt, 1918, p. 42).

It is a living whole, comprised of experience actually going on in school (Taba, 1932, p. 156).
Curriculum is a dynamic interplay between experiences of students, teachers, parents, administrators, policy makers, and other stakeholders; content knowledge and pedagogical premises and practices; and cultural, linguistic, sociopolitical, and geographical contexts (He et al., 2008, p. 223).

[...] [curriculum] encompasses the learning experiences facilitated for students (Fruja Amthor and Roxas, 2016, p. 171).

What does it mean to think of curriculum as experience? As a contrast, note that many think that curriculum is a thing, that it is something that is not human, like a textbook or a set of standards or a worksheet (Fraser and Bosanquet, 2006). And while curriculum certainly can be those things, it is also, at its core, the human experience of learning. Connelly and Clandinin (1988, p. 6) said “curriculum is something experienced in situations. People have experiences. Situations are made up of people and their surrounding environment”.

This is why we are currently troubled by our futuristic view of education. Our current focus in the US is on college readiness, standardized testing performance and workforce preparedness. While attention to the future lives of students is certainly an important part of education, it cannot adequately help teachers and administrators orchestrate meaningful educational experiences that feed the human experience in learning spaces. The marginalization of experience means that what students feel, think, process, undergo and live is less of a priority than the college entrance exam, the standardized tests and workforce skills. If we marginalize experience, we marginalize our students. It is time, in our view, to bring balance to the current lived experience with the tools and materials for learning, time to access the robust nature of curriculum as the interplay between the lives of students, the content to be learned, and the current and future needs of individuals and societies.

Before moving our argument forward, we wish to point out that educators do not intentionally marginalize students. Indeed, many social justice educators argue that workforce and college readiness are paramount to solving many issues of poverty and discrimination. We absolutely support the efforts of such educators and wholeheartedly agree that we ought to prepare students for productive lives. Indeed, standards in education are intended to ensure that all students receive a high-quality education. Standardized tests are in place to ensure that all students have access to teachers and schools who can successfully implement and teach to the standards. State or national tests give teachers goals toward which to plan their lessons. They are both targets and thermometers that indicate our successes or failures. And while we should not ignore students’ futures (nor the tests) to provide the best education for all, we need more avidly to attend to the present. The philosopher Maxine Greene once said, in conversation, that we need an education for having and an education for being[1]. As we see it, meeting the goals to go to college or into the workforce can be seen as an education for having. We need to balance out this having, however, with an education for being, which, for our purposes here, may be thought of as a holistic development of the whole human being: thinking, feeling, doing and connecting.

Thus, we are not arguing that we should abandon goals and targets, but rather that present experience of both the students and the teachers should regain a prominent spot in the curriculum so that curriculum can be seen as a human endeavour through which content is explored and mastered. In fact, recently, Gloria Ladson-Billings, the Kellner Family Distinguished Chair in Urban Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a leading educational theorist, wrote the following:

Perhaps the real future of the curriculum among education researchers will be to defend the right for the curriculum to be fluid and changing rather than fixed and rigid. Perhaps it is time to once again reaffirm John Dewey’s (2016, p. 104) notion of a curriculum that emerges from the experiences of the learners. And, such a curriculum will depend heavily on the skill of our nation’s teachers.
So, what does this mean? What would education look like if we prioritize experience through a fluid curriculum orchestrated by skilled teachers? Fortunately, we have the shoulders of many educational giants to stand upon (Duckworth, 2006; Eisner, 1985; Greene, 1978; Oliver, 1989). And, as suggested by Ladson-Billings (2016), let us begin with John Dewey.

**Educative experiences in education: Dewey’s continuity and interaction**

John Dewey (1859-1952), an influential American philosopher and educational reformer, identified three major categories of experience: educative, mis-educative and non-educative. Here, we focus on educative experiences, as we should strive for those rather than the others.[2] Educative experience may be understood through Dewey’s criteria for such an experience: continuity and interaction.

Continuity refers to the ways in which experiences connect “school” life and “real” life. According to Dewey (1938/1997, p. 38), if experience is isolated, or does not meaningfully connect with other experiences in ordinary social life, it is not educational. Further, for an experience to be considered educative, it must also connect with future experiences in a positive direction; it must lead to “growth.” Said Dewey, “every experience is a moving force. Its value can be judged only on the ground of what it moves toward and into”. Experiences must not only connect to present life but also move us in a productive direction – toward the positive development of life[3].

Interaction, continuity’s complement, “assigns equal rights to both factors in experience – objective and internal conditions. Any normal experience is an interplay of these two sets of conditions” (Dewey, 1938/1997, p. 42). Equal emphasis needs to be placed on those conditions of the content and of the individual learner. Formal education, as dictated by tests and standards, privileges the objective or external conditions (the education of having), effectively paying insufficient attention to the internal reality of the learner (the education of being). Interaction relates to the ways in which students’ belief systems and past experiences regarding the subject are brought into the experience as viable contributions to be explored and evaluated.

Together, both continuity and interaction are requisite conditions for the educative experience. “Continuity and interaction in their active union with each other provide the measure of the educative significance and value of an experience” (Dewey, 1938/1997, pp. 44-45). Without both of these conditions, Dewey considers these experiences less than educative – they are mis- or non-educative. So, we could look at any curriculum – either active in a classroom, or a textbook, or a novel, or any materials intended to engage students in learning – and we could analyze them through this idea: do they provide the conditions for educative experiences? To analyze for continuity, we could ask: Does this curriculum connect to students’ past experiences and lead them into growth for the future? To test for interaction, we could ask: Does this curriculum access and challenge the inner belief systems of the learner while also providing strong content?

Therefore, when we talk about educational experience, we reiterate the point that such experiences are not absent of rigorous content, nor are we suggesting that any and all experiences are good ones. Rather, we argue that a good educational experience is one that connects the learner to the past, present and future through significant content and leads toward growth. That is a lot to ask of educational experience! And while there are many roads to lead to quality educational experiences of the present, we intend to focus on two: aesthetic and ecological experiences.

**Aesthetic and ecological experiences**

In this section of the paper, we offer two types of opportunities for educative experiences that reach into the importance of the present experience: the aesthetic and the ecological.
Before proceeding, one point on nomenclature. Teachers provide the conditions for students to have educational experiences. Each student undergoes his or her own experience. Thus, the teacher may provide the opportunity for students to have experiences that lead to growth, but we need to note that, ultimately, whether a classroom activity is educational or not depends on each individual. Having said that, let us not underestimate the importance of the teacher who aims to provide the conditions for educational experiences by focusing on the present.

Aesthetic experience

What is an aesthetic experience? Why would we ever want such a thing in education? Let us offer its opposite for consideration: the anesthetic experience. Anesthesia numbs our senses—it puts us to sleep! We certainly do not want to put our students to sleep. We want them awake, engaged and present.

So, what is an aesthetic experience? For that, we refer again to John Dewey, who reminds us that the term, derived from the Greek word *aesthetikos*, means capable of sensory perception. Dewey claims that hovering above any experience is the possibility of an “aesthetic experience” (Chapter 3 in Dewey, 1934). For Dewey, in an aesthetic experience, a person fully engages one’s senses on an object of focus—perhaps a work of art in a museum, an old oak tree or a city park. Thus, an aesthetic experience may have its roots in art, but it extends to all avenues of life, including learning. Thus, all experiences have the potential to be aesthetic.

One example Author A recalls happened not long ago:

I was in Steamboat Springs, Colorado attending a rodeo, and the sun was setting in the American West. The cowboys were wrestling bucking broncos. And although the scene was rough and tumble, for a moment, the dust was kicked up high and the setting sun glowed golden, creating halos of unsettled earth around the cowboy’s hat and chaps. And I took a breath or two and came to appreciate the wildness and the peace of it all.

As you consider the following theoretical framework for aesthetic educational experiences, we invite you to think about a time when you had a sensory rich “wow” experience in school. Perhaps it was the recognition of the Pythagorean theorem, or perhaps it was the smell of clay in the art room, or the sight of cells through a microscope. Remember, if you can, how each of your senses felt. Such a sensation is the aim of aesthetic educational experience.

While we know that we cannot force anyone to have an aesthetic experience, as educators, we can create the conditions for such experiences to happen. Since 2004, we have collaboratively researched the ways in which we might help students to have aesthetic experiences in their curriculum. We have created an acronym for the dimensions of an aesthetic classroom experience: CRISPA—connections, risk-taking, imagination, sensory experiences, perceptivity and active engagement. We have written extensively on these ideas, so here we briefly introduce each of these dimensions, along with relevant citations for the reader to pursue (Uhrmacher, 2009 for one of the earliest and most theoretical of the papers).

We begin with an excerpt from a previously published vignette from a third-grade teacher who planned a unit on astronomy with CRISPA (Moroye and Uhrmacher, 2009):

Claire plays soft piano music while photos of spaceships, astronauts, and planets, splash upon the big screen. The ethereal music builds, and the photos show more planets, the moon over evergreens, and then an incredible photo of Saturn, which gets a lot of “oohs” and “ahhs” and a whispered “awesome”. Claire gently says, “I want you to go into space […] I want you to be in outer space.”

The teacher, Claire, created many opportunities for her students to have heightened experiences through using the elements of CRISPA. Below we describe each of the elements.
Connections refer to the ways in which individuals become engaged with ideas, books, or materials in the learning environment. These connections may be intellectual, emotional, sensorial, communicative or social (Conrad et al., 2015). The goal is both to find ways to connect students to content and also to help them stay engaged throughout the learning experience. We have seen many teachers be successful when they engage students through more than one kind of connection. For example, one geology teacher had his students explore the various textures of rocks while discussing similarities and differences with peers, thus engaging the senses and the social needs of students.

Risk-taking refers to students’ opportunities to engage in the unfamiliar or to step out of their predictable or normal experience. Although it must be appropriately managed, risk-taking may increase students’ cognitive development, as well as their creativity, self-motivation and student interest in subject matter (Uhrmacher and Bunn, 2011). Whether an experience contains risk will depend upon the context, the students and the teacher. In one high school English classroom, we observed students taking risks to read their poetry aloud in front of the class. In another fourth-grade classroom, the teacher asked her students to create interview questions for a military veteran interview, which was comfortable for some and riskier for others. The goal of risk-taking is to provide new opportunities for students to stretch themselves intellectually, socially and creatively.

Imagination refers to the manipulation of qualities or ideas. Imagination may be intuitive, in which a person has a sudden rush of insight; fanciful, in which a person combines unexpected elements such as a dancing bicycle; interactive, in which a person works with materials to yield a product; or mimetic, in which a person mirrors or mimics the creative work of another (Moroye and Uhrmacher, 2009, 2012). All content areas are rich with opportunities for imagination. From the world of microorganisms to the geometric planes to mysterious worlds in literary fiction, giving students an opportunity to not only study but also to create or to mimic elements of these newly known worlds activates their imaginative possibilities and engages them in learning.

Sensory experience includes at least one person and a sensory interaction with an object (literal or metaphorical). Such objects – texts, lab equipment and natural objects – are the focus of attention through the five senses. If studying the coming-of-age text Bless Me Ultima by Anaya (1972), the teacher might bring in various objects, photographs, recipes and other artifacts from the New Mexican Chicano culture. A science lesson focused on water quality might engage students in viewing and smelling various water samples. Lessons centered on sensory experiences provide rich data for discussion, as well as a deepened understanding of the objects and their related concepts.

Perceptivity describes a deepened sensory experience, generally focused on one sense in particular. Such a focus provides an opportunity to come to know qualities of the object, as well as the chance to develop one’s perceptive abilities. Noticing subtle qualities leads to extended knowledge, such as of the bones in the body. An extended observation of the bones may lead to an understanding of, and critical thinking about, the varied colours, textures and sizes of them.

Active engagement allows students to drive aspects of their own learning. This could include physical activity, active intellectual meaning-making and/or making choices about paths of learning or types of assessments to demonstrate knowledge. Students who are actively engaged create their own relevance by selecting topics of interest and intellectual pursuits that contribute to their growth.

The six aesthetic dimensions might be used in a variety of combinations throughout a lesson, a unit or the academic year. Most teachers tend to use them in the initial planning of their lessons, which we have found to be quite useful. In fact, teachers who have planned together using the themes have described their own planning experience...
to be heightened – even “euphoric”. Their ideas flow and spiral upon each other to develop intricate and meaningful educational experiences (Uhrmacher et al., 2016). Teachers also use the dimensions “in the moment” when the opportunity opens.

As we have noted, while we cannot force anyone to have an aesthetic experience, we can provide the conditions for the possibility of one through the elements of CRISPA. Such experiences also meet the criteria for Dewey’s educative experience. Aesthetic experiences focus on the here and now and as such are all about interactions. In addition, elsewhere we have argued that aesthetic experiences are powerful ones that we tend to remember for a long time. As such, they have the potential to yield continuity (Uhrmacher, 2009). As demonstration of this fact, try to recall powerful, positive learning activities, the further back the better. We bet that such memories of school activities have stayed with you because in some shape or form they aided your growth.

In summary, aesthetic experiences, those occasions in which one is fully present, are powerful because they dig deep into the quality of the present experience and they may be remembered for a lifetime. Aesthetic learning experiences do the same in the context of education.

**Ecological experience**

We now turn to a second type of educative experience, the ecological. An ecological experience is similar to an aesthetic experience, in that it is about the quality of the present experience. However, whereas an aesthetic experience aims to add dimensions of sensory experience, risk and imagination toward learning any content, an ecological experience attends to *place* and aims toward action upon a set of beliefs. Ecological experiences can be characterized by elements of *care, interconnectedness and integrity* and move toward the aim of awareness and action (Moroye and Ingman, 2013) nested in community and place.

Ecological experience is related to what Gruenewald (2003, p. 3) calls “critical pedagogy of place”. He writes:

> Place-based pedagogies are needed so that the education of citizens might have some direct bearing on the well-being of the social and ecological places people actually inhabit. Critical pedagogies are needed to challenge the assumptions, practices, and outcomes taken for granted in dominant culture and in conventional education […].

One of the noted problems with traditional environmental education is that it is often fear-based and does not lead students to want to learn more about their environments (Sobel, 1996). So how is it that educators can help students ask critical questions of place, as well as provide the conditions for educative experiences that lead students to want to continue to learn? Further, might we use the ideas in ecological education to create conditions for meaningful learning in general? We argue that the elements of an ecological experience provide educators with a way to think about not only environmental issues but also ecological concepts and ideas to create the conditions for educative experiences of place toward the aim of wide-awakeness and continued engagement with a variety of subject areas.

The elements of an ecological experience – *care, interconnectedness and integrity* – were derived from the process of observing ecologically minded teachers in their classrooms through Dewey’s lens of educative experiences and tested against the literature in ecological education. So, for an element to remain, it had to be evident in practice, to be educative in a Deweyan sense and compatible with ecological theory (Moroye and Ingman, 2013). Therefore, the three elements are not exhaustive, but rather are a beginning to what may continue to emerge.

As with our research on CRISPA, we have elsewhere published research on ecological curriculum (Moroye, 2009, 2010; Moroye and Ingman, 2013, 2017).
These research studies were conducted using the qualitative methodology of educational connoisseurship and criticism, a method engendered by Eisner (2002) and designed to describe and evaluate the significance of educational situations toward the aim of improvement. The researchers used four dimensions in the method: description, interpretation, evaluation and thematics. The specifics of the studies vary in participants, data collection tools and research questions, details of which may be found in each independent article. Therefore, we provide a brief overview of our three elements of ecological experience – care, integrity and interconnectedness – along with excerpted vignettes from prior studies.

Ecological care

The element of care emerged from a study Author A conducted of ecologically minded teachers (Moroye, 2009). She was curious about their practices and wanted to see what, if anything, we might learn from their work. All of her participants, Ms Snow, Mr Hepner, Ms Avila and Mr Rye, taught English or Social Studies in traditional secondary American schools in the USA.

Although many theories of care abound, we focus on Nel Noddings’ care theory, as she is a profound educational philosopher whose ideas have relevance here. Though Noddings (1992) identifies six types of caring in education, we have acknowledged three that are particularly relevant to discussions of ecological experience: care for self; care for animals, plants and the earth; and care for strangers and distant others.

Caring for self involves physical, spiritual, occupational and recreational life (Noddings, 1992). A reflective examination of one’s beliefs is a core aspect of developing care for self (Noddings, 1992, p. 136) and subsequently care for others. While “caring for self” may seem like the antithesis of ecological care, Noddings, as well as the study participants, affirm that care for self that includes examination of one’s beliefs is a precursor to caring for others. As indicated by Ms Snow, she believes that her literary study of *Demian* by Hesse (1919) helps students examine “relationships with self, relationship with others.” She adds, “Respect for self and for others […] It also has to do with taking responsibility […] for how we conduct ourselves in relationship to how we use resources on the earth” (Moroye and Ingman, 2013).

According to Noddings, the second type of care – for plants, animals and the earth – includes becoming:

 [...] conscious of the effects of [our] lifestyles on the lives of others. [Students] need to know how much of the world’s energy and other resources are consumed by a small segment of the population [sic] (Noddings, 1992, p. 137).

This type of care directly aligns with ecological concerns and paying explicit attention to it in the curriculum provides students with opportunities to connect the ways in which one’s own examined beliefs (through care for self) can then be activated in caring for plants, animals and the earth.

A third type of care includes caring for strangers and distant others. When practicing this type of care, students must often use their imaginations. If the distant other remains distant, then students, through an examination of their own beliefs, must “imagine with some degree of correctness how we might behave in various circumstances” (Noddings, 1992, p. 118). In other words, the self-knowledge that comes from examining our beliefs, with an aim of empathy, allows us to have encounters with distant others. For example, if students are raising money to help clean up animal habitat from an oil spill, they may first consider and develop the belief that animals and their habitat are important, and that students have the power and perhaps responsibility to help. Through their beliefs that foster empathy, they can visualize both the current state of pollution and the future state of a cleaner habitat that
honours the inherent worth of the animals and the planet. This type of care for distant others is possible because of imaginative empathy.

Together, the three types of care coalesce around what we have called “ecological care” (Moroye and Ingman, 2013, 2017). Specifically, ecological care is the system of caring relationships at work in a classroom, which stem from and promote an ethic of care encompassing three central areas: care for self; care for others near and far (human and nonhuman); and care for plants, animals and the earth” (Moroye and Ingman, 2013). When the three types of care are practiced in the curriculum, students have a chance to examine their own beliefs and actions and their effects on their own lives and the lives of others, human and nonhuman. Because the focus is on the relationship between beliefs and actions, students need not feel paralyzed by the often-overwhelming data on the state of the natural world. The elements of ecological care allow for beliefs to be actualized rather than stifled by fear.

**Interconnectedness**

The second element of ecological experience is interconnectedness, which acknowledges and explores the many and varied relationships among all things, human and nonhuman. One particular type of relationship significant for ecological experience is the understanding of wholes and parts (Næss, 1989). This concept in the curriculum allows students to explore, for example, the ways in which a pencil is one part of a whole global process of manufacturing. Another type of interconnectedness includes an exploration of juxtaposition or relative placement of things and beings in particular spaces. Such place awareness encourages study of, for example, the effect of a big box-store parking lot on an adjacent stream.

One example from our research comes from Ms Avila’s lesson on population pyramids. She helps students see that a bulge in the middle of the pyramid, which represents large population growth – was because of an increase in manufacturing in the Guangdong Province of China. She draws the students’ attention to this by asking them to look at their shoes to examine where they were made. Most say that they were made in China:

> They ship these shoes that you are wearing out of Dongguan County. Why is there a huge number of people of working age?

> Ohh – because people came to work in the factories! a student offers.

> Yes! People migrated from other parts of China, and those people are of working age [. . .]. That big bulge [in the pyramid] is mostly women because they are willing to work for lower wages – very little money (Moroye and Ingman, 2013).

Exploring interconnectedness in its various forms allows students the type of thinking that “includes [. . .] seeing relationship between ostensibly different things” (Slattery, 1996, p. 26). Such thinking, when focused on an understanding of the connections among such differences, allows students to know and to experience interconnectedness.

**Integrity**

Ecological experience in the curriculum includes not just an exploration of care and interconnectedness, but also the related action upon such ideas (Moroye and Ingman, 2013). Integrity is the place in which beliefs are enacted. Ecological care and the perception of interconnectedness are expressed through actions that align with such beliefs and understandings. Integrity means “wholeness, entireness [. . .] the condition of having no part or element taken away or wanting; undivided or unbroken state” (Integrity, 1989, p. 1066). It is also defined as an “unimpaired moral state; freedom from moral corruption; innocence, sinlessness;” (Integrity, 1989, p. 1066), or to act in accordance with one’s beliefs.
The teachers we have studied identify integrity as essential to demonstrating learning. “Are you living a life that reflects (your) values and beliefs?” asked Mr Rye of his students. Similarly, Ms Snow notes that students must “take responsibility for how you conduct yourself” in the world. In another study of teachers who explored these themes in their curriculum planning, several noted that the inclusion of integrity – the action component – helped them reach their educational aims for their students. In particular, the focus on integrity supported student goals such as problem-solving and critical thinking (McConnell Moroye and Ingman, 2017).

Together, the three themes of ecological experience – care, interconnectedness and integrity – provide teachers with curricular elements that support educative experiences. Care encourages students to connect their beliefs to the curriculum, which supports Dewey’s criteria of continuity. Interaction is satisfied in that the elements, when working together, put students on a path toward enacting their beliefs.

Discussion

We end where we began. We start with the non-intuitive idea that to think about the future of education means we need to pay greater attention to the present. And what does it mean to teach in and for the moment? We suggest that it means we must attend to experience. We must create conditions for educative experiences by attending to continuity and interaction. While many curricula may have the potential to lead to educative experiences, we have presented two specific possibilities: aesthetic and ecological. We have shared with you dimensions of aesthetic educational experiences, and elements of an ecological educational experience. Both refer to the qualities of the experience and are compatible with any subject area and accessible to teachers everywhere. We reiterate that the dimensions of an aesthetic experience and the elements of an ecological experience are fluid and responsive to the learners and to culture and to the needs of society; we need not “sacrifice” significant content to provide educative and engaging experiences for students. Teaching in the moment, therefore, means creating the conditions for meaningful present experiences that lead to future growth and engagement[4]. Our students deserve nothing less.

In closing, this paper represents an initial step toward our next research endeavours. Although we have for over a decade conducted research on aesthetic and ecological experiences in education, we have not until now written about them collectively and in support of an argument to attend to present experiences of teachers and students in the curriculum. This moves us toward our future research which is to explore the relationship between ecological and aesthetic experiences, including aesthetic experiences in environmental education. We invite others from around the globe to join us in our efforts and to contribute to an international body of work that explores the ways in which experiences in education take center stage.

Notes

1. This comment was made to one of us in conversation. We are unsure whether she has this idea written in one of her many publications.
2. Miseducation is that which thwarts growth. Non-education is an experience that has little import, such as an adult tying one’s shoes.
3. Dewey (1916/1944, p. 83) also noted the “numerous and varied [...] interests which are consciously shared” as a means to ensuring positive growth in a democratic society.
4. In terms of aesthetic experiences, we believe that some combination of the elements of CRISPA need to be present, and we invite further research to explore how many? For instance, perhaps only three of the elements need to be present, or perhaps the number of elements required are content dependent. Similarly, the elements of ecological care may work independently or as a constellation of elements to create educative experiences for students.
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