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Internationalization in Higher Ed

- International exposure
  - Benefits for students
    - Preparation for future employment
    - Increased knowledge of other cultures
    - Development of cognitive skills
- Curriculum internationalization (CI)
  - A cost-effective and far-reaching method
  - Contributes to critical thinking in the learning environment

Curriculum Internationalization

- Challenges for faculty
  - Support structures/financial resources for CI aren’t clear at all institutions
  - Dearth of research on motivations/interest in CI
    - Not included in tenure & promotion process
    - Lack of know-how
    - No clear link between institutional policy and curriculum

Curriculum Internationalization

- Institutional support
  - Committed to internationalization? Support faculty efforts!
    - Buy-in from administration
    - Training for faculty and staff
    - Invest in trainings and communities of practice

Deep Approaches to Learning (DAL)

- Deep approaches to learning (DAL)
  - A multi-actor process, involving both students and instructors (Watkins, 2014)
  - Deep approaches vs. surface learning
- Instructor role
  - Student centered approach to teaching
- Benefits to students
  - More meaningful learning
**DAL and CI – connection?**

- How are DAL and CI related?
  - Both engage students in
    - Critical thinking
    - Relating concepts across disciplines
    - Reflective thinking
- Do faculty who promote CI practices have DAL goals and outcomes built into their process?

**Research Questions**

1. What faculty, course, and institutional characteristics predict values and emphasis of global perspectives?
2. How are global perspectives in the classroom related to deep approaches to learning?

**Data**

- 2014 administrations of the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)
- 10 items from an experimental item set about global perspectives in course curricula
- 1,391 faculty, 18 institutions

**FSSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty and course characteristics</th>
<th>Institution characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 47% female</td>
<td>• 6 publicly controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 98% U.S. citizen</td>
<td>• 2 Doctoral Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 72% White</td>
<td>• 7 Master’s colleges and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 37% tenured</td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 25% Full professor</td>
<td>• 5 Baccalaureate colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 24% Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>• 3 Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 54% upper division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 45% gen ed req.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disciplinary area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 24% Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 8% Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures**

- Dependent variable:
  - Global Perspective score
- Independent variables:
  - Reflective & Integrative Learning score
  - Higher-Order Learning score
- Control variables:
  - Faculty and course characteristics:
    - gender, race/ethnicity, age, international status, earned doctorate, years spent teaching, rank, tenure status, discipline, division taught (upper/lower), and teaching a general education requirement.
  - Institutional characteristics:
    - Basic Carnegie classification, institution size, and control.

**Method**

- Three ordinal least squares (OLS) linear regression models
  1. Predicting Global Perspectives with faculty, course, and institution characteristics
  2. Predicting Global Perspectives with Reflective & Integrative Learning while controlling for faculty, course, and institution characteristics
  3. Predicting Global Perspectives with Higher-Order Learning while controlling for faculty, course, and institution characteristics
1. What faculty, course, and institutional characteristics predict values and emphasis of global perspectives?

- Significant predictors:
  - Disciplinary area
  - Racial/ethnic identification
  - Age
  - Course load
  - General education courses
  - Course format
  - Carnegie classification

- Non-significant:
  - Employment status (full-/part-time)
  - Academic rank
  - Teaching experience
  - Earned doctorate
  - Gender identity
  - Citizenship
  - Course level (upper-/lower-division)
  - Class size
  - Institutional control

2. How are global perspectives in the classroom related to deep approaches to learning?

- Reflective & Integrative Learning significantly predicted Global Perspectives, holding all faculty, course, and institution characteristics constant ($\beta = 0.69, p < .001$).

- Higher-order Learning significantly predicted Global Perspectives, holding all faculty, course, and institution characteristics constant ($\beta = 0.44, p < .001$).

Implications: Positive and Significant

- Expected results:
  - Minority faculty
  - Social science use vs. hard science use

- Unexpected results:
  - No difference between gender identity or citizenship
  - Distance format vs. traditional classroom
  - General education vs. major courses

Implications for Research

- Online classes – more engaging through global perspectives?
- More general ed courses online?
- Are students still exposed to global perspectives after they complete gen ed requirements?

Future research with GPI data set

- Revisit data set using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM)
- Develop a model that has both RIL and HOL or the overall DAL measure (RIL + HOL)
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