

Global perspective in curricula and deep approaches to learning:

Examining faculty practices for engagement

Leah K. Peck

Yi-Chen Chiang

Allison BrckaLorenz

Indiana University

## **Global perspective in curricula and deep approaches to learning:**

### **Examining faculty practices for engagement**

Many higher education institutions today are embracing internationalization, citing numerous benefits of greater cultural awareness for student learning. Leask (2013) suggests that an internationalized curriculum is important for the student learning environment, because it involves “challenging dominant paradigms, exploring emerging paradigms in [academic] disciplines, and imagining new possibilities” (p. 111). Several higher education institutions today are also invested in deep approaches to learning, through both faculty instruction and student learning itself. Deep learning represents student engagement in approaches to learning that emphasize synthesis, reflection, and integration (Biggs, 1989; 2003; Entwistle & Ramsden 1983; Beattie, Collins & McInnes, 2007). For higher education institutions that are committed to developing critical thinkers and instilling a sense of global-mindedness in students, deep approaches to learning and a globalized curriculum are complimentary approaches that foster these goals, yet the connection between these two areas has gone unexplored. This study examines the premise and goals of curriculum internationalization (CI) and deep approaches to learning (DAL) and how they align in instructional practice through the use of data collected from the 2014 administration of the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE).

### **Internationalization in Higher Education**

Although campus internationalization has been happening since the 1980s (Knight, 2004), efforts surrounding it has become more prevalent in recent years, especially so after the events of September 2011 (Brustein, 2007). Many institutions of higher learning incorporate commitments to practices such as educating global citizens and international engagement in their

mission statements, and these steps to internationalize college campuses take many forms (Leask 2013; de Haan & Sherry, 2012; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Braskamp & Engberg, 2011). Knight (2004) defines internationalization in higher education as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension in the purpose, functions, or delivery of postsecondary education” (p. 11). Elkin and Devjee (2003) extend their definition of campus internationalization to include various campus actors, and suggest these efforts

aim to create values, beliefs and intellectual insights in which both domestic and international students and faculty participate and benefit equally. They should develop global perspectives, international and cultural and ethical sensitivities along with useful knowledge, skills and attitudes for the globalized market place (in Mak & Kennedy, 2012, p. 325).

The rationales for campus internationalization efforts are numerous and far reaching. Developing student intercultural competencies, critical thinking skills, and a sense of social responsibility, understanding global shifts in political, economic and social venues, successful competition in the global marketplace, fostering a greater sense of identity and relationship to others, and the development of human capital are all stated goals of campus internationalization (Brown, Whitaker & Brungardt, 2012; Merryfield, 1998; Knight, 2004; Gacil-Avila, 2005; Merrill, Braskamp & Braskamp, 2012; Leask, 2004; 2013; Chickering & Braskkamp, 2009; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Brustein, 2007). de Haan & Sherry (2012) suggest that the explicit identification of internationalizing goals is important, “as they underpin how internationalization is defined by individual stakeholders and consequently influence how policies and practices are interpreted and implemented” (2012, p. 27). Above all, internationalization efforts require

a deep understanding and appreciation of the institutional context. In addition, although elements of internationalization may be implemented, the findings indicate there is a need to underpin these approaches with a shared understanding of what internationalization is and the ways it should ultimately impact student learning within an institution (Coreyell, et al, 2012, p. 75).

### **Benefits of International Education to Students**

As developing student competencies is an explicit goal of internationalization efforts, it is important to articulate the specific benefits of these efforts. In addition to the straightforward benefits of preparing students for future employment, many researchers point to the development of cognitive skills as an outcome of an international education experience (Leask, 2013; Gacel-Avila, 2005; Braskamp & Engberg, 2011; Dulabaum, 2011). Mestenhauser (1998, in Gacel-Avila, 2005) offers a lengthy list of student benefits in international education, citing

such cognitive skills as the following: ability to recognize differences, understanding the difference between emic and etic thinking ability to make cognitive alterations/shifts, ability to recognize knowledge gap, ability to communicate cross-culturally, ability to recognize scarce knowledge, ability to think comparatively, ability to change self-perception, ability to know how to compare one's own country, possessing knowledge about other cultures, possessing diagnostic skills, understanding differentiation, ability to recognize trends in other cultures, understanding cognitive complexity and cognitive integration, understanding a variety of learning styles, and understanding the difference between product and process learning (p. 128)

Simply put, CI aims to encourage students to think more broadly and deeply about the world, and through that process, develop valuable critical thinking skills that they can apply to many facets of their lives.

### **Internationalization Abroad and at Home**

Knight (2004) identifies two categories of campus activities to meet this end: internationalization abroad and internationalization at home. Leask (2004) points out that internationalization efforts abroad predominantly revolve around the movement of students. These include either domestic students participating in study abroad programs, or the recruitment and enrollment of international students at domestic institutions, but additional efforts include faculty exchanges and service learning opportunities (Van Gyn, Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws & Preece, 2009; de Haan & Sherry, 2012; Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010). Efforts towards internationalization at home focus on “helping students develop international understanding and intercultural skills without ever having to leave campus” (de Haan & Sherry, 2012, p. 27). These efforts include changes at the program, curricular, and pedagogical levels to contribute to “the creation of a culture or climate on campus that promotes and supports international and intercultural understanding and focuses on campus-based activities” (Knight, 2004, p. 20).

Revising the college curriculum is one of the most cost effective and far-reaching internationalizing methods a higher education institution can employ, as not all students can afford the cost of a study abroad experience during their undergraduate studies (Brustein, 2007). CI is important for the learning environment, because it involves “challenging dominant paradigms, exploring emerging paradigms in [academic] disciplines, and imagining new

possibilities. These discussions need to take place within discipline communities in the first instance” (Leask, 2013, p. 111).

### **Challenges for Faculty**

The push for institutional internationalization is a common reality on today’s college campus, but the support structures and means of encouraging faculty to develop internationalized course content are not always obvious. Research findings on the curriculum internationalization process suggest that best results are achieved when it is a “planned, developmental, and cyclical process” (Leask, 2013, p. 103). There is a dearth of qualitative research devoted to the personal motivation and interest of, and process by which instructors engage in the curriculum internationalization process or what their intent is for students in internationalizing their curricula (Wihlborg, 2009).

Scholars recognize curricular components that address “pragmatic, the liberal and the civic” as necessary dimensions of an international education (Schechter, 1993, in Gacel-Avila, 2005, p. 125). The pragmatic addresses the development of skills necessary for the job market. The liberal refers to the development of intercultural skills that allow students to move from ethnocentric to ethnorelativistic viewpoints, and the civic speaks to the development of self-awareness as one’s role as a “global citizen” (Gacel-Avila, 2005, p. 125). Additional curricular adjustments can and should be made to foster

understanding multiple historical perspectives; developing cultural consciousness; developing intercultural competence; combating racism, sexism, prejudice, and all forms of discrimination; raising awareness of the state of the planet and global dynamics; and developing social action skills (Gacel-Avila, 2005, p. 128).

Researchers also call for the use of critical pedagogical approaches that calls upon students to be “active agents in society” (Vainio-Matilla, 2009, p. 100) and works to “facilitate the constitution of meaning and understanding of intentionally relevant features for students and teachers, in the overlapping contexts informed by the specific educational setting and international society” (Wihlborg, 2009, p. 127).

There are barriers to success for faculty in curriculum internationalization. Childress (2010) cites a lack of financial resources to support these efforts, the failure of many institutions to include internationalization efforts in the faculty tenure and promotion process, and skepticism and/or a lack of know-how on the part of faculty and staff on the effectiveness, point of, or process of adopting changes geared towards internationalization. The greatest barrier to curriculum internationalization was identified as “a lack of guidance in connecting institutional policy and the curriculum” (p. 113-114).

These barriers exist, in part, because while a significant amount of literature exists that examines policy implementation of tertiary internationalization goals, very little research has been done on the process of CI, or the experience of faculty and students who respectively teach and learn from an internationalized curriculum (Merryfield, 1998; de Haan & Sherry, 2012; Wihlborg, 2009; Van Gyn, Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws & Preece, 2009; Svennson & Wihlborg, 2010; Leask, 2013). This is attributed to a variety of reasons: there is an inadequate level of understanding on pedagogical and curricular changes that need to be implemented for internationalization of course content to take place, that resistance to change exists on the part of faculty and administrators, internationalization changes are not well integrated with the rest of the curriculum, that crafting policy that states the importance of internationalization takes precedence over actual curricular change, and many faculty and administrators lack the skill or

understanding to make anything other than technical or superficial changes that have low impact (Vainio-Matilla, 2009; Van Gyn, Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws & Preece, 2009; Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010; Mak & Kennedy, 2012).

### **Institutional Support for Curricular Internationalization**

Researchers agree, however, that if an institution is committed to internationalization efforts, it should also be committed to supporting faculty and staff in their efforts to internationalize curriculum (Brustein, 2007; Mak & Kennedy, 2012; Van Gyn, Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws & Preece, 2009; Gacel-Avila, 2005). In order for curricular internationalization to be successful

university and college educators must understand internationalization in a very profound way and then be able to translate this understanding into curricular changes... postsecondary educators need a much greater degree of support than is currently available in most institutions to advance this very complex process (Van Gynes, Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws & Preece, 2009, p. 28).

Support for curriculum internationalization comes in many forms: buy-in from administration, training for faculty and staff, and long-term resource investments in the form of faculty workshops and communities of practice, the efforts of which must be coordinated to champion comprehensive curricular reform, as “internationalization of the curriculum cannot be viewed in isolation from the faculty and student experiences” (de Haan & Sherry, 2012, p. 28). Mak and Kennedy (2012) specifically cite the importance of “strong leadership” from department chairs, deans, and administrators as “vital to drive the development of intercultural competence through modification of courses across an institution” (p. 331).

The literature states that while many universities have adopted rhetoric and designed institutional policies that embrace internationalization efforts, internationalization at home, especially deep and meaningful curricular changes that address international issues and support for faculty to make those changes, can be difficult to achieve. The intellectual growth and skills development for students who are engaged in international curriculum are highly beneficial, however, and share many characteristics with deep approaches to learning.

### **Deep Approaches to Learning**

There is also growing recognition by higher education institutions of the importance of deep approaches to learning (DAL), through both faculty instruction and student learning itself. DAL represents student engagement in approaches to learning that emphasize synthesis, reflection, and integration (Biggs, 1989; 2003; Entwistle & Ramsden 1983; Beattie, Collins & McInnes, 2007). Researchers claim that students who adopt a deep approach to learning gain “a better personal understanding of new ideas and information, and are more likely to respect the pedagogical intentions underlying the learning task” (Bliuc, Ellis, Goodyear, & Hendres, 2011, p. 419). In comparison, students who adopt a surface approach are “typically concerned with completing what strikes them as the most obvious of the task requirements, sometimes distorting the structure or intent of the task to accomplish their goals” (Bliuc, Ellis, Goodyear, & Hendres, 2011, p. 419). Approaches to deep learning also encourage reflective critical thinking, which “enables depth of understanding” and allows “students to participate positively in the discourse of the discipline” (Barton & Ryan, 2014, p. 422). Deep learning is a multi-actor process, involving both students and instructors, wherein both “good teaching and greater student autonomy” exist to “choose both the content and ways of learning” (Watkins, 2014, p. 41).

## **Deep Learning Benefits for Students**

Deep learning is demonstrated through independent thinking, cross-referencing, and the development of analytical skills (Biggs, 1989; Entwistle and Ramsden 1983; Ramsden 2003; Whelan 1988; Warburton, 2003). A variety of studies demonstrate the positive impact that deep learning has on student development and engagement in the classroom through student retention of knowledge, application of that knowledge in a variety of circumstances, and overall higher academic achievement (Marton & Säljö, 1976; Entwistle & Ramsden 1983; Tagg, 2003, Biggs, 1989; 2003; Kek, Darmawan & Chen, 2007; Bliuc, Ellis, Goodyear, & Hendres, 2011). Studies also suggest that deep learning approaches are related to overall student learning orientations, and student social identity, which is associated with increased academic performance (Beattie, Collins & McInnes, 2007; Bliuc, Ellis, Goodyear, & Hendres, 2011; Beausaert, Segers & Wiltink, 2013). Overall, deep learning approaches are equated with “more meaningful learning” for students (Nelson Laird, Shoup, Kuh, Schwarz, 2008, p. 470)

## **Role of the Instructor in Deep Learning**

Teachers play an important role in deep learning for students. Beausaert, Segers & Wiltink (2013) have identified two distinct styles of teaching that influence student learning: a teacher-centered approach, and student-centered teaching. A teacher-centered approach focuses on “transmitting knowledge,” a teaching process through which “students are more likely to employ a surface approach to learning, characterized by a focus on reproduction” (2013, p. 2). In this model, students play the role of “passive recipients of information and learning outcomes are expressed in in quantities rather than in qualitative terms without concern for the students’ understanding of knowledge” (2013, p. 4).

In contrast, the student-centered approach to teaching calls upon students to engage with the course to make deeper connections in the content, which fosters a greater understanding of the material (Bliuc, Ellis, Goodyear, & Hendres, 2011; Emes and Cleveland-Innes, 2003; Beausaert, Segers & Wiltink, 2013). In student-centered teaching, instructors focus predominantly on the learning process of the student, wherein

teaching can be seen as interactive, in interaction with the students' existing conceptions. A student-centered teacher tries to recognize the students' different needs; the teacher takes these needs as a starting point when planning the course and uses more diverse teaching methods than teachers who adopt a teacher-centered approach to teaching (Beausaert, Segers & Wiltink, 2013, p. 4).

The student-centered approach to teaching includes multiple modes of student support, including providing feedback, showing interest in student opinions, using various teaching approaches to cater to different learning styles, and providing clear directions (Emes and Cleveland-Innes, 2003; Bliuc, Ellis, Goodyear, & Hendres, 2011; Marton & Säljö, 1976; Entwistle & Ramsden 1983; Tagg, 2003, Biggs, 1989; 2003). Emes and Cleveland-Innes (2003) suggest that instructors who craft a student-centered curriculum aim to “create highly developed individuals, providing them the skills to continue creating learning experiences, digest current knowledge, and create new knowledge within the curriculum itself” (p. 47). Research done by Beausaert, Segers & Wiltink (2013) also indicates that student perceptions of their instructors' teaching also predict student approaches to learning, meaning that student-centered teaching can lead to deep learning by students (p. 12), so learning institutions should be highly invested in the facilitation of student-centered teaching practices for instructors (p. 1).

### **Moving from Surface Learning to Deep Learning**

Biggs (1989) has devised three conceptions of learning and teaching, falling under quantitative, institutional, and qualitative descriptors. In the case of learning, this is described three ways in increasing levels of depth: “Learning is a matter of how much is learned; learning needs to be validated in an institution of learning, and; learning involves a way of interpreting the world” (p. 8). Similarly, deep approaches to learning call upon faculty to use multiple contexts to address concepts, analyze and synthesize information, and reflect on the learning process (Nelson Laird, Shoup, Kuh, & Schwarz, 2008, p. 469). For teaching, this progression, moving from surface to deep learning, is articulated as “teaching as the transmission of knowledge; teaching as the efficient orchestration of teaching skills, and; teaching as the facilitation of learning (Biggs, 1989, p. 9).

As both teaching and learning move through these paradigms, the differences between the surface approach versus a deep approach to learning are more obvious. Learning as a matter of how much is learned, as well as teaching as the transmission of knowledge, align with the surface approach, where learning and teaching are seen as “a means toward some other end” and limiting “targets to essentials through rote learning” (Biggs, 1989, p. 13). Teaching and learning tasks are performed in a perfunctory manner, with no thought invested in their purpose or larger meaning. When learning involves world interpretation and teaching becomes the facilitation of learning, these qualitative categories are associated with deep approaches to learning, which includes “searching for meaning in the task and the integration of task aspects into a whole” (Beusaert, Segers & Wiltink, 2013, p. 2).

**How (and are) DAL and CI related?**

Given that DAL engage students in critical thinking, asks students to relate concepts across multiple disciplines, and requires reflective thinking, there are striking similarities between DAL and CI outcomes. An internationalized curriculum serves to guide students to become critical and evaluative thinkers. Svennson & Wihlborg (2010) suggest that the learning environment for an international education is “very important, because internationalization in relation to globalization in an educational perspective entails a widening of the environmental opportunities afforded for learning (p. 609). The development of curricular objectives for internationalization become the delivery mechanism for

key issues, such as what and how students learn, and why the knowledge achieved is of importance [and] would then become open to reflect on, and in turn, open up for the possibility to critically examine which features need to be changed, or supported and promoted in practice (Svennson & Wihlborg, 2010, p. 609).

For higher education institutions that are committed to developing critical thinkers and instilling a sense of global-mindedness in students, approaches to deep learning and a globalized curriculum are complimentary approaches that foster these goals.

To further this line of thought, we also assert that faculty who promote CI practices have DAL goals and outcomes built into their process. To bolster this argument, we again draw attention to how CI practices aim to expose students to multiple points of view on issues, foster cross-cultural understanding, and promote conversations between and about diverse groups (Merryfield, 1998; Dulabaum, 2011; Leask, 2013). Faculty who seek to internationalize their curriculum automatically employ DAL techniques like cross-referencing, independent thinking,

Running head: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN CURRICULA AND DEEP APPROACHES TO

and analytical skills development (Entwistle and Ramsden 1983; Whelan 1988; Warburton, 2003) to achieve critical thinking in students through encouraging “students to grasp the underlying meaning of information, gaining a personal interest in the learning process” (Nelson Laird, Shoup, Kuh & Schwarz, 2008, p. 470-471).

### **Purpose**

Our purpose for this study was to explore how curriculum internationalization goals have deep approaches to learning practices incorporated within them, and to test whether this happens in instructional practice. This study builds on the previous work of Nelson Laird, Shoup, Kuh, and Schwarz (2008), who examined faculty emphasis on approaches to deep learning in post-secondary education teaching and learning practices. Using those findings as our foundation, this study follows a similar examination but with consideration for faculty members’ practices in CI.

The following questions guide this study:

- What faculty, course, and institution characteristics predict values and emphasis of global perspectives?
- How are global perspectives in the classroom related to deep approaches to learning?

### **Methods**

#### **Data Source**

The data used for this study come from the 2014 administration of the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). FSSE annually collects data from faculty members at baccalaureate degree-granting colleges and universities where students have completed the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). FSSE was designed to complement NSSE by measuring faculty

Running head: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN CURRICULA AND DEEP APPROACHES TO

perceptions and expectations of undergraduate engagement in educationally purposeful activities, the extent to which faculty promote learning and development in their courses, the extent of faculty interaction with students, and how faculty allocate their time. Results from FSSE provide institutions with an assessment of faculty attitudes and behaviors related to educational practices known to produce positive educational outcomes for students. In addition, survey results provide insight into how faculty members perceive their institution, divide up their work time, and spend class time. The survey results from this study come from two questions on the core survey and an experimental item set specifically addressing global perspectives in the classroom (See Table 1). The 2014 FSSE administration had just over 18,000 faculty at 143 institutions respond to the core survey, about 1391 of which participated in the Global Perspectives (GP) experimental item set.

### **Sample**

The sample for this study consists of responses from 1391 faculty members at 17 institutions that participated in the Global Perspectives (GP) experimental item set. The faculty in this study are from a variety of disciplinary areas, around half female, three-fourths are White, one-fourth are professors, nearly three-fourths are full-time faculty and over nine-tenths identified themselves as United States citizens. When responding to questions about how they structure courses, faculty select one course that they are teaching during the current school year. In around half of the courses faculty selected to respond about, enrolled students were mostly juniors or seniors (upper division), around four-fifths were taught in an on-campus classroom format, and around half fulfilled a general education requirement. Nearly half of faculty respondents were employed at privately controlled institutions and the largest proportion of

Running head: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN CURRICULA AND DEEP APPROACHES TO

faculty taught at Master's-granting institutions. For more details about the sample in this study, see Tables 1 through 2.

### **Measures**

The dependent variable *Global Perspectives* is a continuous variable, which consists of ten items with a mean of 28, a standard deviation of 18 and a Cronbach's alpha of 0.95.

Respondents were asked a series of ten questions with regard to globalizing course curriculum (see Table 1). The scores of these ten items were averaged into one score and transformed into a 60-point scale.

The independent variables include faculty, course, institution-related characteristics, the Reflective & Integrative Learning score, and Higher-Order Learning score. The faculty characteristics examined are as follows: disciplinary area, age, course load, years of teaching, gender identity, race/ethnicity, citizenship, academic rank, highest degree earned, and employment status. The selected course characteristics examined included course division, course size, course format and whether the selected course fulfills a general education requirement. The institution characteristics examined include control and Carnegie classification. Later analyses included FSSE's Reflective & Integrative Learning (fRI) scale (see Table 1) and Higher-Order Learning (fHO) scale (see Table 1) to determine whether or not a positive and significant relationship existed between *Global Perspectives* and the two FSSE scales. The Reflective & Integrative Learning scale (mean=44.19, std. dev.=14.13) and Higher-Order Learning scale (mean=44.00, std. dev.=12.77) both range from 0-60.

### **Analyses**

After removing the missing data using listwise deletion, the data set consists of a sample of 1391 faculty members. To answer the research questions, three ordinal least squares (OLS)

Running head: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN CURRICULA AND DEEP APPROACHES TO

linear regression models were used to examine the relationship between Global Perspectives the two FSSE scales (Reflective & Integrative Learning, Higher-Order Learning) using SPSS for Windows 21.0. In the first model, all faculty, course, and institution characteristics were put into the model to examine whether there are significant differences on Global Perspectives among each of the faculty, course, and institution characteristics. In the second and third models, OLS regressions were used to examine the relationship between Global Perspectives and each of two FSSE scales (Reflective & Integrative Learning and Higher-Order Learning) while controlling for all faculty, course, and institution characteristics.

## **Results**

With all faculty, course, and institution characteristics in the model, there were a variety of differences on the GP score including disciplinary area, race/ethnicity, age, course load, course format and Carnegie classification. For example, a faculty member in a Biological Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Resources, Physical Sciences, Mathematics, & Computer Science, or Engineering discipline is expected to have a decrease by 10.54, 17.65, or 14.49 points respectively on GP than faculty in Business, holding other variables constant ( $p < .001$ ). In addition, for faculty who are Asian, Asian American, & Pacific Islander, Black & African American, or Hispanic & Latino, their Global Perspectives score is expected to increase by 11.11, 8.68, 11.89 points over a faculty member who is White, holding other variables constant ( $p < .001$ ). For a faculty member who teaches a distance-format course, their global perspective score is expected to increase 5.07 points compared to a faculty member who teaches in a classroom, holding other variables constant ( $p < .05$ ).

After adding the variable Reflective & Integrative Learning into the model, we found that for each additional point of Reflective & Integrative Learning, the Global Perspectives score is

expected to increase by 0.69 points on a 60 point scale, holding all faculty, course, and institution characteristics constant ( $p < .001$ ). In other words, there is a significant and positive relationship between GP and Reflective & Integrative Learning. Similarly, after controlling all faculty, course, and institution characteristics, the Higher-Order Learning scale was found to have a positive and significant association with Global Perspectives. For each additional point of Higher-Order Learning, the Global Perspective score is expected to increase by 0.44 points on a 60 point scale ( $p < .001$ ) (see more details in Table 4).

### **Discussion & Implications**

Our findings suggest that Reflective & Integrative Learning has a positive and significant relationship with Global Perspectives, as does Higher Order Learning, after controlling both faculty and institutional characteristics.

While some findings on faculty characteristics were expected (minority faculty incorporate more global perspectives into course content than do White faculty, and faculty in Social Sciences use global perspectives more frequently than the hard sciences), some were unexpected. For example, our results demonstrate there are no differences between gender identity or citizenship for the propensity to incorporate global perspectives into course content. Additionally, global perspectives are utilized more frequently in distance formats than in the traditional classroom setting, and global perspectives are used more frequently in general education courses than within major courses.

These findings pose several points for discussion: Do online classes strive to be more engaging through the use of global perspectives? Are more general education courses offered online? Once students fulfill their general education requirements and move to their major course work are they still exposed to global learning? These questions are worthy of further exploration,

Running head: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN CURRICULA AND DEEP APPROACHES TO  
and suggest how curriculum internationalization can enhance student learning and should  
become connected to pedagogical debates (Mahani, 2012; Vainio-Matilla, 2009; de Haan and  
Sherry, 2012).

### **Conclusion**

Although significant and positive relationships were found between Global Perspectives, Reflective & Integrative Learning, and Higher-Order Learning, faculty can use these results as a basis for increasing the strength between these relationships. A globalized curriculum as described above should contain high levels of reflection, consideration of multiple points of view, and deep thinking about complex issues. A greater understanding of how CI and DAL practices are related can also provide a stronger foundation for exploring the process of CI, or the experiences of faculty and students who respectively teach and learn from an internationalized curriculum. This research will create a foundation for future studies aimed more closely at studying the faculty impact on student gains in understanding global issues as related to deep approaches to learning, as well as similarities between DAL and CI in curriculum development and faculty implementation of those practices.

## References

- Barton, G., Ryan, M. (2014). Multimodal approaches to reflective teaching and assessment in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(3), 409-424. DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2013.841650
- Beattie, V., Collins, B., McInnes, B. (1997). Deep and surface learning: A simple or simplistic dichotomy? *Accounting Education*, 6(1), 1-12. Retrieved 8 July, 2014 from <http://www.ebscohost.com>
- Beausaert, S.A.J., Segers, M.S.R, Wiltink, D.P.A. (2013). The influence of teachers' teaching approaches on students' learning approaches: The student perspective. *Educational Research*, 55(1), 1-15. DOI: 10.1080/00131881.2013.767022
- Biggs, J. (2003). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Oxford, UK: SHRE and Open University Press.
- Biggs, J. B. (1989). Approaches to the enhancement of tertiary teaching. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 8, 7-25. Retrieved 8 July 2014 from <http://www.ebscohost.com>
- Bliuc, A., Ellis, R.A., Goodyear, P., Hendres, D.M. (2011). Understanding student learning in context: Relationships between university students' social identity, approaches to learning, and academic performance. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 26(3), 417-433. DOI: 10.1007/s10212-011-0065-6
- Braskamp, L.A., Engberg, M.E. (2011 Summer/Fall). How colleges can influence the development of a global perspective. *Liberal Education*, 97(3/4), 34-39. Retrieved 5 August 2013 from <http://www.ebscohost.com>

Brown, L.M., Whitaker, B.L., Brungardt, C.L. (2012 Summer). A proposed framework for global leadership education: Learning objectives and curricula. *Journal of Leadership Education, 11*(2), 214-225. Retrieved 19 June, 2014 from <http://www.leadershipeducators.org/JOLE>

Brustein, W.I. (2007). The global campus: Challenges and opportunities for higher education in North America. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3/4), 382-391. DOI: 10.1177/1028315307303918

Chickering, A., Braskamp, L.A. (2009 Fall). Developing a global perspective for personal and social responsibility. *Peer Review, 11*(4), 27-30. Retrieved 4 August 2013 from <http://www.ebscohost.com>

Childress, L. (2010). *The twenty-first century university: Developing faculty engagement in internationalization*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Coryell, J.E., Durodoye, B.A., Wright, R.R., Pate, P.E., Nguyen, S. (2012 February). Case studies of internationalization in adult and higher education: Inside the processes of four universities in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 16*(1) 75-98. DOI: 10.1177/1028315310388945

de Haan, D., Sherry, E. (2012). Internationalization of the sports management curriculum: Academic and student reflections. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 16*(24), 24-39. DOI: 10.1177/10283415311403487

Running head: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN CURRICULA AND DEEP APPROACHES TO

Dulabaum, N.L. (2011). A pedagogy for global understanding – intercultural dialogue: From theory to practice. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9(1), 103-107.

DOI: 10.2304/pfie.2011.9.1.104.

Emes, C., Cleveland-Innes, M. (2003). A journey toward learner-centered curriculum. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 33(3), 47-69. Retrieved from ERIC database.

(EJ788477)

Entwistle, N.J., & Ramsden, P. (1983). *Understanding student learning*. London, UK: Croom Helm.

Gacel-Avila, J (2005 June). The internationalization of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(2), 121-136.

DOI: 10.1177/1028315304263795

Kek, M.A.Y., Darmawan, I.G.N., Chen, Y.S. (2007). Family, learning environments, learning approaches, and student outcomes in a Malaysian private university.

*International Education Journal*, 8(2), 318-336. Retrieved July 2014 from

<http://www.ebscohost.com>

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales.

*Journal of Studies of International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.

DOI: 10.1177/1028315303260832

Knight, J., de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalization of higher education:

Historical and conceptual perspectives. In de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for the*

*internationalization of higher education: A comparative study of Australia,*

Running head: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN CURRICULA AND DEEP APPROACHES TO

*Canada, Europe, and the United States of America*, (pp. 5-32). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: European Association of International Education

Leask, B. (2013). Internationalizing the curriculum in the disciplines – Imagining new possibilities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(2), 103-118.

DOI: 10.1177/1028315312475090.

Leask, B. (2004). Internationalization outcomes for all students using information and communication technologies (ICTs). *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(4), 336-351. DOI: 10.1177/1028315303261778

Mak, A.S., Kennedy, M. (2012 August). Internationalising the student experience: Preparing instructors to embed intercultural skills in the curriculum. *Innovative Higher Education*, 37(4), 323-334. DOI: 10.1007/s10755-012-9213-4

Mahani, S. (2012 Third Quarter). Promoting mindfulness through contemplative education. *Journal of International Education Research*, 8(3), 214-222. Retrieved 8 July 2104 from <http://www.cluteinstitute.com>

Marton, F., Säljö, R. (1976). On qualitative differences in learning I: Outcome and process. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 46, 115-127. Retrieved 23 July 2014 from [www.ebscohost.com](http://www.ebscohost.com)

Merrill, K.C., Braskamp, D.C., Braskamp, L.A. (2012 March/April). Assessing individuals' global perspective. *Journal of College Student Development*, 53(2), 356-360. Retrieved 19 August 2013 from

[http://muse.jhu.edu.proxyiub.uits.iu.edu/journals/journal\\_of\\_college\\_student\\_development/v053/53.2.merrill.pdf](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxyiub.uits.iu.edu/journals/journal_of_college_student_development/v053/53.2.merrill.pdf)

Running head: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN CURRICULA AND DEEP APPROACHES TO

Merryfield, M.M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 342-379.

DOI: 10.1080/009331-4.1998.10505855.

Nelson Laird, T. F., Shoup, R., Kuh, G.D., Schwarz, M.J. (2008). The effects of discipline on deep approaches to student learning and college outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 49, 469-494. DOI: 10.1007/s11162-008-9088-5

Schuerholtz-Lehr, S., Caws, C., Van Gyn, G., Preece, A. (2007). Internationalizing the higher education curriculum: An emerging model for transforming faculty perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 37(1), 67-94. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ771047).

Svensson, L., Wihlborg, M. (2010). Internationalising the content of higher education: The need for a curriculum perspective. *Higher Education*, 60(6), 595-613.

DOI: 10.1007/s10734-010-9318-6

Tagg, J. (2003). *The learning paradigm college*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Vainio-Matilla, A. (2009 Summer). Internationalizing curriculum: A new kind of education? *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 118, 95-105. DOI: 10.1002/tl.356

Van Gyn, G., Schuerholz-Lehr, S., Caws, C., Preece, A. (2009 Summer). Education for world-mindedness: Beyond superficial notions of internationalization. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 118, 25-38. DOI: 10.1002/tl.350.

Vidovich, L., O'Donoghue, T., Tight, M. (2012). Transforming university curriculum policies in a global knowledge era: Mapping a "global case study" research agenda. *Educational Studies*, 38(3), 283-295. DOI: 10.1080/03055698.2011.598681

Watkins, M. (2014). Towards an understanding of the social aspects of sustainability in product design: Teaching HE students in the UK and Ireland. *Design & Technology Education, 19*(1), 40-47. Retrieved 4 August 2013 from <http://www.ebscohost.com>

Warburton, K. (2003). Deep learning and education for sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 4*(1), 44-56.

DOI: 10.1108/14676370310455332

Whelan, G. (1988). Improving medical students' clinical problem-solving. In P. Ramsden (Ed). *Improving learning: New Perspectives* (pp. 199-214). London, UK: Korgan Page.

Wihlborg, M. (2009 November). The pedagogical dimension of internationalization? A challenge quality issue in higher education for the twenty-first century. *European Educational Research Journal, 8*(1), 117-132. DOI: 10.2304/eerj.2009.8.1.117

**Table 2 Descriptive statistics of Faculty Characteristics**

|                   |   | N   | Percent | GPI mean score |
|-------------------|---|-----|---------|----------------|
| Disciplinary Area | Arts & Humanities                                     | 333 | 24%     | 33             |
|                   | Biological Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Resources | 116 | 8%      | 22             |
|                   | Physical Sciences, Mathematics, & Computer Science    | 173 | 12%     | 15             |
|                   | Social Sciences                                       | 133 | 10%     | 36             |
|                   | Business  | 99  | 7%      | 37             |

Running head: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN CURRICULA AND DEEP APPROACHES TO

|                          |   |      |     |    |
|--------------------------|---|------|-----|----|
|                          | Communications, Media, & Public Relations | 66   | 5%  | 30 |
|                          | Education                                 | 113  | 8%  | 31 |
|                          | Engineering                               | 97   | 7%  | 18 |
|                          | Health Professions                        | 130  | 9%  | 29 |
|                          | Social Service Professions                | 42   | 3%  | 30 |
|                          | Other disciplines                         | 89   | 6%  | 28 |
| Employment status        | Part-time                                 | 291  | 21% | 28 |
|                          | Full-time                                 | 1100 | 79% | 28 |
| Academic rank            | Full Professor                            | 352  | 25% | 28 |
|                          | Associate Professor                       | 331  | 24% | 28 |
|                          | Assistant Professor                       | 283  | 20% | 29 |
|                          | Full-time Lecturer/Instructor             | 187  | 13% | 28 |
|                          | Part-time Lecturer/Instructor             | 238  | 17% | 28 |
| Number of years teaching | 4 or less                                 | 206  | 15% | 29 |
|                          | 5-9                                       | 239  | 17% | 27 |
|                          | 10-19                                     | 440  | 32% | 27 |
|                          | 20-29                                     | 290  | 21% | 29 |
|                          | 30 or more                                | 216  | 16% | 31 |
| Highest degree earned    | Doctoral degree                           | 873  | 63% | 28 |
|                          | Professional degree                       | 39   | 3%  | 24 |
|                          | Master's degree                           | 419  | 30% | 29 |
|                          | Bachelor's degree                         | 50   | 4%  | 26 |
|                          | Associate's degree                        | 3    | 0%  | 27 |
|                          | Other                                     | 7    | 1%  | 33 |
| Female                   |   | 655  | 47% | 30 |
| U.S. citizen             |   | 1366 | 98% | 28 |
| Racial/ethnic background | American Indian or Alaska Native          | 21   | 2%  | 39 |
|                          | Asian                                     | 58   | 4%  | 35 |
|                          | Black or African American                 | 49   | 4%  | 37 |
|                          | Hispanic or Latino                        | 66   | 5%  | 40 |

|                         |          |     |    |
|-------------------------|----------|-----|----|
| White                   | 100<br>1 | 72% | 26 |
| Other                   | 22       | 2%  | 31 |
| Multiracial             | 56       | 4%  | 36 |
| I prefer not to respond | 116      | 8%  | 28 |
| <hr/>                   |          |     |    |
| Average age             | 139<br>1 | 50  |    |
| Average course load     | 139<br>1 | 6   |    |
| <hr/>                   |          |     |    |

Note: N=1391

**Table 3 Descriptive statistics of Course and Institution Characteristics**

| Select Course Characteristics  |                | N       | Perce<br>nt | GPI<br>mean<br>score |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---------|-------------|----------------------|
| Selected<br>course<br>division | Lower division | 59<br>3 | 43%         | 27                   |
|                                | Upper division | 74<br>7 | 54%         | 29                   |
|                                | Other          | 51      | 4%          | 31                   |
| Estimated<br>number of         | 20 or fewer    | 42<br>6 | 31%         | 29                   |

Running head: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN CURRICULA AND DEEP APPROACHES TO

|  |   |          |     |    |
|--|---|----------|-----|----|
| students in selected course section                      | 21-30   | 44<br>6  | 32% | 29 |
|  | 31-40   | 20<br>5  | 15% | 28 |
|  | 41-50   | 13<br>8  | 10% | 25 |
|  | 51-100  | 12<br>9  | 9%  | 27 |
|  | More than 100   | 47       | 3%  | 26 |
| Selected course fulfills a general education requirement |   | 63<br>0  | 45% | 32 |
| Selected course format                                   | Classroom instruction on-campus                             | 11<br>55 | 83% | 27 |
|  | Classroom instruction at an auxiliary location              | 27       | 2%  | 31 |
|  | Distance education  | 74       | 5%  | 35 |
|  | Combination of classroom instruction and distance education | 13<br>5  | 10% | 35 |

---

| Select Institution Characteristics |                                     | N       | Percent | GPI mean score |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|----------------|
| Private Institution                |                                     | 57<br>1 | 41%     | 30             |
| Carnegie Classification            | Doctoral-granting: RU/VH, RU/H, DRU | 10<br>5 | 7%      | 32             |
|                                    | Master's-granting: L, M, S          | 86<br>0 | 62%     | 27             |
|                                    | Bachelor's-granting: A&S            | 10<br>1 | 7%      | 25             |
|                                    | Bachelor's-granting: Diverse, Other | 32<br>5 | 23%     | 31             |

---

Note: N=1391 (faculty members), 17 institutions

**Table 4 OLS regression results of three models**

| Independent variables                                 | Model 1<br>(Faculty characteristics) |            |      | Model 2<br>(Faculty characteristics and<br>Reflective & Integrative<br>Learning) |            |      | Model 3<br>(Faculty characteristics<br>and Higher-Order Learning) |            |      |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------|------|--|------------|------|---|------------|------|
|   | Unstd B                              | Std. error | Sig. | Unstd B  | Std. error | Sig. | Unstd B   | Std. error | Sig. |
| (Constant)  | 26.39                                | 5.33       | .00  | 2.35   | 4.67       | .62  | 9.47  | 5.18       | .07  |
| Reflective & Integrative Learning                     |                                      |            |      | .69  | .03        | .00  |   |            |      |
| Higher-Order Learning                                 |                                      |            |      |  |            |      | .44   | .03        | .00  |
| <b>Disciplinary area<sup>a</sup></b>                  |                                      |            |      |  |            |      |   |            |      |
| Arts&Humanities                                       | -2.52                                | 1.90       | .18  | -5.20  | 1.63       | .00  | -3.38   | 1.79       | .06  |
| Biological Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Resources | -13.06                               | 2.21       | .00  | -9.04  | 1.89       | .00  | -10.86  | 2.09       | .00  |
| Physical Sciences, Mathematics, & Computer Science    | -20.17                               | 2.08       | .00  | -11.59   | 1.82       | .00  | -18.99  | 1.96       | .00  |
| Social science  | -.95                                 | 2.18       | .66  | -3.47  | 1.87       | .06  | -1.73   | 2.06       | .40  |
| Communication   | -4.00                                | 2.57       | .12  | -7.96  | 2.20       | .00  | -5.49   | 2.42       | .02  |
| Education   | -4.85                                | 2.24       | .03  | -7.53  | 1.91       | .00  | -4.69   | 2.11       | .03  |
| Engineering   | -17.02                               | 2.36       | .00  | -11.31   | 2.03       | .00  | -14.81  | 2.22       | .00  |
| Health  | -5.85                                | 2.16       | .01  | -7.97  | 1.84       | .00  | -6.17   | 2.03       | .00  |
| Social service  | -4.68                                | 2.96       | .11  | -6.46  | 2.53       | .01  | -5.12   | 2.79       | .07  |
| Other   | -6.87                                | 2.38       | .00  | -6.26  | 2.03       | .00  | -6.04   | 2.24       | .01  |
| <b>Employment status</b>                              |                                      |            |      |  |            |      |   |            |      |
| Full-time   | .61                                  | 2.34       | .79  | 1.20   | 1.99       | .55  | -.50  | 2.20       | .82  |
| <b>Rank<sup>b</sup></b>                               |                                      |            |      |  |            |      |   |            |      |
| Associate Professor                                   | .04                                  | 1.27       | .98  | -.59   | 1.08       | .59  | -.29  | 1.20       | .81  |
| Assistant Professor                                   | -.14                                 | 1.43       | .92  | -.67   | 1.22       | .59  | -.43  | 1.35       | .75  |
| Full-time Lecturer                                    | .56                                  | 1.76       | .75  | -.94   | 1.50       | .53  | -.22  | 1.66       | .89  |
| Part-time Lecturer                                    | .30                                  | 2.57       | .91  | -.60   | 2.19       | .79  | -1.37   | 2.42       | .57  |
| <b>Years of teaching</b>                              |                                      |            |      |  |            |      |   |            |      |
| Taught 4 or fewer years                               | 2.22                                 | 1.37       | .11  | 1.09   | 1.17       | .35  | 1.95  | 1.29       | .13  |
| <b>Highest degree earned</b>                          |                                      |            |      |  |            |      |   |            |      |
| Earned doctoral degree                                | 1.91                                 | 1.17       | .10  | 1.75   | 1.00       | .08  | 1.13  | 1.10       | .30  |
| <b>Gender identity<sup>c</sup></b>                    |                                      |            |      |  |            |      |   |            |      |
| Woman   | .74                                  | .93        | .43  | -1.05  | .80        | .19  | -.16  | .88        | .86  |
| Other   | -22.19                               | 15.94      | .16  | 8.53   | 13.66      | .53  | -2.82   | 15.07      | .85  |
| I prefer not to respond                               | -3.38                                | 2.82       | .23  | -.33   | 2.41       | .89  | -1.68   | 2.66       | .53  |
| <b>U.S.citizen</b>                                    |                                      |            |      |  |            |      |   |            |      |
| Yes   | -5.28                                | 3.35       | .12  | -6.94  | 2.86       | .02  | -3.88   | 3.15       | .22  |
| <b>Race/Ethnicity<sup>d</sup></b>                     |                                      |            |      |  |            |      |   |            |      |
| Asian, Asian American or Pacific Islander             | 11.11                                | 2.18       | .00  | 7.63   | 1.87       | .00  | 10.26   | 2.05       | .00  |
| Black or African                                      | 8.68                                 | 2.37       | .00  | 5.02   | 2.23       | .01  | 6.99  | 2.23       | .00  |

|   |       |      |     |       |      |      |       |      |     |
|---|-------|------|-----|-------|------|------|-------|------|-----|
| American  |       |      |     |       |      |      |       |      |     |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 11.89 | 2.17 | .00 | 8.08  | 1.86 | .00  | 8.65  | 2.06 | .00 |
| Other   | 8.62  | 1.73 | .00 | 6.15  | 1.48 | .00  | 6.79  | 1.63 | .00 |
| I prefer not to respond                                     | 2.61  | 1.81 | .15 | .89   | 1.55 | .57  | .77   | 1.71 | .65 |
| <b>Age</b>  | .09   | .05  | .04 | .09   | .04  | .02  | .10   | .04  | .02 |
| <b>Courseload</b>   | .45   | .19  | .02 | .25   | .16  | .12  | .40   | .17  | .02 |
| <b>Course level<sup>e</sup></b>                             |       |      |     |       |      |      |       |      |     |
| Upper division  | 1.96  | 1.01 | .05 | -.03  | .86  | .97  | .16   | .96  | .87 |
| Other class level   | 3.24  | 2.37 | .17 | -.17  | 2.03 | .94  | 1.37  | 2.24 | .54 |
| <b>Class size<sup>f</sup></b>                               |       |      |     |       |      |      |       |      |     |
| Medium  | .87   | 1.13 | .44 | .81   | .97  | .40  | .60   | 1.07 | .57 |
| Large   | -.35  | 1.24 | .78 | .35   | 1.06 | .74  | -.14  | 1.17 | .90 |
| <b>Selected course is a general education requirement</b>   |       |      |     |       |      |      |       |      |     |
| Yes   | 5.48  | 1.01 | .00 | 4.04  | .86  | .00  | 4.77  | .95  | .00 |
| <b>Course format<sup>g</sup></b>                            |       |      |     |       |      |      |       |      |     |
| Classroom instruction, at an auxiliary location             | -2.27 | 3.18 | .48 | -3.24 | 2.71 | .23  | -3.41 | 3.00 | .26 |
| Distance education  | 4.62  | 2.04 | .02 | 3.26  | 1.74 | .06  | 3.48  | 1.92 | .07 |
| Combination of classroom instruction and distance education | 5.07  | 1.49 | .00 | 3.07  | 1.28 | .02  | 3.44  | 1.41 | .01 |
| <b>Private institution</b>                                  |       |      |     |       |      |      |       |      |     |
| Private   | -.66  | 1.23 | .60 | -1.84 | 1.05 | .08  | -1.04 | 1.16 | .37 |
| <b>Carnegie type<sup>h</sup></b>                            |       |      |     |       |      |      |       |      |     |
| Doctoral universities                                       | .32   | 2.07 | .88 | .61   | 1.77 | .73  | 1.04  | 1.95 | .59 |
| Master-granting Colleges                                    | -2.31 | 1.24 | .06 | -1.71 | 1.06 | -.05 | -1.87 | 1.17 | .11 |
| Baccalaureate Colleges                                      | -5.04 | 2.02 | .01 | -1.50 | 1.73 | -.02 | -4.42 | 1.90 | .02 |
| <b>R<sup>2</sup></b>  |       | .27  |     |       | .47  |      |       | .35  |     |
| <b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>                               |       | .25  |     |       | .45  |      |       | .33  |     |

Note: N=1391

a: reference category: Business

b: reference category: Professor

c: reference category: Men

d: reference category: White

e: reference category: Lower division

f: reference category: Small

g: reference category: Classroom instruction

h: reference category: Other

**Table 1**

***Reflective & Integrative Learning Scale (7 items)***

---

In your selected course section, how important is it to you that the typical student do the following:

- ↯ Combine ideas from different courses when completing assignments
  - ↯ Connect his or her learning to societal problems or issues
  - ↯ Include diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments
  - ↯ Examine the strengths and weaknesses of his or her own views on a topic or issue
  - ↯ Try to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective
  - ↯ Learn something that changes the way he or she understands an issue or concept
  - ↯ Connect ideas from your course to his or her prior experiences and knowledge
- 

Note: Responses to each item ranged from 1 = *Not important* to 4 = *Very important*.

***Higher Order Learning Scale (4 items)***

---

In your selected course section, how much does the coursework emphasize the following:

- ↯ Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations
  - ↯ Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts
  - ↯ Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source
  - ↯ Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information
- 

Note: Responses to each item ranged from 1 = *Very little* to 4 = *Very much*.

***Global Perspectives Scale (10 items)***

---

---

How important is it for students in your selected course section to:

- ↯ Understand the reasons and causes of cultural conflict between and within nations?
- ↯ Consider different cultural perspectives when evaluating global problems?

Note: Responses to each item ranged from 1 = *Not important* to 4 = *Very important*.

How much have you been encouraged by any of the groups listed in the previous question to include global and international perspectives in your courses?

Note: Responses to item ranged from 1 = *Very little* to 4 = *Very much*

---

How important is it that the following are included in your selected course section?

- ↯ Demonstrating how your discipline is interpreted, applied, or viewed in other places in the world?
- ↯ Showing how your discipline is impacted by world issues?
- ↯ Addressing global and international challenges?
- ↯ Including international content?
- ↯ Including global perspectives, with international voices and global resources?
- ↯ Emphasizing global learning outcomes with complementary professional goals?
- ↯ Emphasizing global learning outcomes with complementary disciplinary goals?

Note: Responses to each item ranged from 1 = *Not important* to 4 = *Very important*.

