



Educational Studies in the new Millennium

2020, VOL. 3(1), 1–16



Reflecting on the International Infusion in Higher Education

Dr. Evangelia Fragouli^{1*}

1-University of Dundee, UK.

Received 09 Jan 2020

Accepted 20 Jan 2020

ABSTRACT

This paper is a critical reflection on the research work of Sutherland et al. (2015) which explores the experiences of Erasmus exchange students from European Union (EU) countries to answer whether student-centered approaches are adequate to meet their needs. It also examines possible gaps in the tutor student

pedagogic experience, expectations and perceptions highlighting the need to be adopted a more reflective and reflexive approach to working with Erasmus students, requiring a shift away from a mechanistic focus on systems, structures and cultural awareness towards cultural intelligence. The present paper, through reflection and critical literature review approach, emphasizes the key learning points of the above research article and on the importance of consideration of cultural intelligence in Higher Education as part of the internationalization process. @A.I.A Journals

Keywords: *international students, curriculum, higher education, cultural intelligence*

Introduction

Universities in UK strive to increase the number of international student and claim they internationalize the student experience. At the same time, student -centered approaches seem to dominate across teaching, learning, and assessment methods. However, domestic and international students seem to have different experiences, needs and perceptions regarding

*Corresponding author: e.fragouli@dundee.ac.uk

Published by I.A.U. Ardabil Branch. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license.

pedagogy, education and curriculum while Universities define orientation for all students centrally, as a largely homogenous group. Research indicates that the processes adopted to support Erasmus students in exploring UK pedagogy, assessment and curriculum are insufficient to support them through application of a central approach. Main areas of discord regard curriculum development & context, assessment methods, expectations and pedagogic style. The cognitive and intangible aspects of the student journey are problematic showing that poor cross-institutional communication and generic orientation compound the challenges (Sutherland et al, 2015).

Borrowing from Leask, (2015 as cited in Green & Whitsed, 2015 p.xii) Internationalization of the curriculum is the process of incorporating international, intercultural and 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. It builds the capacity for the university to work with a diversity of backgrounds and prepares students to become global citizens (Egroun-Polak & Hudson, 2014). Disciplinary, institutional, local, national, regional and global factors interact in different ways to facilitate and inhibit, drive and shape approaches to internationalization of the curriculum (IoC), including the way in which learning outcomes are defined, taught and assessed. Hence, we would expect to see approaches to internationalization of the curriculum that are both similar and different within and across disciplines (Leask & Bridge, 2013 as cited in Green & Whitsed, 2015 p.xii).

A Reflection

The rate of mobility of students seeking higher education abroad has increased significantly; this has resulted in a melting pot of many cultures being in the same classroom and learning groups, making the cross cultural learning very challenging. Dealing with this issue, the examined article here introduces a new concept: cultural intelligence. The subject of 'cultural intelligence' (CQ) is familiar to me (teaching, researched published work etc.), however, I found myself not to have ever read an article regarding CQ in relation to higher education, so, I found it extremely interesting, and, engaging further, I felt that I learnt more about the problems Erasmus students experience, positive and negative of exchange programs, but, above all, proposed ideas how the issue to be addressed; additionally, the whole article made think further raising some concerns in relation to internationalization efforts of Higher Education.

Cultural intelligence: In relation to intellectual intelligence being defined as the problem solving ability, the ability to comprehend and reach right conclusions, cultural intelligence is defined as the capability to interpret understanding things and situations correctly and to manage effectively cultural differences (Vedadi, Kheiri, & Abbasalizadeh, 2010). Cultural intelligence refers to an individual's capability to adjust behaviors according to the assumptions, norms, and standards of the cultures he/she interacts with, to communicate effectively with people from different cultures as well as to adjust to cultural differences (Earley & Ang, 2003; Van, Ang, &

Nielsen, 2007). According to Peterson (2004) cultural intelligence is the ability to behave in a way using skills (e.g. language), or, interpersonal relationships/qualities (e.g. tolerance for ambiguity, flexibility) which are adjusted to cultural values, beliefs and attitudes of others with whom someone interacts. Being considered as a set of abilities helping individuals to perform effectively becoming successful in a cross-cultural setting, cultural intelligence is a criterion of critical importance for the management of culturally diverse working groups, understanding and collaborating effectively with people from other countries, organizations, and professions (Earley & Ang, 2003). People who have cultural intelligence notice cultural changes before the members of that culture; those people are able to tune their behaviors right away when they have to deal with a new situation. People who have high cultural intelligence have also high cognitive environmental perception (Thomas & Inkson, 2004). Education is another important aspect of culture where its critical function is to ensure and facilitate the continuity of the culture created by individuals and the society becoming one of the primary means of cultural knowledge transfer. Taking this into consideration, every member of the society learns, approves and improves specific behaviors, changes them when it is necessary because culture has a dynamic/changeable character whereas education can cause changes in culture (Köse, 2016 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018). So, the education international students receive at home expresses their home culture (values, beliefs, assumptions), its role is the continuity of their home culture so it is reasonably expected these students to experience great difficulty of adjustment to a new environment/culture, to experience a change not at home but in another country of a different culture and consequently of an educational –pedagogic philosophy which reflects this new country. The present article, as well as, further research on cultural intelligence (Maznevski, 2008) confirm that cultural intelligence helps international students and specifically students of exchange programs (Erasmus) who move from their home country (during their University studies there) for a certain period of time to study in UK exploring also the UK pedagogic style, in order to adjust and deal better with all the transmission problems and difficulties they face. This does not surprise me at all, instead I fully support it and agree that cultural intelligence helps more than just a simple cultural awareness because CQ is the ability to communicate for the purpose of managing cultural differences in cross-cultural settings as well as embracing, perceiving, interpreting and experiencing other cultures (Merican, 2016 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018); it is not just awareness of country specific characteristics, but ‘intelligence’ so much deeper and inclusive. Although this is not something new to me, however, reflecting on the article I would like to share some concerns: since we are research informed about the role of home education, culture, and, cultural intelligence and the article contributes to examining exchange program students, I would find it interesting to have specifications for the following: a) the fact that 63 students were already in a British/Scottish University students (continuing & direct entry students of various ethnic groups), what about the Erasmus students? They were new comers or what? Time is influential variable regarding adjustment & performance b) ‘how’ was considered the factor ‘level’ of education (in our case, Erasmus students are University Education students meaning more years of exposure to home educational system, and, more

important, level of exposure to home higher level of education which relates to higher cognitive development, advanced cultural perception, experience of home academic learning & teaching styles and approaches, etc.). b) The student-centered approach- program exchange (Erasmus) - international students-cultural intelligence (shift from cultural awareness) is clearly the focus of the present article. However, in the ‘Lessons learned’ where very good points are raised among which is the need of staff development which seems to be connected somehow with the University culture and the degree of University priorities with which I fully agree, I think that would help to be emphasized the importance of culturally intelligent staff (not just development) and of the need of staff self-development for being culturally intelligent e) Reading very carefully the article, and keeping notes for every detail, I noted very often ‘words’ that express locality e.g. students want to navigate the UK pedagogic style, UK educational mode, UK Higher Education, UK Higher Education International Unit; also, I noted phrases, terms or/and applied practices which are used locally such as ‘... need to provide more reflective and reflexive approach’ [these words are confusing to many international students as the article states and I fully agree; many Universities worldwide do not apply reflective or/and reflexive approaches but we do e.g. as a student myself in this module, I am asked to do a reflective writing]; tutorials were provided to students in order through the provided feedback the gap between students’ expectations and students’ expectations to be minimized [in other Universities worldwide where exchange program take place, there are pro-active then reactive practices; different practices, different mentality e.g. at Harvard University where I was student coming from another country, there were many different types of orientations, after every lecture various workshops were offered by the teaching assistants providing further subject explanation, explanation for the system, support for the assignments etc.]. I feel that there is an issue for concern here: In order to prepare our students to be global citizens, to live in a global world, we ourselves and our system also need to be global, to reflect global thinking. The way we approach issues reflect our way of thinking. Locally acting does not constraint global thinking. For example, why to be perceived that Erasmus students come in UK in order to navigate the UK pedagogic style and not to be prioritized that they come to meet other students all over the world, other staff with sound expertise or get knowledge in subjects that might not be taught in their country, or generally to get a new experience etc.; what kind of globalized world we will we have if we say ‘American pedagogy’, ‘American educational system or method’ ‘French pedagogy or French educational system or method’, ‘Italian pedagogy’ etc.? It reminds me when I was doing my PhD at Columbia University in New York, many years ago, during my research interviews, leaders, managers said to me ‘for companies, institutions, organizations claiming ‘being global’ means others – us as managers, employees- to have the empowerment to make adjustments and be global but the company remains American or Japanese’. Global thinking means thinking together (Manikutty, Anuradha, & Hansen, 2007). Reflecting on all these, my thoughts drive me to the idea of building a ‘globally oriented pedagogy’, ‘global education system’ I would suggest the following:

Global education: The globalized world is changing continuously, the social foundation of educational curricula has caused to review student experience required by a constructivist approach in educational curricula. With the variety of transportation means and mass media, people and countries are coming closer, people from diverse cultures are interacting with each other either due to work, or education or tourism or other reasons. Additionally, educational curricula have changed and continue to change in many places, especially in the geographies with high cross-cultural interaction. Açıkalın (2010 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018) draws attention to the globalized climate and underscores the relation of the emphasis on culture with educational curricula. He sheds light on the issue by exploring an aspect of culture as global education.

The idea of ‘global education’ aims to give a solution to current global problems we deal with regarding educational curricula (Alger & Harf, 1985 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018). Global problems, e.g. environment, terrorism, famine, this approach has the philosophy of introducing world cultures to students and emerged with the notion of incorporating them in educational curricula (Açıkalın, 2010 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018). Kirkwood (2001 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018) builds the concept of ‘global education’ on four dimensions and these are: • acquiring many perspectives, being aware and respecting that others can have ideas or perspectives different from their own; • being aware and respecting other cultures; • being aware of global problems and finding solutions for these; • understanding the globalized world and acknowledging that nations are much more intertwined. Cultural intelligence helps to manage cultural differences in cross-cultural settings (Mercan, 2016 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018) and social skills are an individual’s capability to understand deeply and effectively his/her own and other people’s ideas, emotions and behaviors in social relationships acting accordingly (Çubukçu & Gültekin, 2006 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018). Global education serves the global world, serves the needs of our students without confusing them, without setting barriers to their preparation for the global citizenship. My belief is that education shapes minds and global education, global pedagogy would contribute to shaping global mindset for all.

Closing with regard the issue of cultural intelligence, being myself international oriented, interacting with my students, I always try to ‘hear and listen to what they say, I always question myself if I have perceived something correctly or I filter it through my own assumptions, I borrow from my own experience and the problems of effective communication and understanding in a different country and show empathy, try to learn from other, I try to understand the needs of my students and adjust my teaching, my work to their needs for higher satisfaction; I try to manage cultural differences aiming people to get what they need and feel well without stress and anxiety.

Types of problems exchange & home students face: I found many interesting information in the article about the type of problems program exchange students face. I believe that organizational and individual (students, staff) high cultural intelligence being able to manage cultural differences many of these problems would be minimized. The fact that there were

tensions between home students and program exchange students (Erasmus) in the present seem lack of cultural intelligence, lack of adequate preparation, understanding of both parties. However, I was surprised to notice that the tensions were between home and international students and not really between Erasmus students and other international students. Different seating, lack of communication at the start of the class definitely relate to cultural matters and group dynamics in the class but there were not tensions. I believe this shows the common issue between exchange program students and students from other ethnic backgrounds: they are diverse, they are internationals. I believe that has to be addressed more carefully the issue of home students so that to be helped & supported to understand, to respect, and to manage relationships in an international knowledge based institution. Training on cultural intelligence would have added value for everyone including home students.

Student centered: knowledge is something that is socially constructed : I agree that student-centered teaching approach provides opportunities to students to be active learners, to improve their analytical skills, problem solving skills, deep learning skills, self-directed and reflective learning, as well as motivation (Indrianti, 2012; Lestari & Widjajakusumah, 2009) . This aims to achieve the learning outcomes which satisfy all the objectives of the learning process. Besides the above, the implementation of students- centered approach has to be viewed on the basis whether there is a necessity for this. Research informs us by reducing any gap between students' and teachers' beliefs through learning need analysis. Xiao (2006 as cited in Indrianti, 2012)) states that preferences, attitude towards student- centered approach, authority in class, culture learning, program, students' motivation, and other factors can give insightful information on learners' learning needs. Although in this article many authors' opinions are presented which are against the student-centered approach, however, I believe that student-centered approach is beneficial for the students and should be adopted in the classroom when teaching international, home, and program exchange students however requires to be implemented in the right way, to be applied with some flexibility (e.g. which situations require a mix with other approaches), and the student-instructor feedback to inform for possible adjustments.

Learning approaches, styles and culture: Pratt (1992) supports that learning styles might among cultures. Interdisciplinary research in this area targets to enhance our understanding of how learning styles or approaches differ across cultures (De Vita, 2001). Since culture is perceived as an all-pervading shared set of values, beliefs, assumptions, and accompanied behaviours, then matters such as studying and learning, although take place at an individual level, are also embedded in the rationale of a specific culture, so reveal collective patterns at a macro level.

At this point, I need to make a distinction between learning styles and approaches to learning which both are raised here. The term 'learning style' is associated with Kolb's (1984) work, and regards a kind of general and higher level of preferences for specific learning modes, whereas learning approaches regard mainly competencies needed for effective learning for a specific

situation, particularly in student courses (Entwistle and Wilson, 1970), or ‘how’ a student decides to address a learning task under the consideration of perceived demands (Entwistle, Hanley and Hounsell, 1979). Culture and education system of a country influence the type of learning modes and approaches so it does not surprise me why the Erasmus students reacted positively to the learning journey when they learned how things were through the received feedback minimizing the gap between their own expectations and tutor’s expectations, and why before, although effort was put the performance was not so good.

As Hall (1990) emphasizes, educational systems are cultural products and due to this educators will have to be aware of the context where learning is acquired. This requires a deep and critical understanding of how learning approaches and teaching differ across cultures. In the present case, I was satisfied to notice that the staff, as supportive practice creating a positive learning environment, they made themselves appeared also ‘vulnerable’ in sharing poignant (and harrowing) personal learning curves which helped shape staff’s knowledge and perceptions of soft skills.

Preparing to learn in a new and culturally different environment has appeared a very critical element regarding a student’s preparation or a student’s planning to emigrate for studies, (Manikutty, Anuradha & Hansen, 2007). Research regarding ‘how’ individuals learn has captured the attention of scholars across disciplines many decades before and continuously generates much empirical and theoretical work ending up in refinement of conceptualizing learning patterns, and developing new instruments for assessing learning patterns. It is agreed that educators could employ this knowledge to get a deeper understanding of the variety of differences in learning behaviors that they experience in their classrooms, even within one country (Coffield et al., 2004).

We see that performance of Erasmus students were low although they put effort because they did not make use of the right information, because they seemed to have problems of understanding and learning approach; I felt that was appropriate the staff member to arrange tutorials and provide detailed and constructive feedback helping them to understand the tutor’s expectations and the tutor similarly to understand students’ expectations, however, I would suggest, instead of the student having such a negative (low performance) assessment experience which often can demotivate dramatically, and get a feedback afterwards, the staff member being proactive should provide feedback with detailed directions in advance so that students not to experience frustration and anxiety. To my perspective, it is not fair University students of one country to be ‘assessed’ or to be expected to ‘learn’ when experiencing a ‘cultural shock’, having knowledge only of their own learning style and of their home University assessment standards. The staff member also reflects an institutional and local educational culture applying approaches and practices that are known and applied in UK higher education (tutorials after) but not necessarily in other countries (e.g. and they do not have the level and quality of the needed support, adjust changing learning styles and approaches to a direction that is unknown to them. The same applies for the abstract words that are used by the staff member e.g. independent

learning, critical thinking etc. expressing a local approach and thinking in terms of communication.

Strategic learning-culture influence: In this article it is very well presented the issue of strategic learning approach that Erasmus students applied choosing two similar modules and managing to do this due to limited cross –institutional communication and hazing of the process of the module. These students, although wanted to learn, finally they were unable to engage in perceived periphery activities. The way/s a student-learner approaches a learning task depends upon his/her personality and the setting where this learning occur. Research scholars for this type of learning focus on the individual - student learning strategy/ies, being described as learning approaches than learning styles. The stream where this approach belong was originally explored by Entwistle and Wilson (1970), which was refined in 1977. The researchers defined two ‘motivation’ types for learning: motivation for achievement and motivation led by fear of failure. Marton and Saljö (1976) introduced the concepts of deep and surface learning, which were further developed by Entwistle (1992), Entwistle and Tait (1995), Tait, Entwistle and McCune (1998), Biggs, Kember and Leung (2001), and many others. Adding to this, Pask (1976) developed the notion of holistic vs. serialist learning strategies. These streams were integrated into the following main learning categories: deep, surface apathetic, and strategic. The issue of ‘what’ motivates’ the learner is the basis of these approaches: intrinsic motivation meaning ability to understand and assimilate learning, extrinsic motivation where learner approach is led by a fear of failure, and achievement motivation leading to proper organization of studies, and a goal oriented approach to studying (Entwistle, Hanley and Hounsell, 1979). The difference of this stream from Kolb’s (1984) stream is that deep, surface apathetic or strategic learning approach is not the result of the individual attributes alone, but of the culture and learning environment which influence the individual. So, I fully understand the reason behind the strategy of the Erasmus student of choosing ‘two similar modules’ in the exchange program process failing to engage in periphery module activities. The strategic approach connects the adopted learning approach as well as the leaning motive , whereas the latter relates with organized studying and time management (Atkinson and Feather, 1966).Strategic learners’ behavior aims to achieve the highest grades or/and other rewards, addressing their own predefined objectives. Lack of the skill to manage cultural differences , insufficient communication, lack of support of an orientation program which informs students helping towards their adjustment (however, has to be well structured not addressing all students-Erasmus and others of other ethic backgrounds who already study in UK- as a ‘homogeneous’ audience, home country cultural and educational influences in relation to pressure of assignments and assessment all these cause stress, anxiety, fear, wrong perceptions making the Erasmus student to adopt a strategic approach which is not a superficial one (Manikutty, Anuradha, & Hansen, 2007) but still it is not the expected and beneficial one for effective learning .

Reflective & reflexive approach I agree that these approaches have great added value for every kind of student including international, program exchange students.

The reflective approach, reminds Kolb (1985) learning stream who supports that learning involves four activities, namely, feeling, reflecting, thinking, and doing which lead to two basic components of learning, namely, how people form their ideas, whether through concrete experience, or abstract conceptualization, and how they process these ideas further: through active experimentation or reflective observation. The four phases he proposes (feeling, reflecting, thinking, and doing) constitute four stages in a learning cycle that go in sequence, each building on the earlier stage; but depending upon the inherent learning styles of individuals, the emphasis placed on different stages differ. Reflective learning, reflexive approach and practice have benefits, but 'should' it be encouraged for preparing students to live in a globalized world where is even unknown or/and not accepted approach to many countries, educational systems, learning professionals? Are there sufficient empirically tested evidence on a global basis that this is the correct approach, or/and 'how' and 'when' reflective and reflexive approach apply to serve the needs of exchange program students, international students when in many countries students are not allowed to express opinions? To remind that though Kolb's learning styles are very individual dependent, few patterns of these have also been observed across different countries (Jaju, Kwak and Zinkhan, 2002), but most studies addressed the matter of learning styles across specific cultures (better, across specific countries) and stopped generalizations of the findings to more generic cultural attributes of those countries. Learning approaches depend upon many parameters e.g. the context of learning, the learning incentives, failure consequences etc. as may be seen from Entwistle's work (1992). In any case, I believe that experts and academic research will contribute further. In any case, as there a lot of literature on reflection in a higher education setting (Brookfield, 1995; Kreber, 2005; Lyons, 2006), it is evidenced that critical reflection assists learners to describe & share experiences, to analyze what has been learnt from those experiences as well as to come up with judgmental processes using them to frame other experiences (Brookfield, 1995). Research shows the importance of reflection in teaching along many dimensions such as becoming aware of how our own life stories influence our practice, perceiving and understanding our awareness of in-the-moment factors influencing our student learning, understanding how an academic/ teacher defines his/her in the learning process (Dees et al., 2007, p. 133) as we see here in the article when the staff members noticed that, at the beginning of the session students were somehow apathetic or/and vulnerable the instructor understanding the situation and borrowing from practice or/and knowledge or/and personal experience tried to intervene as a role model being vulnerable and drawing a learning curve to support students' learning development about soft skills which indeed was achieved here. On the other hand, besides reflective approach also reflexivity is proposed as a way of focusing on self-reflection within teaching. Reflexivity often is confused with reflection although many claim that the two are inextricably connected. Payne (2002) argues that: "reflexivity means that we are constantly getting evidence about how effective or worthwhile our actions are, and we can change what we are doing according to the evidence of its value. To do so, of course, requires being reflective". (p. 127) So, we see here that the instructor, noticing the coursework of Erasmus students, arranged feedback sessions to explain

further, to analyze, to clarify what is needed to be done and contribute to students' understanding helping the gap between tutor's expectations and students' expectations to be minimized. However, reflecting further on putting both of these together, I believe that reflexive form of reflective practice and generating reflection takes time, requires spaces, places and strategies which can enable it to happen. Considering also the time needed students who come from other countries and are not familiar with these 'abstract concepts' as it is presented here, and training time will be needed these to be understood, I am concerned about the effectiveness managing of all these without overloading and stressing students as well. Also, I am concerned about the fact that 'productive' (Boud, 2006) reflection is what should be targeted than just reflection since the key feature of this is that it is not focused on the individual independent learner but has a collective dimension as well as 'critical' (Fook, 2006) reflection which focus on the individual in a social context for collective applications of critical reflection.

Contribution of staff: Here it is emphasized also the role of the instructor for contributing to the development of a safe and supportive learning environment for the exchange program students Teachers dealing with students from different cultures would benefit by understanding how the learning approaches of students from different cultures differ, and could deliver their courses with greater sensitivity to their diverse needs. For example, teachers could devote certain kinds of attention to students from specific cultural backgrounds by devising exercises that encourage deeper learning, counselling sessions to enable a more strategic approach to encourage better efficiency in their studies, or even just bring their learning habits to their attention in feedback sessions as we observe in our case study to take place, can minimize gaps and contribute to students' better understanding and perhaps to improvement of performance (Manikutty, Anuradha, & Hansen, 2007). Staff who are not interested or engaged to the above, definitely, is one of the reasons, as is stated here, of the problems program exchange students face. After each of my classes I always question myself about the extent I achieved students to get a deep learning, to what extent I contribute to the efficiency of my students' studies with my continuous feedback, mentoring, teaching approach, module preparation and other.

Proposed training: I fully agree that training on cultural intelligence matters Focusing on the learning approaches than to more fundamental constructs of styles of learning, perhaps a better and practical understanding of the ways students in new environments learn, of the difficulties they face, of the extent these are because of cultural assumptions they have, and of what supportive-preparatory work could be helpful. The supportive-preparatory work could be by designing and developing training programs with the aim at managing the cultural- shock enabling as well a quicker & effective adjustment. The cultural nature of education is important in becoming aware about the ways and reasons learners act and react in a specific manner to a new learning environment. Considering the need students to develop a good understanding of this learning environment, particularly when they are in a new environment, if they target to achieve an academic success, helps them to get a good understanding of the ways their own

cultural assumptions and predilections may have to change as well as of the type of needed changes, and of the way they can achieve their approaches to learning to be in line with the expectations of a specific learning environment. It is challenging though for the exchange students that they may still have to get a more depth in their learning in this new setting. This would regard to find/learn about the ways to cope in a system which expects more independence in the way of thinking coming up with their own answers rather than expecting the instructor to provide that knowledge ready (Manikutty, Anuradha, & Hansen, 2007).

Workshops can help towards building this thinking process and dealing with all the above matters; workshops are a type of developmental activity and contribute to the above. So, I found very interesting the workshops that are provided by the UoD for postgraduate students which follow a staged approach and these are a) Intercultural Awareness : getting into your studies b) Working in an intercultural Context: Getting on with each other; c) Developing intercultural intelligence for the global environment d) Getting ahead: Graduation and Beyond . Also, the above workshops, following a staged approach is very appropriate to me as these are provided gradually, addressing different needs, and adjustment issues to different situations. In general, workshops and tutorials (even when focus on a specific discipline subject) help students form small groups, share their experiences, opinions, values and assumptions , debate on an issue examining different perspectives. This is developmental as it supports their socialization and challenges their ability to interact with others from different country. For example, in my module workshops when forming groups of students with diverse cultural background, although at the beginning seems that they are not connected, however, when they start working towards solving a business case problem , this 'common goal' challenges them, moves them forward to share ideas, express experiences, to try to communicate regardless possible language matters, feel members of the same group 'being heard' by others, so, this is becoming a kind of 'sharing & navigating ' experience , a developmental activity for their socialization as well and this is encouraged through this problem solving or project-based activity; due to this, in other workshops the group members want to sit together again, but, I try to change the groups. Of course in many cases I have to deal with personality matters (e.g. dominant figures over others, chemistry no match etc.) which is expected when individuals work together. In any case, I fully agree that such activities contribute to socialization and interaction of students.

Emotional Intelligence I strongly believe that emotional intelligence (ED) also contributes to adjustment of international exchange program students,; as is indicated in the article problem solving tasks can assist both CQ and EQ. Marquez and et al (2006 as cited Tammannaefar & Hesampour, 2016) proposed that adjustment and social capacities are significantly connected to emotional intelligence. It can be supported that high emotional capacity makes the individual to display positive temperament, tolerance when communicating with people, trying to respond in the best way. By applying social skills, this type of capacity can support students' adjustment challenging them to exhibit few positive behaviors such as responsibility, self-reliance, empathy cooperation, responsibility (Cartledge & Milburn, 2009 as cited in Tammannaefar & Hesampour, 2016). Damasio (1994 as cited in Tammannaefar & Hesampour, 2016) also

supported that EQ promotes one's self-control and motivation adaptability establishing the optimum relation with others, temperament management, efficiency in educational contexts enhancing consequently their adjustment to university life. Cultural and emotional intelligence help towards the development of social skills. The ability to express positive and negative interpersonal feelings without worrying about losing social reward defines the context of social skills (Çakıl, 1998 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018). Sorias (1986), on the other hand, defines social skills as the qualities that contribute people to explain their positive or negative feelings in an appropriate way, to defend their rights, to ask others for help when necessary, and to reject the requests they do not approve (Sorias, 1986 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018). Vygotsky claims that social learning supports cognitive development. A well-arranged social setting (e.g classroom) can facilitate their cognitive development.

The social environment where students study in, is a source of the concepts in their mind (Ergün & Özsüer, 2006 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018). Keskin (2007 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018) states these skills improve with the increase of academic success. Students initiate positive social relationships with students, peers, teachers, families, and other community members and their assessment should be well structured (Riggio, 1986).

Finally, with regard to other issues raised in the article such as the importance of orientation programs, as well as, the development of the appropriate programs when the synthesis of students is diverse, the importance of feedback, the specific dimensions of the cultural intelligence that are considered more important for program exchange students, reflecting upon these, I would say that I fully agree, however, my belief is that it is not only 'what' we do but 'how' we do it, 'whether' we perceive correct what we do and how, as well as, 'what' we know for our students so to do well what we do. Planning, designing, administering, implementing correctly are important facilitating the effectiveness of our teaching. In other words, besides organizational policies and organizational climate which influence staff approach as is mentioned here, and I agree, we should always follow up sharing feedback with peers, students and others.

Considering the above, the key learning points from my reading of this interesting article are the following:

I would like to start from the key finding of this article, that is, the shift from cross-cultural awareness to the importance of cultural intelligence (CQ) for international students and more specifically for Erasmus students who are exchange University students (doing the main body of their studies at their home country) visiting and navigating the pedagogic style in UK for a short period of time. Cultural intelligence helps students' socialization, effective management of cultural differences contributing to student adjustment at the University. Due to this, University curricula should be culturally intelligent, being designed, developed and delivered facilitating not only cross cultural awareness but cultural intelligence. As this is the key finding, I would like to add that academic research supports fully this research result. Cultural intelligence not only helps students to adapt to a new culture but also to develop a successful communication environment when they are in a foreign culture (Aksoy, 2013 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018). Tamannaefar & Hesampour (2016) in their research concluded that there is a significant

relationship between cultural intelligence and adjustment. Their findings are consistent with Tsai and Lawrance's study(2011 as cited in Tamannaefar & Hesampour, 2016) which showed that emotional intelligence influence cultural adjustment, cultural intelligence can be a predictor for adjustment and dealing with cultural shock as well as that emotional intelligence is the interface between cultural intelligence and adjustment. Their research regarding individual interactions across cultures" asserted that those individuals who have high emotional intelligence are able to adjust themselves more effectively in a new cultural context different from their own without losing their cultural identity. Kim et al (2007) concluded that people with high cultural intelligence exhibit strong penchant to encounter challenges in new environments and are more decisively determined to overcome despair in unfamiliar circumstances like University.

Cultural and emotional intelligence, as part of the University curriculum, contribute to the development of socialization of students. Socialisation is a process where values, customs and traditions of the community are analyzed, taught and instilled in students (İnanç, 2004 as cited in Koc & Turan, 2018); this process can take place only within education and training systems where the society experiences socialisation as well as enculturation. An examination of the prediction of social skills by cultural intelligence reveals that cognitive, metacognitive, motivational and behavioural dimensions are predictor of social skills. Positive significant relationships exist between the metacognitive dimension of CQ, emotional sensitivity and social expressivity dimensions of social skills. Also, positive significant relationships between the cognitive dimension of CQ and emotional sensitivity, social expressivity and social sensitivity dimensions of social skills.

Conclusion

With reference to the Sutherland et. al, (2015) work, the main learning points regard:

Dimensions of CQ: It was shown that learning mechanisms have to be addressed towards developing motivational and metacognitive CQs between students as these two help more towards cultural adjustment

The difference between cultural awareness and CQ: Cultural intelligence serves internationalization more & better than just cross cultural awareness helping students to adjust better, manage cultural differences, manage changes, share experience, communicate, and understand better.

The fact that student mobility itself does not help exchange program & international students but only accompanied by CQ.

The curriculum should nurture metacognitive and motivational CQs to help student have successful transition from cultural awareness to CQ

Identification of activities that help CQ & EQ is needed: Problem –based and project-based learning activities help develop CQ and EQ. Terms like independent learning, critical analysis, reflective thinking are confusing terms for international students

Providing feedback helps aligning student and tutor expectations especially for Erasmus students minimizing the gap that might be caused especially when exchange program students

trying to navigate a pedagogic style in another country, not being well prepared and supported adequately, might raise different expectations than those of their tutors.

The type of problems Erasmus exchange programs experience is of critical importance. For example, there is a student-center approach dominates but the oxymoron is that orientation programs are not addressed to homogeneous orientation programs, and tensions between home-international. Also, there was lack of mechanisms to help students to perform at all levels; Cognitive and intangible processes were problematic other factors which influence the internationalization include: course standards between partners, funding & administrative issues, policies etc.

The strategic learning of students and the challenges for filling the expectation gaps. (e.g. taking two similar modules and not attending induction, cross cultural activities/interactions.

Should internationalization need to occur through exchange programs? Some say NO because a) internationalization at home (teaching, learning process, curriculum) is equally drive for internationalization when being abroad, Student mobility is not considered now an objective itself, and, because b) course offered by Erasmus exchange programs can be equivalent to what is delivered at home (knight, 2013); this is an obstacle and pedagogical adaptations have to take place ; c) student mobility and cultural learning benefits are not always balanced across partners.d) Also, are not well articulated the traditional values of internationalization(King 2013)

Understanding the difference between cultural awareness & learning and CQs: Culture intelligence goes beyond cultural knowledge (Van Dyne et al, 2010).

Ways of development CQ: e.g. through management training, virtual team facilitation, international merger and acquisition integration (Konanahalli et.al 2014.In curriculum CQ dimensions are useful for the design of curriculum for creating challenging tasks. The importance of hidden curriculum (Leask & Bridge, 2013) for developing deep cultural awareness and knowledge on what means effective practice has to be considered.

It is a fallacy that students from different international backgrounds brought together in one place nurtures cross cultural understanding and positive relationships.

There are two problems: a) Creation of gaps between what students expect and what they receive or understand they receive. Students have expectations when arrive and if not met gaps are caused B) home students feel that interconnecting with international students is a threat for their success and group identity

Home students feel anxiety with their studies and intercultural contact might be perceived as a threat to their success and group-identity. Academic staff has to close the expectations gap, and, integrate different camps of student together

The University has to embrace more student-centered reflective and reflexive approaches for supporting Erasmus students

References

- Alger, C. F., & Harf, J. E. (1985). *Global Education: Why? For Whom? About What?*. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington D.C.
- Atkinson, J.W. and Feather, N.T. (1966) *A Theory of Achievement Motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Biggs, J., Kember, D. and Leung, D.Y.P. (2001). The revised two-factor study process questionnaire: R-SPQ-2F, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 71, pp.133–149.
- Boud, D. (2006, July). Rehabilitation or rejection? Relocating reflection in the context of practice. Keynote presented at Lifelong Learning Conference, 2006, Leeds Institute of Medical Education. Retrieved February 6, 2009, from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/medicine/meu/lifelong06/papers/P_DavidBoud.pdf
- Coffield, F., Moseley, D., Hall, E. & Ecclestone, K. (2004) *Should We Be Using Learning Styles? What Research Has To Say To Practice*. London, UK: The Learning and Skills Research Centre (Monograph).
- Dees, D.M., Ingram, A., Kovalik, C., Allen-Huffman, M., McClelland, A., & Justice, L. (2007). A transactional model of college teaching. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 19(2), 130–139.
- De Vita, G. (2001) Learning styles, culture and inclusive instruction in the multicultural classroom: a business and management perspective. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 38, 165–173.
- Entwistle, N.J. (1992). *The Impact of Teaching on Learning Outcomes in Higher Education*. Sheffield, UK: Universities' and Colleges Staff Development Unit (Mimeo).
- Entwistle, N.J. & Tait, H. (1995) *The Revised Approaches to Studying Inventory*. Edinburgh, UK: University of Edinburgh Centre for Research on Learning and Instruction (Mimeo).
- Entwistle, R.N. & Wilson, J. (1970) Personality, study methods and academic performance. *University Quarterly*, 24, 147–156.
- Entwistle, N.J., Hanley, M. & Hounsell, D. (1979) Identifying distinctive approaches to studying, *Higher Education*, 8, 365–380.
- Entwistle, N.J., Tait, H. & McCune, V. (2000) Patterns of response to an approaches to studying inventory across contrasting groups and contexts. *European Journal of the Psychology of Education*, 15, 33–48.
- Fook, J. (2006, July). Beyond reflective practice: Reworking the 'critical' in critical reflection. Keynote presented at Lifelong Learning Conference, 2006, Leeds Institute of Medical Education. Retrieved February 6, 2009, from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/medicine/meu/lifelong06/papers/P_JanisFook.pdf.
- Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2015). *Critical Perspectives on Internationalizing the Curriculum in Disciplines*. NL: Sense Publishers
- Indrianti (2012) Developing student-centered grammar materials for beginners. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* 9(1), 380-401.
- Jaju, A., Kwak, H. and Zinkhan, G.M. (2002) Learning styles of undergraduate business students: a cross cultural comparison between US, India and Korea, *Marketing Education Review*, 12, 49–60.
- Kreber, C. (2005). Reflecting on teaching and the scholarship of teaching: Focus on science instructors. *Higher Education*, 50, 323–359
- Kolb, D.A. (1984) *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kolb, D.A. (1985) *LSI Learning-Style Inventory*. Boston, MA: McBer and Company
- Lestari, Endang., Widjajakusumah, Djauhari (2009) Students' self-directed learning readiness, perception toward student-centered learning and predisposition towards student-centered behavior. *South East Asian Journal of Medical Education* 3(1). 1-10.

- Lyons, N. (2006). Reflective engagement as professional development in the lives of university teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 12(2), 323–359.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press
- Hall, E.T. (1990) *The Silent Language*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Koc, K. & Turan, M.B (2018). The Impact of Cultural Intelligence on Social Skills among University Students *Journal of Education and Learning* 7 (6), 241-249.
- Manikutty, S., Anuradha, N.S & Hansen, K. (2007). Does culture influence learning styles in higher education? *International Journal of Learning and Change*, 2(1),71-87.
- Marton, F. and Saljö, R. (1976). On qualitative differences in learning. 1. Outcome and process. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 46, 4–11.
- Maznevski M., (2008), How cultural intelligence can improve performance: Adapting abroad while being yourself. IMD International.
- Peterson, B. (2004). Cultural Intelligence: A Guide to working with people from other cultures. *Intercultural Press*, s.89.
- Pratt, D.D. (1992) Conceptions of teaching. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 42, 203–220.
- Payne, M. (2002). Social work theories and reflective practice. In L. Dominelli, M. Payne, & R. Adams (Eds.). *Social work: Themes, issues and critical debates* (2nd Ed.) (236–248). Basingstoke: Palgrave/Open University.
- Riggio, R. E. (1986). Assessment of basic social skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(3), 649-660. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.3.649>
- Segrin, C. (2001). Social skills and negative life events: Testing the deficit stress generation hypothesis. *Current Psychology*, 1(20), 19-35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-001-1001-8>
- Sutherland, A., Edgar, D., Duncan, P., (2015). International infusion in practice: from cultural awareness to cultural intelligence, *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice*, 3(3), 32-40.
- Thomas, D., & Inkson, K. (2004). *Cultural intelligence: people skills for global business*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Tait, H., Entwistle, N.J. & McCune, V. (1998) ASSIST: a re-conceptualization of the approaches to studying inventory, in C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving Students as Learners* (pp.262–271).
- Tamannaefar, M., & Hesampour, F. (2016). The relationship between cultural and emotional intelligence with students' adjustment to University. *International Academic Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management*. 3(9), 1-13.
- Vedadi, A., Kheiri, B., & Abbasalizadeh, M. (2010). The Relationship between Cultural Intelligence and Achievement: A Case Study in an Iranian Company. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 3(3), 27-28.
- Van, D. L., & Ang, N. T. M. (2007). Cultural intelligence. In S. Clegg & J. Bailey (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of organization studies* (1st ed., pp. 345-350). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Walker, H. M., Colvin, G., & Ramsey, E. (1995). *Antisocial behavior in school: Strategies and best practices*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.