

# The imperative for international education

**Susana Gonçalves**

Escola Superior de Educação (College of Education) - Instituto Politécnico de Coimbra (Polytechnic Institute of Coimbra)

Unidade de Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Educação e Formação (UIDEF), Instituto de Educação - Universidade de Lisboa

## Abstract

The article explores the meaning, scope and dimensions of International Education as a concept, an ideology and a philosophy of education. From study abroad to the infusion of an international dimension in the curriculum, from international I&D teams to individual study visits, teaching abroad and conferences, from mobility to the appreciation of diversity, International Education includes a great many aspects and is in itself a challenging concept for education and policy makers. Why do we need to learn and teach in an international environment if the majority of us are not supposed to travel for work or training? Why internationalize what can be satisfactorily achieved through a national perspective?

The article is not so committed to answer these questions in dept but to highlight the fact that there are better questions to guide our behaviour as educators. Very few would argue nowadays that a nationalist education is the best fit for the purposes of a nation. This can be seen as politically incorrect and blatant xenophobic behaviour. More useful and guiding questions related not to the why but to the how, when, and for what purposes. Thus, the article evolves from a brief discussion on topics such as student mobility and cosmopolitanism to the more sensitive and broad questions of diversity and citizenship in a global world. The linkage between International education and Intercultural education is clarified and discussed.

## Key-words

International education, Mobility, Study abroad, Cosmopolitanism, Erasmus, Interculturalism, Transculturalism

## I.

Over two decades ago, when I was studying at the university, I had to move from one town to another, up to the north, 200 kilometres away. Today it's a two hours drive but back then the train took almost four hours, so going back home for the weekend or even holidays was not as easy as it is today; students could be separated from their families for

a long time. Long-distance communication wasn't what it is now: one wrote letter and postcards to family and friends, and telephoned, often from the post office, as there was no phone in the rented room. Mobile phones, text messages, e-mail and Skype hadn't been invented yet. Distance in space, those vast 200 Kms, was equal to distance in time: to see family again would only be possible in two or three months.

On the day I was left alone, in a strange city, with no friends around, no one familiar, I sat at a café by the train station and let tears and *saudade* run free. Then I did what had to be done: pulled my sleeves up, got my bags, and got on with discovering this new place. I hadn't yet crossed national borders but I have no doubt that a university course was my entry ticket to a boat of discoveries (*Nau das Descobertas*), to the world and myself. I didn't need to leave my country to feel cultural shock, to hear accents and strange words, to taste food that wasn't usual at home, to suffer (and perhaps cause suffering) at the hands of stereotypes associated to one's origins. I made friends from all over the country and learned from them as deeply as from tutors; I understood that there are countless ways of seeing the same realities; made beginners' mistakes and finally, after a few years' journey, was considered able: I got a diploma!

Twenty-five years have passed. The world is shorter and more connected. National accents have become diluted, what is left is almost only different ways of speaking work languages (English, predominantly). What happens on another part of the world is at our minds' disposal, just a Blackberry click away.

Today, I feel that my university student experience in an adopted city in my country was a study abroad experience, as it is that of the students who now go on the adventure of an international exchange program (such as the famous Erasmus). Those four hours between Lisbon and Coimbra in the 1980s are now plenty to get to distant world capitals, over 2500 Kms away from Lisbon: Oslo, Stockholm, Helsinki, Athens, Bucharest, Riga, Tallinn or Warsaw.

The above picture, although simplistic, helps to understand that student mobility has existed for a long time, both national and international. Let us remember that in Erasmus' medieval times, when the term university was created to mean the locus of knowledge, universities were bodies of *intelligentsia* distributed through European centers that (international) students would visit to complete their studies. The difference between then and now, and what justifies the movement of thousands of students between universities each year, is the transition from an elitist state of opportunities to study abroad to a system of democratic and universal access to higher education. International studies become more common also due to the fortunate advances of democracy (and democratization of higher education) and globalization.

The Erasmus programme or other continental (I dare not say inter-continental yet) student mobility programmes are little steps students are challenges to take to expand their international and intercultural horizons. To many, this is their first time abroad. Perhaps we should look for this first time effect to explain why studying abroad is such an intense and long lasting experience (cf. McKeown, 2009), which is recalled more frequently and with more emotion attached to it than “college memories.” (Wallen, 2009).

A study by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) (cf. Grothus, 2009) shows that undergraduate German students abroad recognize the importance of study abroad for various aspects of their lives, such as learning more about the host country culture, new intellectual approaches, improving language skills and academic and professional skills. Other aspects such as new perspectives on Germany and making contacts with foreign scholars are also valued. The period of stay doesn't seem relevant for this study abroad impact. The majority of those students say that they remain in touch with the host country and about half of them have subsequently lived abroad for more than three months (average total: 30 months). Findings also suggest that Academic motivation for the choice of host university and program supervision and counselling at host institution are critical factors for success. Now, regarding diplomats, it looks like this experience impacts significantly on their careers: more than 50% mention that they frequently use the qualifications acquired abroad in their jobs (language skills and cultural expertise), 83% mention a positive impact of their stay abroad on getting their first jobs, 65% on their current responsibilities.

Evidence tells us about similar results in other studies (for a review cf. McAllister, 2006). This essay is not merely about study abroad, however. On the contrary, the focus is on the broader notion of International Education. This concept includes study abroad but is not restricted to it. This difference must be highlighted and the conceptualization of international education must be infused in the curriculum so that it doesn't remain a satellite activity of concern of the minority of students who experience the Internacional mobility for some time during their graduation (or postgraduate studies). International mobility is part, not the whole, of a prospectus of Internacional Education. And this is part (not the whole) of intercultural Education.

## II.

The impact of globalization on culture and economy is tremendous and although frequently mentioned it still is not duly appreciated by many, both on managerial level and on the work floor (Joris, 2006). The statement is especially relevant for institutions of higher education “where, in spite of the obvious need for change management,

---

we witness a reluctance to fully embrace the idea of globalization and to bring internationalization in as a defining element or instrument for curriculum design and classroom experience.” (op. cit., p. 91). Even if there are already many who accept the idea of internationalization as positive and mandatory, it is also evident that there’s still a lot to do in order to change mentalities, actions and institutional policies. Globalization, together with political changes in the relations between countries and nation-states, such as the creation of European Union, translate into profound changes of issues such as consumership, citizenship and identity. All these changes are marginal to geography and territory constraints. As a matter of facts, it has more to do with cross-border mobility, transnational networks, supranational policies, the global market, a new social, political and mental order.

A learning process is needed for young people to deal with these new demands. The learning process includes the transition from a local view (local used here as a synonym of national culture) to a cosmopolitan view and understanding of the world. It isn’t only about appropriating some elements of the other’s culture, but of will and capacity of interacting with the other, of learning from him, cooperating and actively participating in the cosmopolitan, transnational, transborders and transcultural citizenship model. This isn’t an easy task, especially since ethnocentrism is learned by immersion in the culture of belonging, the mother-culture, which has been handed down by the origin community (national, ethnical, linguistic, religious). Assimilation of the mother-culture depends on the assumption that it is a good culture, which deserves to be preserved, lived and defended from all threat of disappearance, decay or corruption.

Cosmopolitan citizenship doesn’t have an easy agenda as it somehow implies change to this cultural absolutism and openness to external influence. It isn’t demanded of the global citizen that he stops acknowledging and loving his culture, country and cultural heritage, but individual adaptation to this kind of *franca* citizenship is made on assumptions different to the mother-culture’s. Cosmopolitanism is thus, as Hannerz (1996) clarifies:

*First of all an orientation, a willingness to engage with the Other. It entails an intellectual and aesthetic openness towards divergent cultural experiences, a search for contrasts rather than uniformity. To become acquainted with more cultures is to turn into an aficionado, to views them as artworks. At the same time, however, cosmopolitanism can be a matter of competence, and competence of both a generalized and a more specialized kind. There is the aspect of a state of readiness, a personal ability to make one’s way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting, and reflecting. And there is cultural competence in the stricter sense of the term, a build-up of the skill in manoeuvring more or less expertly with a particular system of meanings (p.103).*

Because of the influence of ethnocentric ideas, worldviews, education and biased experience, travelling for study abroad (or even for touristic/leisure, cultural or work purposes) is strategic for such learning, but in itself it is not enough to make a student become a more cosmopolitan citizen. Travelling and studying abroad alone can be a rather innocuous and superficial experience. Other educational strategies are needed and these should be planned, intentional and based on an unambiguous rationale.

### III.

For years I have heard criticism from tutors/ teachers who do not believe in the Erasmus programme and refer to this kind of programme as a few months of tourism in the students' lives. These comments result partly from doubts about the quality of formation and rigorous assessment by the welcoming institution, and partly from the tutor's own lack of experience with these programmes. But by and large, the quick and negative judgment understated in these comments are associated with the notion that travelling and knowing other places during the study years is a waste of time, as it clashes with academic learning and studying. At the same time, it also denotes the lack of importance attributed to tourism in relation to academic studies.

This critical posture and the adverse attitude it implies, is also subject to criticism, especially from the professionals who lead international programmes, who complain of the powerful blocking power that these attitudes represent against the study abroad programmes' success. If we wish to play devil's advocate, we will have no trouble finding arguments to support this criticism. Indeed, the tourist's experience and the cosmopolitan citizen's experience are not equivalent. The simple act of travelling doesn't start by itself a process of deep transformation and experiential knowledge. It isn't enough to know distant landscapes, taste exotic dishes or live for a while amongst people of various languages and customs to learn something from this diversity and to learn to live adaptively with difference. What separates the tourist and the cosmopolitan citizen is the distance between superficiality and a desire to penetrate the core of others' cultural realities. You don't know the forest for having seen a tree nor do you understand the tree for having seen a forest. It is necessary to continuously focus and lose focus, reflect and question, enjoy and suffer both similarity and difference. The cosmopolitan competence doesn't depend on the trip or the tourist/cultural offers pack one has acquired, it depends on the traveller's attitude and his way of facing intercultural relations.

Many tourists seek only a few select alien elements, while keeping themselves closed to the whole of the difference. They especially avoid profound cultural difference, at the same time looking for superficial exotic difference (gastronomy, music, folklore, customs). Paul Theroux (1986, ref. in Hannerz, 1996) mentioned how many people

travel to find “home plus” (Spain = home + sunshine; India = home + servants; Africa = home + elephants and lions; and many other places equal home plus good deals on exotic goods and souvenirs). This formula may apply to some students (not all), which would explain the lack of faith of so many tutors in the temporary study abroad programmes (such as Erasmus).

Having presented these arguments, it is time to consider the other side of the coin. The fact is that few people will stand behind the idea that travelling, studying abroad or even tourism can be time-wasters. Indeed, all, including student mobility critics, accept more or less peacefully that international mobility adds value to life experience and many will accept that academic experience abroad will be beneficial in a student's path, under certain circumstances. Through analysis of the critics' points we are many times led to the conclusion that what's at stake is on the one hand, the student's maturity and responsibility to resist temptation external to his or hers academic path, and on the other hand, some fear that Erasmus students may somehow gain advantage due to less rigorous assessments than they would have at the home institution.

It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss this second aspect and it is enough to say that institutions should take on the responsibility of establishing fair partnerships and to send their students only to destinations that can assure academic quality, if that is the point of the mobility. Concern with the student's skills is more interesting to us in this context, as what takes place is a learning process, and the student's rule is precisely to learn, in a guided manner. To guide learning in the best way – this is universities' purpose.

What are then the strategies we use to guide learning abroad? In what way do we prepare students for the world out there, to face the temptations of multicultural parties, to absorb the essence of the cultural kaleidoscope instead of limiting themselves to the intoxicating exotic, the alienated dissipation of youth or the anxieties of cultural shock?

If we intend to have cosmopolitan students, isn't it appropriate to think we must prepare them for cosmopolitanism? What are we doing in that respect? It is universities' responsibility to invest in the development of their students' knowledge and skills in order to prepare them for a successful professional life, an able life and a responsible and active citizenship. It is here that lies the essence of International Education in the global era. It is also in the domains of politics and practices of internationalization that we find the bridges between International Education and Intercultural Education.

#### IV.

Before moving forward it is necessary to open a parenthesis to mention the importance of the models of thought on practices in education in general and in International and Intercultural Education particular. Nowadays we need a model that's based on complexity, simultaneity, on change and chaos rather than linearity, constancy and law. Reductive, isolationist and simplistic models of thought are no longer useful in a society of information and in today's interconnected and global world. On the contrary, we need a kind of posture and academic thinking that is integrating, complex, multidimensional, that allows us to face uncertainty and contradiction (Gonçalves, 2008b).

Edgar Morin (1973, 1980, 1996), relates the challenge of complexity with the meaning variations of information depending on the context in which it is divulged or understood. To Morin, any information holds meaning only in relation to a situation, a context. Complex thought is, according to this author, a thought that allows a connection between human autonomy and dependency – if this is an autonomous being, able of self-organization, and in possession of an individuality and an identity, it is the case that his autonomy depends on the exterior, of material and cultural resources that the environment offers. The individual's survival and development are not isolated acts, in fact they compromise the whole of humanity and the world. These ideas could not be more actual and relevant for our concerns in this essay: “in a time of globalization, it is fundamental to understand the simultaneity between unity and diversity. Our destiny is uncertain and our situation extremely complex and we should know how to place ourselves within this uncertainty.” (Gonçalves, 2008).

International education strongly relates the economical, cultural and social sides of coexistence and cooperation between human peoples and that's where its virtues, tests and interrogations are to be found and explored by educators. A broad definition of international education labels it as strategic for international development and social cohesion, while asserting that it goes beyond study abroad. From this perspective, International education entails a comprehensive vision of education as a mean to foster student's intercultural competence and the skills needed to adapt to diversity, to communicate with people from diverse backgrounds and to be able to work, learn and cooperate across borders. It also includes knowledge about other cultures and social, cultural, economical context in different regions of the world, respect and appreciation of diversity and the will to learn from it, and the ability to communicate in other languages, not just the mother tongue.

This perspective of International Education which we've just presented implies the linkage of internationalization to Intercultural Education and promotes an education to complexity as it secures students' placement in culturally complex situations and guides

them on how to interpret such situations, how to move in the ambiguity they imply and how to adapt to them in order to reach goals in an autonomous and responsible way.

Hobbs e Chernotsky (2007) mention, by way of political sciences students' abilities for global citizenship, the need to change syllabi for the development of fundamental skills suggested by literature:

*“First, there is the vital task of fostering an appreciation of the multiple perspectives guiding perceptions and visions across the world. (...). Second, there is the need to impart a view of the world as an increasingly interconnected set of systems. (...) Third, familiarity with critical issues and controversies impacting on relationships across those systems must be promoted. (...) Fourth, students must come to understand the impact of choices in shaping the future direction of those systems”.*

In order for an institution to guarantee the link between its teaching practices, its syllabus, its contents and the methodological choices that favour international and intercultural education, and the development of the four elements suggested by Hobbs and Chernotsky, It is necessary to have cooperative participation and the synchronized voices of international affairs' tutors, managers and technicians. Allow me to stress that it is *synchronised voices*, not *one voice*, which silences diversity, nor *parallel voices*, which are nothing but monologues or communication noise. Synchronization is achieved only by dialogue and common reference points.

I would like to use another personal example to illustrate these ideas of complexity and synchrony. Fortunate circumstances of my life provided me with the privilege of becoming a teacher, of modules in psychology and intercultural education, and of coordinating an international affairs office. Psychology, teacher training, multiculturalism and the international affairs revealed to be connected in ways that I couldn't have predicted ten years ago. In fact, they were initially separate subjects, kept on separate shelves of the knowledge and professional activity library. Today I no longer see them this way. However, it wasn't the knowledge archive that prompted this understanding of the connections between themes and the necessary interdisciplinarity to better understand and intervene.

Psychology – Teacher training – Interculturality: these subjects give each other meaning in a higher education context and need each other to get meaning themselves. This lesson, which seems more or less obvious (sustainable) in the theoretical plan, is extremely hard to translate into effective practices. In truth, traditionally there is no preparation for a truly interdisciplinary point of view. My own learning on these bridges between science and culture, formal and informal education, life and academia, the brain and the heart, developed from my travels, conversations with students and



national and international colleagues, reading from other shelves and reflecting on my readings, analysing others' practices and evaluating their effect with the unavoidable Sherlock Holmes' syndrome, common to so many teachers.

It was necessary to leave my comfort zone to understand this bigger lesson: it's only worth to talk about the things we've lived, and indeed only then are we truly qualified to speak about them. Here I paraphrase Henri Cartier Bresson, the critical moment photographer, to whom photography was the alignment of vision, mind and heart. So is teaching! The teacher works on the critical moment and if he or she misses it so too is the student lost, the profession's *raison d'être*. Teaching is a complex task. It's easy to learn the truth *by* heart (as great pedagogues have said, in accordance to teaching and learning theories), but it's difficult to learn *with* the heart. This is especially true when we're offspring of the positivist tradition, still embarrassed about our emotions, even after Damásio's revelations (1995, 2000), after whom we can no longer ignore the fact that our brain doesn't function without emotional fuel.

Science's linear paradigm, pre-colombian positivism, doesn't help to integrate this evidence of cognitive-emotional functioning into teaching (and science). On the other hand, it also doesn't help to understand the reasonability of educational work in an interdisciplinary context. The division of subjects, common in higher education, according to their departments or scientific areas (i.e. comfort zones) blocks teachers' ability to see the trees and the forest I mentioned earlier. Whilst some focus on the forest and others on the trees, the ability to understand the phenomenon and its context is lost, and thus we also lose the ability to understand that what interests and intrigues other scholars, subjects and departments is sometimes exactly what interests and intrigues us.

Nowadays, I do things differently in order to be a good professional. To mention the Cartier-Bresson vision-mind-heart alignment means to integrate artistic expression in teaching, to favour the presence of guest specialists and practitioners, to mix up traditional academic activities such as conferences and talks with other types of events (cultural, festive, alternative); it also means not to limit myself to the role of teacher but to engage in other activities, like international I&D projects, writing and using literature, cinema and photography as alternative and complementary forms of understanding the world; it also means circulating through spaces where culture is produced, transformed and preserved. Wherever I got it was by an effort of interdisciplinary, multimodal and multidimensional learning.

This effort implies a challenging but pleasant work of reflexion on our practices. The following questions have been selected from a long list by Karwacka (2010) and have to do with intercultural competence and sensibility. I have picked them as examples of

---

useful tools (and present them as a challenge) to walk this reflexion path.

- Do I think creatively and critically?
- Do I have long lasting relationships with people from other cultures?
- Am I able to adapt to changing social circumstances?
- Do I respect and value human diversity?
- Do I have the flexibility to see different values as they are in the context of another cultural filter (not from my culture's perspective)?
- Am I ready to open emotionally and intellectually to foreign and unknown?
- Am I able to gain knowledge through interactive learning?
- Do I work on common projects?
- Do I develop tolerance of ambiguity?
- Do I developing strategies of solving and negotiating conflicts?
- Do I have multiple identities (do I develop my identity basing it on more than one culture)?

This kind of questions, together with the challenge of experimenting with new form of thinking about teaching and our professional mission in the globalised world, may take us far, individually, and favour positive changes and the improving of our practices. However, in the institutional plan, the collective force is a must. Individual action has great power for change, but the collective can act far quicker.

Some practices work better than others when it comes to interdisciplinarity and complexity. Contrary to what one may think, simple practices are better for complex learning. I could list a few of these practices as solid examples of actions good for interconnecting international education and intercultural education and for promoting internationalisation in universities. However I have already presented these actions and strategies elsewhere (Gifford, Gocsál, Balint, Gonçalves & Wołodzko, 2007; Gonçalves, in press, 2010, 2009, 2008, 2003) and prefer to adopt a more socratic strategy in this article.

The practices that work for a school can easily be transferred to the next school with little trouble if the key-questions are kept in mind and there is the necessary internationalist and intercultural guidance. The presentation of good practices is interesting but not a substitute for the school's institutions' participation in their own activities, methods and strategies. They should be consistent with the nature of the institution, including its mission, regional and national context, goals, course type, students' expectations, resources, etc. Sometimes the repetition of what one has seen others do will only turn out superficial and inconsequent approaches. If true conviction about the action's validity is not at its core, the action will quickly lose its power and risk

failure. This is often the case with internationalisation and interculturality, especially when these subjects haven't been collectively recognised as central in the institutional mission.

What mobilised the action and the critical sense regarding it is the intelligence we bring to our problems' analysis, the way we see (or don't see) the trees, the forests and the countless creatures (problems, opportunities) who jump between branches, between light and dark.

In summary, it seems to me that it's more effective to teach how to fish instead of handing over the fish. Teaching how to fish, in this article's context, is not something you do merely by presenting ideas. It's better done as Socrates did with his maieutics: asking instead of answering. It's for this reason that I've selected and present in the annexed table a few questions which may be taken as indicators of the syllabus' level of internationalization and International Education's success. The questions have been picked out of the many dozen posed by Karwacka (March, 2010). I also suggest the reading and thinking of the ones indicated by Whalley (1997). These indicators' simplicity is the secret to their efficiency and relevancy. The questions are real torches to illuminate our path. They aren't the way or the steps, but the light which allows us to decide.

I heartily recommend the reading of lists such as these as the questions have a transformative power that no answer may ever have. The learning of complexity is better achieved when we're the ones asking and seeking the answer rather than when we're listening to the answer someone else has found. To internationalise a higher education institution in a deep and transforming way and to prepare the academic community (including students, faculty and staff) for the challenges of multiculturalism and the cosmopolitan citizenship is not a task accomplished in one go – it takes several small steps, from question to question. The questions that stick to the mind are those with real power to transform practices.

## V.

One of the reasons why many don't teach about these subjects nor in accordance with an internationalist and intercultural vision is because these teachers do not themselves experience the global dimension of teaching or see its consequences from a closed (even narrow minded) perspective of teaching. Another reason may be the fact that this is a huge subject and therefore might be perceived as scary. It implies living through linguistic, cultural and even ideological barriers. Anything to do with internationalisation and global citizenship evokes complexity and therefore falls out of the comfort zone. The challenge of uncertainty may be insurmountable.

Nevertheless, I believe that this is no longer a choice we can make based on our individual will. Higher education in Europe is tuned (remember the Bologna process and its intentions and ways of being put to practice) and this relates to the political project of European construction. It is also related to an international project of cooperation, of sustainable development of science and societies, above all of peace.

It's important to understand this new paradigm in order to make the small personal revolutions that will allow the materialization of the ideas which guide Bologna. Otherwise we will only have the ruins of a well designed (and full of intentions) building which was eroded by the conservative rigidity of simplistic, isolationist models and practices. I hope the ideas (and lists of questions) in this essay may help to kick-start the quest for tune and complexity that is presupposed by global citizenship, internationalization and internationalism in higher education.

## **Bibliography**

- Damásio, A. R. (1995). *O erro de Descartes: emoção, razão e cérebro humano* (15<sup>a</sup> ed.). Mem Martins: Europa-América. (1st ed.: 1994).
- Damásio, A. R. (2000). *O sentimento de si: o corpo, a emoção e a neurobiologia da consciência* (8<sup>a</sup> ed.). Mem Martins: Europa-América. (1st ed.: 1999).
- Gifford, C., Gocsál, A., Balint, R., Gonçalves, S. & Wolodzko, E. (2007). *Intercultural learning for european citizenship*. Guide prepared by the CMID task group, funded by European Commission's Department of Education and Culture Socrates Programme. Edited by Alistair Ross, International Coordinator, Cice. London: Cice.
- Gonçalves, S. (2003). Multiculturalism and multicultural education: challenges in teacher training, In V. Smekal, H. Gray & C. A. Lewis (Eds.), *Together we will learn: ethnic minorities and education* (pp. 174-180). Brno: Barrister & Principal.
- Gonçalves, S. (2008, Fevereiro). Aprendizagem intercultural: estratégias pedagógicas para o ensino superior. *Proceedings of the 6<sup>o</sup> Congreso Internacional de Educación Superior, Universidad 2008* (CD-ROM). Havana, Cuba: Ministério de Educacion Superior da República de Cuba/ Universidades de Cuba.
- Gonçalves, S. (2008b). Complexidade e fluxo: chaves motivacionais da excelência. In *Actas do XV Colóquio da AFIRSE "Complexidade: um novo paradigma para investigar e intervir em educação?"*. Lisboa: FPCE. (CD-ROM).
- Gonçalves, S. (2010). Promoting intercultural competence: the role of internationalization. In M. Soininen & T. Merisuo-Storm (Eds.), *Looking at diversity in different ways*, (pp. 5-27). University of Turku. Department of Teacher Education, Rauma Unit.
-

- Gonçalves, S. (in press). Intangible culture, cooperation and intercultural dialogue among university students. *Intercultural Education*.
- Gonçalves, S. (Junho, 2009). Internacionalização em casa: a experiência da ESEC. *Exedra*, 1, 139-166.
- Grothus, U. (2009). *Measuring impact: evaluating program areas*. Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst / German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). Retrieved 21 May 2010, available at: <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Publications-and-Reports>
- Hannerz, U. (1996). *Transnational connections: culture, people, places*. London: Routledge.
- Hobbs, H. H. & Chernotsky, H. I. (2007). *Preparing students for global citizenship*. Paper prepared for the American Political Science Association Teaching and Learning Conference (Charlotte, NC. USA).
- Joris, M. (2006). IaH: A quality tool for change and institutional management – mainstream approach to help change in your organization and people, from local to cosmopolitan. In H. Tekkens (Ed.) *Internationalization at home: a global perspective* (pp. 91-104). Rotterdam: NUFFIC.
- Karwacka, K. (March, 2010). Towards indicators for intercultural understanding. In J. Huber (Ed.), *Intercultural understanding: preparing teachers for heterogeneous classrooms* (pp. 58-66). Council of Europe Teachers Matter Series No 2.
- McAllister, L., Whiteford, G., Hill, B., Thomas, N. & Fitzgerald, M. (2006). Reflections in intercultural learning: examining the international experience through a critical incident approach. *Reflective practice*, 7: 3, 367-381.
- McKeown, J. (2009). *The first time effect: the impact of study abroad on college student intellectual development*. Albany, New York: Suny Press.
- Morin, E. (1973). O paradigma perdido: a natureza humana. Mem Martins: Europa-América.
- Morin, E. (1980). *O método II – A vida da vida*. Mem Martins: Europa-América.
- Morin, E. (1996). *Política de civilização e problema mundial*. Conferência apresentada no Porto em 1996. Disponível em: <http://paginas.terra.com.br/saude/oconsultorio1/portugalmorin.htm>
- Whalen, B. (2009). *Measuring impact: learning from evaluations to assess study abroad outcomes*. Dickinson College, The Forum on Education Abroad. Retrieved on 21 May 2010, available at: <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Publications-and-Reports>
- Whalley, T. (1997). *Best practice guidelines for internationalising the curriculum*.
-

Retrieved on 20 April 2009 available at: <http://www.jcu.edu.au/office/tld/teachingsupport/documents/Whalley-Best-Practice.pdf>

**Correspondence**

**Susana Gonçalves**

Escola Superior de Educação de Coimbra,

Praça Heróis do Ultramar – Solum

3030-329 Coimbra, Portugal

susana@esec.pt

## Annex

### Shortlist of institutional indicators for success in intercultural education Taken from Karwacka (March, 2010)

- 
- Are we involved in hosting of a foreign pupil during intercultural exchanges?
- 
- Do we promote engagement of teachers, school management and students in intercultural experiences (professionally and in life)?
- 
- Do we provide intercultural, mixed and integrated school environment in order to reduce the social distance among students from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds?
- 
- Do we give the students an opportunity to develop their plurilingual competence?
- 
- Do we make a selection of topics which are related to the multilingual context of education?
- 
- Do we promote new teaching and learning methods orientated on students (e.g. explorative learning, project-oriented learning, role play, learning to negotiate positions and views)?
- 
- Do we develop methods of dealing with otherness and difference?
- 
- Do we encourage learners to develop larger loyalties beyond their home and their nation?
- 
- Do we give students various opportunities to meet different needs, interests, abilities and cultural backgrounds?
- 
- Do we promote non-centric curriculum based on principles of non-discrimination, pluralism and cultural relativism?
- 
- Do we create deliberate and explicit intercultural learning situations (e.g. through encounters with the unknown)?
- 
- Do we promote the understanding of cultural differences in relation to meaningful context (learning from differences and multiperspectivity)?
- 
- Do we extend the range of choices and options, including alternative and non-public provisions (without affecting the core curriculum and overall cohesion of education delivery)?
- 
- Do we teach social skills and competence necessary for democracy learning (e.g. the capability to take part in a public debate, resolve conflicts)?
- 
- Do we provide opportunities for multicultural delivery, intercultural communication and exposure to the other countries?
- 
- Do we measure academic achievements in citizenship-related subjects (civics, history, social studies and political sciences)?
- 
- Do we value intercultural encounters and experimental learning situations occasioned by non-formal education (e.g. exchanges, visits, projects)?
- 
- Do we include in curriculum specialised modules and training programmes as well as cross-cultural topics with “European” content?
-

