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ABSTRACT

INTERCULTURAL UNDERSTANDING OF TEACHER EDUCATORS

Sydney A. Merz, Ph.D.

George Mason University, 2015

Dissertation Director: Dr. Beverly D. Shaklee

Teaching for interculturalism requires teacher educators (TEs) to reflect upon themselves before they can model and facilitate the intercultural growth of their students. Using qualitative inquiry with a mixed method component, this study investigated 10 TEs’ understanding of interculturalism, examined the Intercultural Development Inventory’s® (IDI) (Hammer, 2011) influence on how they think about and teach for interculturalism, and explored how they incorporate intercultural components in their university classrooms. Participating TEs taught in undergraduate educator preparation programs (EPPs) at a large public research university in the United States (U.S.). Data sources included individual interviews, syllabi, program documents, self-reported scores from a modified intercultural value rubric, researcher notes, and IDI scores. The analysis of data revealed that though broadly defined, interculturalism takes on various meanings, and TEs’ understanding of interculturalism is influenced by personal and professional life events and their own students’ intercultural development. The addition of International
Baccalaureate (IB) certification and a curricular focus on internationalization played a role in how most TEs thought about or taught for interculturalism, whereas the IDI had little to no influence. Additionally, many TEs emphasized the importance of ongoing professional development administered by the institution as an aid in their intercultural development. Finally, the TEs indicated that their primary roles are to cultivate, challenge, and support the intercultural development of their preservice teachers, recognizing the rewards and battles of this approach.
CHAPTER ONE

As the world becomes flatter and more interconnected, people are becoming increasingly accessible to one another (Friedman, 2005). Social establishments, such as educational institutions, are trying to implement innovative strategies and methods to embrace the culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) populations found in today’s U.S. classrooms. In this conversation, attention has revolved around the skills and attitudes needed to develop our pK-16 learners as global and intercultural citizens, as well as how to appropriately prepare pK-12 teachers to model such skills and attitudes with their students. However, an important stakeholder in the development of intercultural skills and attitudes for teaching and learning is often ignored—the teacher educator (TE).

While researchers have continued to assess secondary education students’ and inservice teachers’ intercultural skills and attitudes, both domestically and internationally, few researchers have attended to TEs and their intercultural development.

This dissertation investigated TEs’ understanding of interculturalism, examined the Intercultural Development Inventory® (IDI) (Hammer, 2011) as a tool to teach and think about interculturalism, and explored how TEs think about and teach for intercultural development. This research continued the dialogue of how we best prepare future global citizens and preservice teachers by first examining those who prepare future teachers. In the past, researchers have addressed the need for intercultural development
for preservice and inservice teachers (DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Emert, 2008; Grossman & Yuen, 2006; Mahon, 2006, 2009; Straffon, 2003; Tian, 2013; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010), yet a paucity of research exists on TEs’ intercultural attitudes and skills. Therefore, no matter whom TEs are and/or the content and pedagogical knowledge and dispositions they possess and practice, it is vital for TEs to understand and develop their intercultural skills in advance, as they should model such skills for their preservice teachers, who in turn should model such skills for their students (Shaklee & Merz, 2012).

Currently, increasing attention is drawn toward the importance of a more globalized approach in educator preparation programs (EPPs) due to the increase in diversity in today’s classroom (Ben-Peretz, 2001; Dooley & Villanueva, 2006; Duckworth, Walker Levy, & Levy, 2005; Hill, 2012; Levy, 2010; Longview Foundation, 2008; Lunenberg & Willemsen, 2006; Tamo, Jubani, & Gjokutaj, 2012; Wang, Lin, Spalding, Odell, & Klecka, 2011; Woolf, 2011; Zhao, 2010). The call for a more globalized approach in EPPs can also be seen through recruitment efforts in providing a diverse teacher workforce (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2013; Dilworth & Brown, 2005; Villegas & Davis, 2005); multicultural and diversity education (Cochran-Smith, 2004, 2008; Kasten et al., 2013; Sleeter, 2009); and intercultural development (Cushner, 2011; Cushner & Mahon, 2009; Deardorff, 2004, 2006, 2009, 2011; Heyward, 2002; Hofstede, 1986; Hunter, 2014; Shaklee & Merz, 2012; Yuen, 2004). Furthermore, research from Australia and the U.S. indicates the K-12 teaching force is comprised of mostly white, Anglo-Saxon females, while their students are far more racially, economically, culturally, and linguistically diverse (Allard & Santoro,
There are a variety of ways students are diverse, (e.g., language, class, learning abilities, ethnicity, race, class and gender), but not all of these things are easily visible. Thus, EPPs in Europe, North America, Oceania, Southeast Asia, and sub-Sahara Africa have taken steps to assist pK-12 teachers to be more prepared for the diversity in their classrooms. Furthermore, EPPs have been called upon to include a more intercultural approach to teaching (Cushner, 2011; Zeichner, 2010), which begins with self-examination of one’s beliefs about self (Deardorff, 2004, 2006).

**Who Are the TEs?**

Who are our TEs in the U.S.? What skills, knowledge, beliefs, and dispositions do they possess? Are TEs former classroom teachers? These questions are among the many inquiries that revolve around understanding whom the TEs are. Though TEs are not typically researched (Ben-Peretz, Kleeman, Reichenberg, & Shimoni, 2010; Goodwin et al., 2014; Wood & Borg, 2010), some have believed TEs are former classroom teachers and that good classroom teachers will eventually make good TEs (Korthagen, Loughran, & Lundenberg, 2005). While it may be assumed that TEs have comprehensive expertise in their specific disciplines or fields of study, little to no training is offered to TEs in the pedagogical preparation on how to teach future teachers (Loughran, 2014; Murray, 2005; Shagrir, 2010; Troyer, 1986; van Velzen, van der Klink, Swennen, & Yaffe, 2010). Additionally, the transition from a classroom teacher to a TE can be very challenging (Murray & Male, 2005; Ritter, 2007; Trent, 2013; Williams, 2014) since no one assumes
responsibility in assisting in the transition to a TE (Arends, Murphy & Christensen, 1986; Wilson, 2006).

The Association for Teacher Educators (ATE) in the U.S. produced nine standards that address the quality of a TE. These standards were developed to help clarify the roles and responsibilities of TEs and assist in providing a way to articulate the teacher education profession. The ATE standards provide some context as to what is expected of and from TEs, but still, little is known about TEs. Troyer (1986) summarized demographics and characteristics of TEs, but the latest information stems from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) from the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES). The 2003-2004 NSOPF was the latest data collected on teacher education faculty in the U.S.; however, this study’s data is not available publically. Thus, researchers have used data from the 1998-1999 NSOPF to understand TEs’ sociodemographic characteristics and academic and professional backgrounds (Wolf-Wendel, Baker, Twombly, Tollefson, & Mahlios, 2006).

In December 2013, the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) released a draft of regulations calling for more accountability on university EPPs. If it passes, these regulations would link university EPP federal funding to how well the students of the EPPs’ graduates perform on their elementary and secondary standardized tests. This is being met with scrutiny from several entities, including the American Association of College of Teacher Education (AACTE), ATE, and several colleges and universities. In fact, more than 2,300 public comments were made as of the end of January 2015
(Sawchuk, 2015). However, even with such national attention on the quality of EPPs, it is interesting that TEs have not been scrutinized in this discourse.

Before the USDOE’s latest draft of recommendations, scholars and researchers focused on how the EPPs are not fully preparing teachers for today’s classroom demands and challenges (Kennedy, 1997; Levine, 2006; U.S. White House, 2014). Often overlooked in this research and conversations are the values, beliefs, and knowledge that the TEs bring into their practice and how these attributes facilitate and/or influence the values, beliefs, and knowledge of the preservice teachers (Garber, 1995; Loughran, 2014; McAllister & Irvine, 2002; Tatò, 1996, 1998; Willemse, Lunenberg, & Korthagen, 2008; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Additionally, researchers also suggested that most TEs’ professional identities are shaped by their past experiences as teachers (McKeon & Harrison, 2010), which may or may not include experiences with CLD students (Edwards & Kuhlman, 2007; Lucas & Grinberg, 2005; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). This becomes essential since some scholars have claimed that TEs may be the most important influencer to preservice teachers (Snoek, Swennen, & van der Klink, 2011).

**TEs’ Beliefs**

Pajares (1992) called for teacher beliefs to be considered part of educational research. To better prepare preservice teachers for working with CLD students, researchers focused on the dispositions of preservice teachers and how they understand themselves as they prepare to enter a classroom of students who may not share similar cultural understandings (Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000; de Jong, Harper & Coady, 2013; Garmon, 2004, 2005; Irvine; 2005; Li, 2013; Pohan & Aguilar, 2001; Sleeter,
or for inservice teachers and how they navigate a class with CLD students (Garcia & Guerra, 2004; McAllister & Irvine, 2002). The specific pedagogical and instructional methods used to embrace the diverse study body in pK-16 classrooms are commonly researched, but the development of TEs’ dispositions and beliefs of CLD learners garners less attention. As such, Hornbuckle (2013) discovered 46 international teachers teaching at an International Baccalaureate (IB) school might not be as prepared to be cultural mentors as they thought, which resembles other research regarding inservice teachers’ perceptions of being intercultural (Bayles, 2009; DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Grossman & Yuen, 2009; Lundgren, 2007; Mahon, 2006, 2009; Straffon, 2003; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010). Moreover, when TEs’ beliefs and values are recognized, it allows for better clarity and alignment in their teaching and actions (Loughran, 2014, p. 279).

As researchers continue to probe the experiences of preservice and inservice teachers in CLD classrooms, it is important to know how TEs are preparing both preservice and inservice teachers for CLD classrooms and how they perceive themselves in the ever-changing CLD interconnected classroom. Some TEs have heeded Zeichner’s (2003, 2005) call to be more reflective and published self-studies in which they examined their own beliefs of CLD students to help inform their preservice teachers (see Beeman-Cadwallader, Buck, & Trauth-Nare, 2014; Grierson, 2010; McDonough & Brandenburg, 2012; Turner, 2013; Williams & Power, 2010). Others found that both preservice and inservice teachers do not feel adequately prepared to teach CLD students (Castro, 2010; Young, 2010) and that possibly, TEs have not “walked the talk” when it comes to
preparing preservice teachers for working with CLD students (Edwards & Kuhlman, 2007; Lucas & Grinberg, 2005; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). This becomes even more convoluted as TEs are often the individuals who determine whether or not a preservice teacher is qualified to graduate and have his/her own classroom (Goodwin & Oyler, 2005; Smith, 2005).

Though EPPs struggle to recruit, prepare, and retain the best teachers for all students (Zeichner, 2003), policies that take a “colorblind” approach hinder EPPs since such policies continue to nurture the dominant culture’s students (Skerrett & Hargreaves, 2008; Wells, 2014). Additionally, TEs may exhibit stereotypes about a particular group that may transfer to their teaching and learning practices. Thus, a stereotype may lead into a stereotype threat, which is defined as “being at risk of conforming, as self-characteristic, a negative stereotype about one’s group” (Steele & Aronson, 1995, p. 797). Researchers found that stereotype threats toward a particular group’s intellectual ability also create an academic deficit for that group (Aronson, 2004; Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999). Although this notion has been not studied with TEs, stereotype threats may be attributed to what is learned in the EPPs. In addition, stereotypes threats are not always unidirectional or negative; they can exhibit positive stereotypes, such as creating model minority (Chang & Au, 2009). Thus, further research is warranted to understand how TEs perceive their own beliefs about cultures and others and how these beliefs are infused into their teaching practices.

**Intercultural Competence and Development**

Defining and/or assessing intercultural competence is challenging (Deardorff,
Historically, the idea of intercultural competence in the U.S. evolved from disciplines such as anthropology, communications, and study abroad programs (Cushner, 2011). Since the early 1980s, scholars and researchers in an array of disciplines studied the importance and/or influence of intercultural competence (Bennett, 1986, 1993; Byram, 1997, 2008, 2009; Deardorff, 2006, 2011; Hammer, 2005, 2011, 2012; Hofstede, 1980). However, it was Milton Bennett (1986) who pushed the idea of evaluating intercultural competence on a developmental continuum. Bennett (1986, 1993) combined the work of other scholars across various disciplines to form an intercultural competency measurement named the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). The DMIS assesses intercultural development through two stages: ethnocentric and ethnorelative. The ethnocentric stage is where individuals view their culture’s perspectives, views, and attitudes as the center of everything. In the ethnorelative stage, individuals begin to shift their cultural worldview to include the context of other cultures rather than just their own cultural view.

By the turn of the 21st century, and with the assistance of Mitchell Hammer, the DMIS evolved into the reliable and valid IDI (Hammer, 2011). Within the scope of the IDI, Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman (2003) defined intercultural competence as the progression or regression of one’s “ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences to think and act in interculturally appropriate ways” (p. 422). Currently, IDI research resulted in over 150 published works, and IDI is heavily implemented as a measure in study abroad programs (Paige, 2013).

In the field of education, the IDI is just one tool to measure intercultural
development. Others focused on a more holistic approach to intercultural development by using intercultural education as a way of preparing teachers (Deardorff, 2006; Cushner, 1998, 2011; Yuen, 2004). Using an intercultural education approach, Cushner (2011) suggested that those who can develop and continue to develop intercultural skills are more effective in understanding diverse perspectives. Therefore it may be critical that EPPs and inservice professional development programs expand upon intercultural development as an effective way to connect to the diversity in today’s classrooms.

Furthermore, a growing number of studies were conducted to promote and/or understand inservice teachers’ intercultural development (Cushner & Mahon, 2009; Emert, 2008; Grossman & Yuen, 2006; McMillon, 2009; O’Neill, 2008; Valverde, 2010). In the studies that used IDI in the U.S., inservice educators were assessed in the ethnocentric stages of the IDI (DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Mahon, 2006, 2009), as the inservice teachers’ evaluated culture and people through a lens predominately used by their cultural standards. Such results resembled international findings from Grossman and Yen (2006) who studied 317 inservice secondary educators in Hong Kong and discovered 55% of the teachers scored in the ethnocentric stage. Conversely, Straffon (2003) discovered students who attended an international school in Southeast Asia scored more consistently in the ethnorelative stages of the IDI. With such findings, this leads one to question many ideas. For example, if inservice teachers are scoring in ethnocentric levels of intercultural development, have they received opportunities to develop their intercultural knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors? What occurs if their students are scoring further along the intercultural development continuum? Where are the TEs in this
conversation and what are the implications for EPPs?

Purpose of the Study

This study investigated TEs’ understanding of interculturalism, examined the IDI’s influence on how TEs think about and teach for interculturalism, and explored how TEs incorporate intercultural components in their university classrooms. Using a basic qualitative approach with an interpretivist lens, individual interviews were conducted with TEs to investigate in greater detail their understanding of interculturalism and to what extent they use interculturalism as part of their pedagogical tools in their university classrooms. When available, syllabi and program documents also were reviewed. Last, in order to inquire about the complexities of interculturalism and descriptive statistics from the TEs’ IDI scores, self-reported scores from a modified intercultural VALUE rubric were used.

Research Questions (RQs)

To explore my research purpose, three RQs guided my study:

1. What are these TEs’ understandings of interculturalism?

2. To what extent and in what ways did these TEs’ IDI results influence how they think about interculturalism?

3. To what extent, and in what ways, do these TEs incorporate interculturalism in their educator preparation courses?

Significance of the Study

The significance of this research is two-fold. First, researchers have addressed the intercultural development of students, preservice teachers, and inservice teachers, but
TEs are historically and categorically omitted from this examination (see Bayles, 2009; DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Emert, 2008; Grossman & Yuen, 2006; Horbuckle, 2013; Mahon, 2006, 2009; Straffon, 2003; Tian, 2013; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010). By investigating TEs’ understanding of interculturalism and to what extent they implement intercultural components in their university courses, a third stakeholder, the TEs, are added to the intercultural education research within teacher education. It is significant to include TEs when understanding how to address intercultural development for the pK-16 classrooms, and it expands Zhao’s (2010) call for more culturally competent teachers and Hunter and Pearson’s (2014) approach to interculturalize teacher education.

Second, there is some debate on how much information from EPPs actually transfers to the preservice teacher’s classroom (Garber, 1995; Smith, 2005; Tatoo, 1996, 1998; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Additionally, researchers discovered preservice teachers may not fully reflect upon themselves as they prepare to enter a classroom of students who may not share similar cultural understandings (Causey et al., 2000; Armento, 2000; de Jong et al., 2013; Garmon, 2004; Irvine; 2005; Li, 2013; Pohan & Aguilar, 2001; Sleeter, 2001, 2005). As such, the beliefs that TEs bring into their courses may influence what the preservice teachers take into their future classroom (Loughran, 2014). By uncovering TEs’ understandings of interculturalism, I bring forth the TE as a stakeholder in the body of intercultural research. With the continued call by accrediting bodies (e.g., Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), university missions, educational policies, and research to promote more culturally diverse
pedagogical knowledge), it is imperative that TEs are included in such dialogue and research.

**Researcher Perspective**

When conducting and analyzing any method of research, it is important for researchers to recognize their biases (Glesne, 2010; Maxwell, 2005). Being a TE myself, I hold biases and understandings within the field and in relationships I have formed with other TEs. I strongly believed TEs should model pedagogical behaviors, facilitate learning, and offer multiple perspectives of content to their preservice teachers. This constructivist teaching creates the opportunity for preservice teachers to connect not only through a teacher’s lens on the importance of creating a toolkit of pedagogical skills, but also provides a context for understanding that all learners have unique needs, which requires that content to be taught through multiple perspectives. Through this, I believe teachers should build relationships with their students to understand their needs, and TEs should model and practice these behaviors with their preservice teachers.

I am also influenced by five years of working in EPPs outside of the U.S., where I, as a white middle-class female, was a minority. These experiences have heavily influenced the way in which I approach my work and scholarship with intercultural education and development within the field of teacher education. Born and raised in a small community in rural Nebraska, I was not often exposed to people different than I; and this lack of exposure, unfortunately, provided a one-dimensional perception about the world. This ethnocentric view was not questioned until I left the comforts of my privileges and became a U.S. Peace Corps Volunteer, serving two consecutive tours as an
educator in the Republic of Armenia and the Philippines. Though these experiences quickly reshaped my thinking as I was placed in a minority role, I also questioned why I had to go outside of the U.S. to understand people different than I; when in fact, the U.S. is full of multiple cultural and linguistic diversities. My comfort zone could have been pushed if I looked beyond an ethnocentric worldview and saw I could have just gone a few miles down the road to experience something “different” or “similar.”

I believe providing an intercultural education is pivotal for all individuals to understand self to understand others, especially future teachers who need to be exposed to intercultural opportunities. I find intercultural education to be part of a socially just mindset that encourages everyone, including all educators, to provide educational opportunities accessible to all. This journey, however, is not limited and is a lifelong journey. It is a journey that requires constant critical reflection of self and passionately seeks multiple perspectives of any given situation. In the teacher education context, a preservice teachers’ commitment in an EPP is just one destination in this lifelong journey.

Additionally, I have my own thoughts and assumptions of the IDI after becoming a qualified administrator of the tool. One bias I have regarding the IDI is that I believe the tool cannot stand alone as a sole assessment of intercultural development. Given the complexities and various contexts of how one facilitates intercultural experiences, I believe the IDI is just one reflective approach to understanding intercultural development, not a tool to determine one’s intercultural development. Though IDI research is published more compared to other cultural assessments, it is mostly in the realm of study abroad,
which leaves me hesitant on its transferability in teacher education.

To avoid my biases playing a role in the research, I wrote researcher memos that assisted me in checking my subjective thoughts while investigating my RQs. I also reflected after each interview, as I listened to the audio recording to find different tactics that would leave my biases and assumptions aside. Though not easily done, these steps were important in assisting me to “check myself” on a topic about which I am deeply passionate.

Last, while analyzing the data, I enlisted a second coder who was comfortable in discussing discrepancies of any coding in which my biases explicitly or implicitly surfaced. Her balanced approach in checking my assumptions provided a crucial element in ensuring that I approached this data with fair and open perspectives.

**Definitions of Terms**

The following terms are used in this study. The definitions for the terms are presented to help the reader understand the specific meanings used for this study.

**Beliefs.** “An individual’s judgment of the truth or falsity of a prospection, a judgment that can only be inferred from a collective understanding of what human beings, say, intend, and do” (Pajares, 1992, p. 316).

**Culture.** Describes all the mental processes that are (or can be) subject to social transmission, as well as other elements of human behavior (including material goods) that help to establish and form our mental processes. These different elements (mental, behavioral, and material) can often only be understood as a set of interrelated features, one causing and forming the other, and are in constant relation with the (social, historical,
and natural) environment (Ross, 2004, p. 57).

**Educator preparation program (EPP),** Preservice teacher education programs that are situated in a traditional program at a university or college.

**Intercultural competence.** “The ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based upon one’s intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Deardorff, 2004, p. 194).

**Intercultural development.** Combines the definitions of intercultural sensitivity and intercultural competence as described by Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman (2003) as the progression or regression of one’s “ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences to think and act in interculturally appropriate ways” (p. 422).

**Intercultural education.** Uses the definition provided by Cushner (1998) is more proactive and action oriented than multicultural education, and rather than focusing on specific problems; recognizes that a genuine understanding of cultural differences and similarities is necessary in order to build a foundation for working collaboratively with others (Cushner, 1998, p. 4).

**Interculturalism.** An overarching term that embraces how one thinks, communicates, and understands anything intercultural. Intercultural represents relating, involving, and taking place in and/or from different cultures.

**Stereotype threat,** “Being at risk of conforming, as self-characteristic, a negative stereotype about one’s group” (Steele & Aronson, 1995, p. 797).

**Teacher educators.** Individuals “who work in tertiary institutions and are largely
involved in teaching of prospective teachers enrolled in a preservice teacher preparation program (Loughran, 2014, p. 272). For this study, this term embraced the undergraduate education level.

**Summary**

Darling-Hammond (2010) extended Thomas Friedman’s (2005) idea of a flat world by applying the ideology to the field of education. There is no doubt, especially in the U.S., that public classrooms are becoming more CLD, yet the teachers serving the classrooms are overwhelmingly white females from the middle/upper socioeconomic class (Feistritzer, 2011). This imbalance may produce a classroom in which the teachers are unprepared for the cultures and languages that are different from their own (Causey et al., 2000; de Jong et al., 2013; Garcia & Guerra, 2004; Garmon, 2004, 2005; Irvine, 2005; Li, 2013; McAllister & Irvine, 2002; Pohan & Aguilar, 2001; Sleeter, 2001, 2005), unless the teacher develops a sense of understanding interculturalism. The outcome of this imbalance is not new, but as we continue to live in a more interconnected world, inservice teachers and TEs must find ways to look beyond their ethnocentric views to embrace a more ethnorelative perspective that encompasses the views of other people and standards. For the first time in research, I brought TEs into this research by understanding what drives their understanding of interculturalism at personal and professional levels. By explicitly investigating TEs’ understanding of interculturalism, this study extends intercultural education research by using a multi-model approach (Deardorff, 2009b) and includes TEs’ perspectives of the IDI and how it relates to the TEs’ university teaching and learning.
CHAPTER TWO

This study investigated TEs’ understandings of interculturalism, and explored to what extent TEs incorporate interculturalism into their educator preparation program (EPP) courses. In addition, this study examined the ways the IDI results influenced how TEs think about interculturalism. Since it is assumed that preservice and inservice teachers should model intercultural skills and attitudes for their students (Shaklee & Merz, 2012), it may well be assumed that TEs should do the same for preservice teachers.

This study’s review of literature comprised journal articles, books, book chapters, websites, and professional organizational reports. The journal articles were researched by using three research database search engines: Education Full Text, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text, and Psych Info. The search terms used in this review involved the following: intercultural education, intercultural development, intercultural competence, intercultural training, intercultural development inventory, culture competence, CLD students, diverse students, teacher education, TEs’ beliefs, TE identity, TE professional development, preservice teachers’ beliefs, inservice teachers’ beliefs, and teacher education dispositions. I purposefully eliminated research on intercultural development and the IDI in the study abroad context in order to focus on intercultural development research within teacher education. Much can be learned from the study abroad IDI literature, as the research implications are applicable to TEs to who can plan
and provide domestic or authentic intercultural teaching experiences for themselves and their students. However, for the purposes of this study, it was important to narrow the literature review beyond short-term study programs and extend the dialogue of what is occurring or not occurring in intercultural development research with pK-16 formal educational settings.

Based on the research derived from the aforementioned key terms, the following topics emerged as the study’s conceptual framework: who are TEs, the beliefs of preservice teachers, inservice teachers, and TEs on CLD learners; a review of four selected theories of intercultural competence; and intercultural research with teachers and students using the IDI.

**TEs and Their Professional Needs**

“All teacher educators, regardless of their values, can benefit from being critical of their views.” (Hansen, 2005, p.16)

As noted in Chapter One, the demographics of preservice and inservice teachers are not as CLD as the student diversity in today’s U.S. public classrooms (Boser, 2014; Dilworth & Coleman, 2014). Based upon data from the 2009-2010 school year, the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) (2013) found that 68% of preservice teachers identified as white, while the overall K-12 student population was approximately 46% non-white. Conversely, Boser (2014) claimed that states and districts have done little to address the widening diversity gap between teachers and students.

**Knowledge about TEs.** Complicating this issue is the examination of those who enter education preparation programs (EPPs) and who facilitates their learning. Troyer’s
(1986) research summary on TEs’ characteristics debunked previous research findings by concluding that most TEs had public school teaching experience and that TEs saw their primary roles to be teachers more than researchers. We further our knowledge of Troyer’s work by examining postsecondary faculty demographics from the NCES. The latest data collected on postsecondary faculty is from the 2003-2004 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF); however, only data from the 1998-1999 NSOPF is available for public use. Today, the current knowledge we have of those in the field of teacher education is from Wolf-Wendel et al.’s (2006) examination of the 1992-1993 NSOPF and 1998-1999 NSOPF data. Wolf-Wendel et al.’s descriptive findings from the NSOPF data revealed that full-time or tenured track faculty indicated that 59% were male, 70% were white, and 36% work at research institutions (p. 280). Besides the aforementioned data, little else is known about TEs’ demographic information, previous professional experiences, or their ethnic backgrounds and the languages they speak since TEs “seemed to be an under researched occupational group” (Ben-Peretz, Kleeman, Reichenberg, & Shimoni 2010, p. 112).

Similar to the American teacher preparation, Ben-Peretz et al. (2010) claimed most Israeli TEs were effective school-based teachers and/or experts in a specific area. However, it is often assumed that good classroom teachers make good TEs (Korthagen et al., 2005). Some former classroom teachers who have become TEs have found the transition into higher education encompasses much more than their good classroom teaching (Loughran, 2014; Turner, 2013; Zeichner, 2005).
**TEs’ roles and responsibilities.** What are the roles and responsibilities of being a good TE? The Association for Teacher Educators (ATE), a U.S. teacher education organization, created nine standards that articulate the roles and responsibilities of TEs. The standards are described as follows:

- **Standard 1 Teaching:** Model teaching that demonstrates content and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions reflecting research, proficiency with technology and assessment, and accepted best practices in teacher education;
- **Standard 2 Cultural Competence:** Apply cultural competence and promote social justice in teacher education;
- **Standard 3 Scholarship:** Engage in inquiry and contribute to scholarship that expands the knowledgebase related to teacher education;
- **Standard 4 Professional Development:** Inquire systematically into, reflect on, and improve their own practice and demonstrate commitment to continuous professional development;
- **Standard 5 Program Development:** Provide leadership in developing, implementing, and evaluating teacher education programs that are rigorous, relevant, and grounded in theory, research, and best practice;
- **Standard 6 Collaboration:** Collaborate regularly and in significant ways with relevant stakeholders to improve teaching, research, and student learning;
- **Standard 7 Public Advocacy:** Serve as informed, constructive advocates for high-quality education for all students;
• **Standard 8 Teacher Education Profession**: Contribute to improving the teacher education profession; and

• **Standard 9 Vision**: Contribute to creating visions for teaching, learning, and teacher education that take into account such issues as technology, systemic thinking, and world views (Association for Teacher Educators, 2008).

These standards were created to assist in clearly defining the role of the TE in a time of much reform and change in the profession. As such, ATE (2008) has provided examples in which to use these standards in the teacher education profession. Some of these examples include: as a guide to hiring TEs or preparing doctoral student to be TEs, a guide for TE professional development, and/or promoting dialogue on the roles and responsibilities of TEs.

**TEs’ professional needs.** While these standards assist in understanding TEs’ responsibilities, research indicates that more support is needed for novice TEs in the practical understanding of being a TE. Researchers concluded that novice TEs have specific needs as they navigate the pedagogical process of teaching about teaching, as they find avenues to improve continuously on their new roles as TEs, and as they become new members of a professional research community (Goodwin et al., 2014; Ritter, 2007; Shagrir, 2010; van Velzen et al., 2010; Williams, 2014; Wood & Borg, 2010). Despite these specific needs, there is typically no formal or informal training to become a TE in the U.S. or in other countries (Loughran, 2014; Wilson, 2006). In England, Murray and Male (2005) found that out of 28 former successful classroom teachers who were new TEs, all but two shared that the transition to teacher education was stressful and difficult,
taking between two to three years to form their TE identities. Often, the institutional support these TEs received was insufficient since there were assumptions that these former classroom teachers had the pedagogical skills to become a TE. Likewise, researchers indicate limited attention toward professionalism for TEs with much of the professional development dependent on the specific institution (Snoek, Swennen, & van der Klink, 2011) by the TEs own self-directed hands-on learning (Murray, 2005) and/or by their past experiences as teachers (McKeon & Harrison, 2010).

Goodwin et al.’s (2014) study involving 293 TEs found TEs to be unprepared for the “work of teacher educating” (p. 298). In this, the authors discovered that these TEs were typically prepared in a doctoral program that focused more on theory than practice and did not give substantial attention to diversity and multicultural topics. The TEs expressed a lack of understanding the academy and its way of life, and they often viewed teaching and research as two separate components rather than as integrated roles. Zeichner (2005) has proposed that “if teacher education is to be taken more seriously in colleges and universities, then the preparing of new school- and university-based teacher educators needs to be taken more seriously as well” (p. 123).

Zeichner’s (2005) call is furthered by Wilson’s (2006) mission in preparing doctoral students for both the research and teaching in teacher education, advocating for the term “teacher educator-researcher.” Wilson posed seven questions to her fellow experienced TEs in how they could best sustain teacher education by adhering to the needs and development of the next generation of TEs. Her questions included:

- What knowledge of teacher education do future teacher educator-researchers
need?

- What kind of interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary/transdisciplinary preparation best suits future teacher educator-researchers?
- What knowledge of and skill in research methodologies do future teacher educator-researcher need?
- What knowledge of and skill in teaching methodologies do future teacher educator-researchers need?
- What is the role of K-12 teaching knowledge, skill, and experience in the preparation of future teacher educator-researchers?
- How does one learn the practice of research?
- How does one learn the practice of teacher education?

With these questions, Wilson addressed how doctoral students should learn about research and practice in teacher education, as “learning to be a teacher educator-researcher requires understanding of the practice of teacher education and the practice of teacher education research” (p. 316). Wilson called upon her colleagues to critically discuss how to pass their knowledge to the next generation of TE researchers to inform the field and their own practice and research.

However, Ben-Peretz et al. (2010) believed that the picture of a TE possesses a double commitment—one commitment toward the future teachers and another commitment to the future teachers’ future students. Through this double commitment, it is often difficult for TEs to find time and dedication to continue their own professional development. In the U.S., it may be implied that there is more than a double commitment
since TEs are not only responsible for preservice teachers and their future students, but TEs must meet the demands of research, publication, and service needed for tenure and promotion.

Ben-Peretz et al. (2010) revealed four interconnected mental models of a TE, providing ways in which TEs can examine their possible professional development needs.

- The model pedagogue is someone who places teaching and its pedagogies to the forefront of all they do. They update their pedagogies to model the most innovative pedagogy to facilitate the future teacher’s learning.
- The reflective, self-studying practitioner is someone who uses reflection and self-study as avenue to improve and expand the field. Typical professional development involves narrative inquiries, self-studies, case studies, and reflection.
- The developer of professional identities is one who goes through self-discovery within a community of practice to understand one’s personal strengths. In these communities, TEs share their stories to enhance their professional identities that, in turn, hope to influence their students’ teaching identities.
- The career developer is a TE who manages his/her professional development needs alongside with what the system is currently demanding (p. 119-120, 123).

Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) also have encouraged TEs to become more reflective about their work if they truly want to produce progressive future educators. In fact, when investigating research on TEs’ beliefs, self-study methodology is used to empower teacher education practice (Beeman-Cadwallader et al., 2014; McDonough & Brandenburg, 2012; Ritter, 2007; Samaras, 2002, 2011; Williams & Power, 2010; Wood
& Borg). Recently, Loughran (2014) advocated a conceptualized framework for TEs’ professional development that extends beyond induction and instills a vision for future professional development. This plan begins with becoming a TE and experiencing the TE life (i.e., experiencing the academy, shaping identity) to understanding the nature of teacher education (i.e., knowledge and practice of teaching about teaching, searching for the curriculum and program coherence; and knowledge and practice of learning about teaching) to articulating one’s scholarship which informs his/her teaching and learning about teaching. By creating a vision of professional development, Loughran suggested that TEs might have more and better control of what teacher education is, does, and looks like (p. 280). As such, researchers have suggested that TEs should be reflective in their evolving identity and explicitly reflect on their values and beliefs.

**Facilitating Preservice Teachers’ Knowledge**

The quality of EPPs and how TEs facilitate the learning process with preservice teachers in their everyday classroom practices is addressed in research (Garber, 1995; Kennedy, 1997; Levine, 2006; Tato, 1996, 1998; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981) and brings recent attention to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE). While some research concluded that the quality of the teacher is an important factor in influencing students’ knowledge (Barber & Mourshed, 2007; Hattie, 2009; U.S. White House, 2014), Snoek et al. (2011) proposed that TEs could be the most important influencer for preservice teachers despite the lack of professional development offered to TEs. With such influence, it is critical to observe the values, beliefs, and dispositions of TE.

Drawing data from the Teacher Education and Learning to Teach (TELT) study
carried out between 1985 and 1990, Tattò (1996) found a disconnect between what TEs (n = 113) believe their EPPs were conveying to the student-teachers (n = 522) and what was actually being self-reported by the student-teachers. Results found these EPPs did a poor job in altering student teachers’ views of teaching and managing a diverse classroom, even when using a constructivist and/or social justice approaches in their teaching. However, the results are compounded by the fact that student-teachers bring with them views that are difficult to change.

Conversely, Garber’s (1995) research determined that one particular TE had been “[more] important in shaping preservice students beliefs than an entire program of courses and experiences” (p. 175). This particular TE believed the influence of the student-teachers’ cooperating teachers reinforced his teaching beliefs since the cooperating teachers were his former preservice teachers. Similarly, Willemse, Lunenberg, and Korthagen (2008) were curious about how TEs promoted moral instruction to preservice teachers and found a wide range of categories that TEs deemed important moral values (which may be argued as important characteristics for intercultural understanding) that need to be modeled for preservice teachers. This supported the researchers’ hypothesis that moral education is not easily decided upon among TEs and that moral values depend upon individual preference. Often, practicing such moral values was difficult for the TEs to explain to each other and the researchers, making such teaching spontaneous and possibly implicit.

Katz and Raths (1985) pushed for professional dispositions as a goal for teacher education by proposing that the ethos of an EPP may revolve around system and
administration concerns rather than examining individual TE’s dispositions. However, it
is assumed that TEs already possess professional dispositions modeled to preservice
teachers. Using dispositions instead of beliefs, Raths (2001) proposed three dispositions
of knowledge, colleagueship, and advocacy as goals for teacher education. Again, these
goals do not examine the dispositions of the TEs and whether or not the TEs modeled,
practiced, and employed these dispositions for their preservice teachers.

The USDOE released a draft of regulations to monitor the success of teacher
education graduates by how well their K-12 students perform on standardized
assessments. Even after two years of meeting with professionals in the field, the
regulations were met with strong opposition during the public comment period. Colleges,
universities, teacher unions, and teacher education associations, such as American
Association of College for Teacher Education (ACCTE) and The Association for Teacher
Educators (ATE), commented strongly against these regulations; while non-profits, such
as the National Council for Teacher Quality (NCTQ) and alternative teaching licensure
programs, such as Teach for American (TFA) and the New Teacher project, indicate
support for such reform (Sawchuk, 2015). Interestingly enough, while EPPs are the
center of focus in these new regulations, the TEs and their expertise, knowledge, and
dispositions are not directly considered in this reform.

Research and policy continue to surround how effective traditional EEPs facilitate
preservice teachers’ knowledge. The literature and policymakers continue to emphasize
the retained content knowledge (and rarely pedagogical knowledge) of the preservice
teachers in order to improve pK-12 learners’ academic achievement. However, the TEs’
roles, responsibilities, and dispositions remain ignored when critiquing the effectiveness of EPPs.

**Beliefs About CLD Learners**

“Every philosophy of teacher education presupposes underlying assumptions about teaching and education.” (Hanson, 2005, p.5)

Teachers bring their cultural beliefs and values with them into the classroom. Along with this, teachers bring some misconceptions about cultures to the classrooms, and rarely acknowledge their own attitudes toward culture differences (Banks, 1993). The lack of exposure to cultural differences becomes a cultural disconnect between the students and the teacher, especially as most U.S. public school teachers are white females (Feistritzer, 2011), and the proportion of non-Hispanic whites (majority) students in public schools decreases, as the Hispanic student population continues to increase (Davis & Bauman, 2013). This cultural divide (Zeichner, 2003) continues as a social justice journey for many EPPs since the academic achievement gap between majority and minority students in reading and mathematics only narrowed slightly since the 1990s (Hemphill & Vanneman, 2011; U.S Department of Education, 2013).

Additionally, people have different definitions of culture. Cushner (2014) elaborated on our different definitions of culture, hidden thoughts, and messages that may hinder the students’ and teachers’ understanding of each other. Thus, seeing people and their cultures through multiple perspectives and creating and building relationships with each other are vitally important.
There is a wide swath of literature surrounding the importance of EPPs preparing future teachers for CLD learners, and much research has examined preservice teachers’ identity, biases and/or providing specific courses on multicultural education (Banks, 1993; Nieto, 2002; Sleeter & Grant, 2009) and/or social justice education (Cochran-Smith, 2004, 2008; Francis & le Roux, 2011; Gewirtz, 1998; Grant & Agosto, 2005; Keesing-Styles, 2006; Lee, 2009; McDonald & Zeichner, 2009; McInerney, 2007; Mills, 2009; Mills & Ballantyne, 2010; Mills & Keddie, 2012; Murray, 2010; Olson, & Craig, 2012; Philpott & Dagenais, 2012; Reynolds & Brown, 2010; Sleeter, 2009; Zajda, Majhanovich, & Rust, 2006). While research continues to probe the experiences of preservice and inservice teachers in CLD classrooms, teacher education researchers have overlooked themselves in this same body of research, as well as how they have perceived themselves in the ever-changing CLD classroom. Goodwin et al. (2014) and Loughran (2014) emphasized the need for TEs to reflect on their values and beliefs systems at every stage of development in order to understand diversity and support a socially just approach to teaching, learning, and researching. Using mixed method research, Goodwin et al. (2014) found that less-experienced or pre-tenured TEs had more experience in being prepared about multicultural issues than did their experienced TE peers and those whom identified as white, felt less prepared for multicultural issues. Goodwin et al.’s analysis, when paired with interview data, in general, found multicultural issues are hardly mentioned by any of the TEs. This suggests multicultural and diversity issues are not gaining much attention in professional development for both early and experienced TEs,
Despite the pK-12 classroom becoming more diverse, while the pK-12 teaching force is overwhelmingly white (Feistritzer, 2011; U.S. Department of Education, 2013).

In addition to the aforementioned research, little else is known about TEs’ beliefs and values. What we know from the pK-12 teacher research on beliefs and values and their professional development might further inform us about the TE perspective. Inquiring about inservice teachers’ training on diversity, Deveney (2007) found that “more than 60% of the UK trained teachers who returned a questionnaire (n = 20) had no formal training teaching in diverse classrooms” whereas all but one out of 10 Australian trained teachers and all U.S. trained teachers had formal training (p. 315). Most inservice teachers in Deveney’s study believed they required authentic experiences in the classroom to help bridge the cultural divide. Deveney concluded that even with no formal training about teaching culturally diverse students, inservice teachers still could be effective in the classroom.

On the other hand, direct and authentic experiences are known to provide change in teachers’ beliefs of the CLD others. Ladson-Billings (2009) found experience in the classroom and identifying a transformative moment in teachers’ lives in which they reevaluated their work were key components in their quality of teaching. Likewise, McAllister and Irvine (2002) investigated 34 inservice teachers’ empathetic dispositions as an effective tool when working in a diverse classroom and discovered that all of the teachers believed empathy was a good disposition to use with their diverse learners as both an effective and cognitive concept. Furthermore, research by Kasten et al. (2013) shed light on how literacy TEs prepare their preservice teachers for CLD learners by
investigating the role in which diversity plays in literacy teacher education. In this study, the literacy TEs emphasized direct diverse experiences (e.g., tutoring, field experiences, practicum) and indirect diverse experiences (e.g., class projects, assigned readings, professors, reflections) as avenues in which they promote diversity learning in their EPP courses. Yet, a small number of TEs in this study indicated there is a lack of diversity training for them and/or their own students.

**Preparation for culturally and linguistically diverse learners.** Studies have discovered that both preservice and inservice teachers do not adequately feel prepared to teach diverse students (Castro, 2010; Young, 2010), questioning not only the theory-to-practice disconnect, but inquiring whether or not TEs themselves have enough experience with CLD students. TEs have been criticized by researchers for not “walking the talk” in regard to pedagogical approaches of teaching CLD students (Edwards & Kuhlman, 2007). Preservice teachers need modeling by TEs of what is culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1992, 1995), as well as real and genuine educational cultural experiences to help connect the theory learned in the university classroom into the day-to-day teaching practices.

However, “sometimes teacher educators themselves have not had enough personal or professional experience with students of different racial and ethnic groups to help prospective teachers enact why they are learning about diversity in their teacher education program” (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005, p. 413). Lucas and Grinberg (2005) proposed that TEs do not have enough experiences and exposure to environments in which English is not the TE’s first language and struggle to understand their roles in an
ever-changing world (Ben-Peretz, 2001). Yet, it is often the TEs who serve as the gatekeepers who decide whether or not teacher candidates are skillful and prepared enough to enter their own classrooms (Goodwin & Oyler, 2005; Smith, 2005).

Providing culturally relevant mentoring to preservice teachers throughout their EPP, especially during clinical practice, is one way to help bridge the theory to practice divide (Zozakiewicz, 2010), as preservice teachers realize being a culturally responsive educator extends beyond graduation and into lifelong journey (Edwards & Kuhlman, 2007). Benton-Borghi and Chang (2012) have proposed a systematic assessment that rigorously assesses preservice teachers’ efficacy to teach CLD students. Additionally, Christine Bennett (2001) suggested that EPPs might not be as successful as they think they are in changing preservice teachers’ perspectives on diversity. As such, Bennett mapped clusters and genres of the roots of multicultural education, addressing what she believed are the complexity and multiple perspectives of multiculturalism. By understanding the different historical roots and underpinning of multiculturalism, TEs and preservice and inservice teachers can critically think about the clusters and genres that are interconnected. Bennett believed a new lens and framework of inquiry to teach multicultural education is needed.

Also, being a culturally responsive TE may not always align with educational policy. Investigating how education reforms of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s have affected the teaching of diverse learners, Skerrett and Hargreaves (2008) concluded “increasing standardization undermined the efforts and abilities of change-oriented teachers…to
develop a more multicultural or antiracist curriculum and to be more pedagogically responsive to student diversity” (p. 936).

In his review, Zeichner (2003) highlighted that the social justice and deregulatory and professionalized agendas of educator preparation reform have weaknesses and challenges in providing strategies to recruit and retain the best teachers for all students. Adding to this research is a policy report from Wells (2014) who continued to report there is the “colorblind” myth in educational environments. Through her many recommendations, Wells promoted “an approach to accountability that relies on almost exclusively on standardized tests often has a negative impact on the educational experiences of all children” (p. 14) and the “current colorblind policy focus[es] on standardized testing as the almost exclusive measure of high-achieving students and good schools and teachers does an educational disservice to students of all racial and ethnic backgrounds” (p. 19). The colorblind notion that every student is the same and has the same learning needs adds to the discourse of stereotype threat towards people different from their own groups. Steele and Aronson (1995) define stereotype threat as being “being at risk of conforming, as self-characteristic, a negative stereotype about one’s group” (p. 797). Stereotype threat has been well studied in education psychology. Steele and Aronson found that a stereotype threat toward a particular group’s intellectual ability, effects that group’s academic achievement, especially for black male students and female math performance (Aronson, 2004; Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1998). In addition, stereotype threat also may provide a positive stereotype threat by creating a model minority (Chang & Au, 2009).
**Self-study research of TE beliefs.** Self-studies also provide a better understanding of how TEs understand self and their own beliefs through the practice of reflection—a skill that TEs should develop in their preservice teachers (Smith, 2005). Zeichner (2003, 2005) also argued that TEs should engage and reflect on their own practices. Adhering to such, Grierson (2010) reflected upon her own understanding of her knowledge, beliefs, and values in her new role as a TE, which assisted in facilitating her preservice teachers’ critical reflection of their own values, beliefs, and knowledge about themselves. Specifically, Grierson realized through course evaluations that she was not “walking the talk” (p. 8) and decided to implement reflection journals assignment. The reflection journal assignment provided Grierson with more information to be a more responsive educator as she devoted attention to “deconstructing how instruction practices reflect [personal] beliefs” (p. 7).

This sentiment was also shared by Turner (2013) who used her personal experiences studying South Sudanese adult students and their Australian teachers as fuel to promote reflective practice among her preservice teachers in regard to their ideas about diversity. After class observations and listening to the interviews from the adult students and teachers, Turner altered her teaching philosophy to recognize students’ needs and modified her own teaching methods when needed. “I am far more aware of students’ past learning experiences and the way the values arising from these experiences interact with both my personal values and also with the opportunities generated by the learning environment” (Turner, 2013, p. 88). Due to this finding in her self-study, Turner made it
a personal goal for her preservice teachers to become critically reflective in their practices and beliefs.

TEs are important stakeholders in EPPs, yet they are often neglected in the research involving EPPs. Because of this neglect, we do not know much about them, how they prepare to become TEs and researchers, nor how they implement, facilitate, and model the information to their preservice teachers. Therefore, when it comes to facilitating information about CLD learners, little information is available to understand the TEs’ positions, value, and beliefs and how these attributes facilitate the growth of preservice teachers’ understandings of teaching CLD learners besides what is in self-study research. Additionally, the diversity gap between the students and their inservice teachers continues to widen (Boser, 2014; Dilworth & Coleman, 2014), even as more white preservice teachers enter the field at much higher rates than their non-white counterparts (U.S. Department of Education, 2013). Thus, as important investors to the future generation of teachers, it becomes vital that researchers continue to investigate TEs when addressing the quality of teacher education programs.

**Intercultural Competence Theories**

The ideas of intercultural competence have evolved from various social sciences concepts and theories of management. There are many frameworks and models of intercultural competence (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009), but in this section, I discuss four theories that have helped shape and evolve the discourse and research of intercultural development in various ways. These four theories were chosen based on their connections and research in education settings. While social psychologists Geert
Hofstede and Milton Bennett are foundational leaders in assessing intercultural competence through a positive lens, world language scholar and researcher Michael Byram added a more qualitative dimension, and Darla Deardorff, an intercultural and international education researcher, proposed a multi-method approach to gain better understanding of the complexities found with intercultural development. All four models represent a western lens in understanding intercultural competence. The *SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence* (2009) offers other non-western approaches to intercultural competence and how it is being manifested in those contexts (see Ashwill & Hoang Oanh, 2009; Chen & An, 2009; Manian & Naidu, 2009; Medina-Lopez-Protillo & Sinnigen, 2009; Nwosu, 2009; Ting-Toomey, 2009; Yun Kim, 2009; Zaharna, 2009). For the purpose of this study, the western models are most appropriate given the context and participants involved in this U.S. study, though all models were considered. In the subsequent paragraphs, each intercultural researcher is examined separately.

**Hofstede and the Values Survey Model (VSM).** Hofstede (1980) pioneered the field with his comparative research studying the value of cultures in the workplace of International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) global employees from 1967 to 1973. The large-scale survey, VSM, was conducted twice. Hofstede collected data from over 116,000 employees in 40 countries, aiming to understand cultural values (Hofstede, 1980). From this study, Hofstede determined four dimensions in which people’s cultures seemed to differ: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism versus collectivism, and masculinity versus femininity. Power distance refers to how societies view and handle human inequity, whereas uncertain avoidance is how individuals feel
about ambiguity and uncertainty. The latter included coping with uncertainty of the future and involving concepts of technology, religion, and law. Individualism refers to how one relates to society. Individualism is where one finds responsibility in taking care of oneself and his/her immediate family. On the other hand, collectivism is more communal and includes extended families and groups. Finally, masculinity versus femininity is how societies cope with the dueling sexes (not gender) and how this plays into the social and emotional behaviors of the sexes. Two more cultural dimensions (long-term versus short-term orientation, and indulgence versus restraint) were added later based on research findings from other studies (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Long-term orientation focuses on searching for virtue and truth depending upon the context, whereas short-term orientation emphasizes the absolute truth and tends to have more respect for traditions. Indulgence portrays a society that embraces gratification to have fun and enjoy life, where restraint does the opposite—it suppresses such gratification.

With his first four-dimensional model, Hofstede (1986) focused on student and teacher relationships, especially in classroom environments where the teachers and students come from different cultures. In this, Hofstede (1986) highlighted the importance of language as an important vehicle in culture, suggesting the chances for successful cultural adaptation are better if the teacher is to teach in the students’ language rather than the student is to learn in the teachers’ language, because the teacher has more power over the learning situation than any single student (p. 316). The results of Hofstede’s work produced a theory of intercultural research that continues
to transcend the workplace and education by focusing on the dichotomous split of differences.

**Bennett—DMIS to the IDI.** Unlike Hofstede’s research that produced elements in which people can collaborate by understanding their cultural differences, Milton Bennett created a developmental theory to understand cultural differences. With a sociology and communications background, Milton Bennett (1986, 1993) brought forth the idea of intercultural sensitivity through development continuum with various stages. Bennett expanded on intercultural training strategies promoted by Paige and Martin (1983) by adding a development model that recognizes “that cultures differ fundamentally in the way they create and maintain world views” (p. 181). In this, Bennett combined ideas from other disciplines to form an intercultural sensitivity measurement called DMIS.

Bennett’s DMIS (1986, 1993) focused on six concepts that were equally distributed into two stages, ethnocentric stages (Denial, Defense, Minimization), and ethnorelative stages (Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration). The DMIS assesses individuals as they see themselves as a central figure among varying cultures to the latter stages where they see themselves as one among many cultures. This framework also provides intercultural activities that are developmentally appropriate for the learner. Finally, the DMIS inspired a more current and theoretical instrument called the IDI (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003).

In its third version, Hammer and Bennett established the IDI as a tool that measures how one adapts to cultural situations. Similar to the DMIS, the IDI is designed
as a developmental continuum that identifies individuals’ cultural perspective, which is either an ethnocentric mindset (monocultural) or an ethnorelative mindset (intercultural).

In Figure 1, individuals operating in an ethnocentric perspective are in the developmental stages of Denial, Polarization, and Minimization. However, as individuals shift from Minimization (often known as the transitional stage), a more ethnorelative and intercultural perspective is constructed as one advances to the Acceptance and Adaptation stages.

Each stage is defined in how one sees cultural differences, beginning with lack of seeing or understanding cultural differences (Denial) to changing behavioral patterns and
adapting to cultural differences (Adaptation). Table 1 offers a more comprehensive understanding of how each stage is defined.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Recognizes more observable cultural differences such as food, but may not notice deeper cultural differences, such as conflict resolution styles; may avoid or withdraw from culture differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>Views culture difference in terms of “us” and “them.” Takes on the form of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Defense:</strong> Uncritical view toward one’s own cultural values and practice and an overly critical view toward other cultural values and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reversal:</strong> Overly critical toward one’s own cultural values and practice and an uncritical view toward other cultural values and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>Highlights cultural commonality and universal values and principles that may also mask deeper recognition and appreciation of cultural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Recognizes and appreciates patterns of cultural difference and commonality in one’s own and other cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Capable of shifting cultural perspective and changing behavior in culturally appropriate and authentic ways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Adapted from the “Intercultural Development Inventory Resource Guide” by Mitchell R. Hammer, Ph.D., IDI, LLC. Copyright 1998, 2003, 2007, 2012 Mitchell R. Hammer, IDI, LLC. Adapted with permission. All rights reserved.*

The IDI calculates a developmental orientation score (DO) and a perceived orientation score (PO) of an individual’s intercultural competence. If the gap between DO
and PO is more than seven points, the individual has overestimated his/her intercultural competence. If the gap between PO and DO is less than seven points, the individual has underestimated his/her intercultural competence. Thus, if exactly seven points separate the PO and DO scores, individuals accurately predicted their intercultural development.

The IDI also identifies trailing orientations, leading orientations, and cultural disengagement. Trailing orientations are those that are “in the back” of your development score and are not resolved, whereas the leading orientation is “in front of” your development score. Finally, cultural engagement is the disconnection or detachment from one’s cultural group (Intercultural Development Inventory, 2013). As such, the IDI not only provides individuals intercultural development scores, but also identifies where individuals’ intercultural development trajectory is and the connection individuals have with their own cultural group.

**Byram and the intercultural speaker.** Providing a perspective beyond studying cultural differences that Bennett and Hammer promote, but adding the importance of language that Hofstede (1986) emphasized, Byram’s (1997) focus of intercultural development is highlighted by foreign language teaching and learning. Here, Byram stressed the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed for intercultural competence since individuals identify and use language in social groups. In this, he described the intercultural speaker as one who can navigate the language worlds. In order to navigate these worlds, “the foundation of intercultural competence is in the attitudes of the intercultural speaker and mediator” (Byram, Gribkova, & Starkey, 2002, p. 11). Thus verbal and non-
verbal forms of languages interact with factors, such as knowledge, attitudes, education, skills of interpreting and relating, and skills of discovery and interaction—all of which lead to critical language and cultural awareness (Byram, 2009). These components, called *saviors*, aid individuals in navigating intercultural experiences and are located in Table 2. Sercu (2006) encouraged teachers to implement pedagogical practices that foster the *savoirs* that Byram proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Savoir</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge (savoirs)</td>
<td>of social groups and their products and practices in one’s own and in one’s interlocutor’s country, and of the general processes of societal and individual interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting &amp; Relating (savoir comprendre)</td>
<td>ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents from one’s own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery &amp; Interaction (savoir apprendre/faire)</td>
<td>ability to acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices and the ability to operate knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Cultural Awareness (savoir s’engager)</td>
<td>an ability to evaluate critically and on the basis of explicit criteria perspectives, practices and products in one’s own and other cultures and countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural attitudes (savoir être)</td>
<td>curiosity &amp; openness, readiness to suspend disbelief about other cultures and belief in one’s own</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Byram proposed that intercultural experiences occur when individuals
with different values, beliefs, and behaviors (e.g., cultures) meet in an authentic
experience. This occurrence is not just environmental, but is between languages
and across social boundaries (Byram, 2008). However, to become intercultural,
one must reflect, analyze, and focus attention on the intercultural experience, both
internally and externally with others. Byram (1997) realized that the knowledge,
skills, and attitudes could not be easily assessed and, therefore, called for a
portfolio-based assessment that reflects a self-assessment intercultural process.
The portfolio process was adopted by the Council of Europe Language Policy
Department to aid language teachers in creating an intercultural dimension to
learning language skills, attitudes, and knowledge.

Byram’s framework brings intercultural competence to the forefront of
foreign language studies, but it did so through a social identity lens rather than a
linguistic one since social identity relates to cultures (Byram, 2002, 2009).
Because we cannot know everything about all cultures, especially as cultures are
changing and/or adapting with the rise of globalization and with our identities
changing as we experience new opportunities such as language learning, we must
be able to adjust to the new identities (Byram, 2002). Even though Byram’s
ideology is framed in the foreign language domain, it is not limited to the foreign
language context, thus expanding our understanding of intercultural development
in an educational context.
Deardorff and education. Though Hofstede provided a foundation to intercultural competence, Bennett’s DMIS and Byram’s framework are triggers to view intercultural competence as more than just a skill set, but as a framework to understand intercultural interactions. Deardorff (2006) challenged scholars in the way intercultural competence is defined and assessed as a way to create a process model of intercultural competence. As shown in Figure 2, Deardorff’s model represents intercultural attitudes, skills, and knowledge derived from a personal outcome and/or external outcome. Individuals can produce both interpersonal and internal outcomes of intercultural attitudes, knowledge and skills. However, producing only an external outcome such as behaving and communicating in an intercultural way, does not shift one’s frame of reference. It is by internalizing the process that an individual fully participates in the process model in which a shift in a frame of reference occurs. Therefore, an external outcome can be seen as intercultural, but it’s truly not intercultural until an internal outcome also transpires. Thus, the degree of intercultural competence depends on the attitudes, knowledge and skills, rather than just focusing on skills (Bennett, 1986, 1993; Hammer et al., 2003; Hofstede, 1980; 2010) and interactions among the various elements.
Summary. Four models represent the concepts of intercultural development that are discussed within an education context. Hofstede, a Dutch social psychologist, began his intercultural research in the field of business, examining ways in which IBM global employees from different cultures and context could forge better understanding of each other to enhance collaboration. On the other hand, Bennett was influenced by his years working in Micronesia as a U.S. Peace Corps Volunteer and established his career around intercultural training and assessing intercultural sensitivity. He is most well-known for DMIS, which was adopted by many corporations, international exchange programs, and other organizations, and is the basis for a newer tool, the IDI (Hammer et al., 2003). Byram has provided different perspectives of understanding intercultural competence.
through a sociocultural lens that emphasized an intercultural speaker. Through world language acquisition, Byram (1997) proposed five saviors [knowledge] that aid in steering toward positive intercultural experiences, which are best assessed through a collection of reflections. Last, Deardorff (2006) expressed the benefits of understanding intercultural competence in higher education and offered a model that not only explores the intercultural knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviors, and attitudes externally, but also provides an internal dimension that is pivotal in encouraging more valuable external results.

While Hofstede and Bennett have provided frameworks that have pushed the dialogue of intercultural development by examining cultural differences, and Byram embraced an intercultural communicative approach that included sociolinguistics as the central feature, Deardorff (2004, 2006, 2009b, 2011) promoted a multi-method approach to intercultural competence. What binds these conceptual frameworks of intercultural competence is the willingness to understand each other and to build relationships with each other despite cultural differences.

**Defining Intercultural Competence in Education**

*Intercultural competence is about our relationships with each other, and ultimately, our very survival as the human race, as we work together to address the global challenges that confront us* (Deardorff, 2009a, p. 269).

Defining and assessing intercultural skills, knowledge, and attitudes is challenging since intercultural development is constantly evolving from numerous frameworks and assessments (Deardorff, 2009b; Fantini, 2006, 2009). Deardorff (2006)
found few higher education institutions have specific definitions and methods of assessment for understanding intercultural competence, even if they are promoting avenues to interculturalize and/or internationalize their institutions. Specifically Deardorff gathered 23 scholars from various disciplines in higher education and institutes to discuss defining and assessing intercultural competence (only two individuals outside of the U.S. participated in the study). Deardorff found scholars struggled to agree on a specific definition of intercultural competence and to find a “definition that works with all students in all situations, regardless of their majors” was difficult to propose (p. 247). The administrators used numerous terms that referred to intercultural competence, such as cross-cultural competence, global competence, and global citizenship, while the intercultural scholars showed more differences in their terms in describing intercultural competence than the university administrators, with a focus on communication and behavior. All parties agree that intercultural competence skills encompass not only affective and empathetic attributes such as openness, curiosity, and respect for others, but there is also a cognitive domain of comparative thinking and flexibility in thinking.

Deardorff (2006) also found that the administrators and scholars used an array of assessments to measure students’ intercultural competence, and often the administrators and scholars disagreed on the use of pre-and post-test measures, with the administration heavily in favor of the pre-and post-measures while the scholars were more hesitant about this approach. This continues the debate on whether or not self-reporting measures are the best way to capture intercultural competence growth. Deardorff’s (2006) research is intriguing in that many U.S. universities’ mission statements address components of
culture and diversity in effort to interculturalize their universities (Pearson, 2014) but at the same time, university administrators fail to agree upon how they will develop and assess whether or not their students are more intercultural when they leave the universities.

**Assessing Intercultural Competence in Education**

The multiple definitions and understandings of intercultural competence contribute to the large number of assessments geared toward determining cultural competence. There are over 80 assessments, including the IDI, that measure some component of cultural competency (Fantini, 2006; 2009; Institute for Intercultural Communication, 2013). Some of these assessments include Intercultural Conflict Style Inventory (ICS) (Hammer, 2005), Global Competencies Inventory (GCI) (Mendenhall, Stevens, Bird, & Oddou, 2008a), the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES) (Mendenhall, Stevens, Bird, & Oddou, 2008b), Intercultural Readiness Check (IRC) from the Intercultural Business Improvement in the Netherlands, and the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992). It can be hypothesized that the cost of each assessment is relative to its established validity and reliability; thus the IDI with its higher costs may not be easily accessible to all, especially those in education.

Van de Vijver and Leung (2009) have proposed that the increase of intercultural competence discourse in the past 25 years introduced a variety of intercultural frameworks; assessing these frameworks using empirical data is greatly needed. Specifically, Van de Vijver and Leung addressed the external validity, sample sizes, and design procedures of intercultural research studies which often show “favorable findings
regarding internal validity” (p. 413), and the results from these assessments are often not applicable to other groups in intercultural experiences. They also believed a challenge exists to which language is being used for the assessment among other methodological biases (e.g., western approach to intercultural competence) that may hinder the true assessment of such scales.

Furthermore, Fantini (2009) challenged those creating intercultural competence assessments to understand the focus of assessment. In addition to the lack of agreement on definitions and overlapping terms for intercultural competence (e.g., communicative competence, global mindedness, cross-cultural awareness), assessment quality is also needed. Fantini found intercultural assessments to be quite varied in that some instruments are predictive while others may be more formative, summative, and/or normative, and often the language used in the assessment is not addressed (p. 465). Therefore, when determining the appropriate intercultural assessment tool, one must be very explicit and cognizant of the following:

- Is the tool compatible with your goals and objectives?
- Does it improve your overall assessment plan?
- Is it based on theoretical foundation?
- Does it have a cultural bias, or can it be used for any ethnic or national group?
- Is it appropriate for the age level and developmental level of those involved?
- What logistical aspects are involved in administering the tool, including cost, time, and other resources needed?
- Who are the results intended for?
Like Fantini (2006, 2009), Deardorff (2009b) proposed five steps in assessing intercultural competence. The first step is defining intercultural competence so individuals know what is being assessed. Next, individuals should examine the purpose of the assessment by prioritizing goals and determine certain elements that should be assessed. After such is completed, the individuals should state the goals and learning outcomes of what should be reached (Lou, Vande Berg, & Paige, 2012). It is important to emphasize that these goals and learning outcomes should be measurable. Once this task is complete, individuals should examine their available resources and create an assessment plan. Individuals can access such tools from the Intercultural Communication Institute’s online resources, as well as information from Fantini (2006, 2009). The chosen assessments should align with the previous steps, as well as incorporate the questions proposed by Fantini.

Deardorff (2006, 2009b) encouraged a multi-method and multi-perspective stance toward assessing the complex notion of intercultural competence; therefore, multiple tools should be considered. However, Deardorff (2009b) has cautioned that the multi-method and multi-perspective should be balanced and prioritized and not haphazardly put together. Finally, assigning a timeline and evaluating the process concludes the assessment plan. Knowing when to collect, analyze, interpret, and write the results of the data are critical to the overall process of the providing the intercultural competence assessment. Reporting and communicating results are very important in furthering the
field and its knowledge of intercultural competence. In this, individuals typically decipher the limitations of the study through an evaluation asking questions such as:

- What worked?
- What was missing?
- What could have been better implemented?

**Summary.** Though Deardorff (2009b) highlighted steps to help avoid pitfalls and challenges, it is equally important to understand that she and Fantini (2009) offer suggestions on assessing intercultural competence that can be ascertained by other research agendas. Assessing intercultural competence can be an intimidating undertaking with an array of tools and varied definitions. Van de Vijver and Leung (2009) also remind us that many of these assessment tools lack research that provides a deeper understanding of the tool’s external validity and reliability. By following the steps provided by Deardorff and critically questioning the assessment protocol (Fantini, 2009), we begin critical and thoughtful understanding of the total process to consider assessing for intercultural development. However, the questions of whether or not intercultural competence should be assessed and how it can be assessed have yet to be answered (Deardorff, 2006).

**Intercultural Competence Research in Education**

The ideas of culturally relevant pedagogy, multiculturalism, cultural competence, intercultural competence, and international mindedness and/or globalization are important characteristics with the possibility of developing perspectives to create an inclusive and intercultural learning and teaching environment; oftentimes, the terms are
used interchangeably. In fact, Hunter (2014) viewed intercultural education as compatible to the existing multicultural education efforts in teacher education. However, for the present study, it is important to note that the terms are not interchangeable, and each term is defined separately. While some researchers explored ways in which teachers and educators can continue to develop and grow with a more internationally minded and/or globalized pedagogical approach to teaching and learning (Dooly & Villanueva, 2006; Duckworth et al., 2005; Hill, 2012; Hunter & Pearson, 2014; Lee, 2007; Levy, 2010; Longview Foundation, 2008; Lunenberg & Willemse, 2006; Tamo et al., 2012; Wang, et al., 2011; Woolf, 2011; Zhao, 2010), others have integrated facets of intercultural competence into teaching and learning (Byram, 2008; Byram & Feng, 2005; Clay & George, 2000; Cushner, 1998, 2011; DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Emert, 2008; Grossman & Yuen, 2006; Lundgren, 2007; Mahon, 2006, 2009; Meade, 2010; McMillon, 2009; O’Neill, 2008; Sercu, 2006; Straffon, 2003; Valverde, 2010; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2004, 2010).

**Evidence.** When specifically examining intercultural competence in teacher education, no studies in the current review addressed the TEs’ intercultural skills, attitudes, and knowledge. A few studies attended to preservice and inservice teachers’ intercultural skills, knowledge, and/or attitudes (Emert, 2008; Lundgren, 2007; McMillon, 2009; O’Neill, 2008; Sercu, 2006). The studies that used IDI as the assessment tool revealed that inservice teachers commonly belong in the ethnocentric stages of development (Denial, Polarization, Minimization) of intercultural competence (Bayles, 2009; DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Grossman & Yuen, 2006; Mahon, 2006; 2009;
Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010). In a large-scale study involving 386 secondary teachers and nine schools in Hong Kong, Yuen (2010) found that the overall DO mean score was 82.83, putting the teachers in the Denial (ethnocentric stage). The overall PO mean was 117.69, which exceeds the gap of seven points indicating that, on average, the teachers overestimated their intercultural competence. Westrick and Yuen (2007) discover that inservice teachers from an international school produce a more advanced ethnocentric score and the smallest gap between the PO and DO when compared to three other non-international schools in Hong Kong. These findings possibly suggest that an international school and its various international attributes may contribute to further development of intercultural competence in its teachers compared to those in non-international schools.

Addressing the educational inequities in their area in the U.S., DeJaeghere and Cao (2009) assessed 86 American, urban, Midwestern elementary teachers’ development of intercultural competence using a pre- and post-test after district-wide professional development sessions were given within a two- to three-year span. After a series of professional development sessions throughout a two-and-a half to four-year period, the overall DO and PO mean scores increased. The changes between the DO scores were statistically significant and carried a moderate effect $F(1, 85) = 18.39, p < .001, d = 0.46$. The changes between the PO scores, however, revealed a large effect and significance $F(1, 85) = 30.98, p < .001, d = 0.57$. These results propose that guided professional development for teachers, over a period of time, can aid in the preparation and development of one’s intercultural competence even without an immersion experience.
Mahon (2006) used the IDI and assessed 155 elementary and secondary teachers from nine schools in urban, suburban, and rural schools in the Midwestern section of the U.S. without using a professional development as an intervention. Only 2.5% of the teachers scored in the lower end of an ethnorelative mindset (Acceptance), while the majority, 60.7% scored in Minimization, 8.4% in Defense and 8.4% in Denial. While age, previous travel, and ethnicity were shown to be significant on three scales, the ethnicity factor suggested further research since “whites were shown to have a tendency to agree more with constructs on the ethnocentric denial scale, while non-whites agreed more with the ethnorelative scales” (p. 402). In addition, it would have been productive to examine the PO scores with DO scores in respect to each type of school (rural, urban, suburban) to further the understanding of these teachers’ intercultural development through the use of the IDI.

What is alarming is that the majority of teachers participating in research projects worldwide, score in the ethnocentric stage, and other research findings have shown students are scoring further than their teachers in the development stages of IDI (Pederson, 1998; Straffon, 2003). Straffon (2003) examined 168 high school students attending an international school in a large Southeastern Asian city and discovered “most students had DO scores in the Acceptance stage with a second large group in the Adaptation stage; both of which represent an ethnorelative worldview” (p. 498). Furthermore, the longer a student had been in the international school, the better score the student obtained in regard to intercultural sensitivity. This research suggested that those
who study in international schools for a longer amount of time possess more developed levels of intercultural sensitivity.

Expanding upon her study and potentially adhering to Deardorff’s (2006, 2009) call for a multi-perspective assessment of intercultural competence, Mahon (2009) examined 88 teachers’ intercultural development and their ability to handle conflict. In her study, teachers were assessed by the IDI v2 and The Thomas–Kilmann Conflict Inventory (TKI). Like the IDI, the TKI is a self-reported measure that assesses one’s behavior in conflict situations, specifically along the two dimensions of cooperativeness and assertiveness (CPP, 2009).

Mahon (2009) reported that the teachers’ overall DO mean score was 96.50 ($SD = 15.66$) and an overall PO mean of 112.11 ($SD = 5.68$), showing on average that the teachers operated in lower levels of Minimization and predicted themselves in higher levels of Minimization. Mahon also discovered the cooperation index of the TKI did predict IDI levels of the DO score. This finding is interesting given that the IDI does not address cooperativeness and given that the teachers did not bring up a theme of cooperativeness in their interviews (Mahon, 2009).

The aforementioned studies highlight the literature on intercultural development for teachers and students with studies often placing teachers in the ethnocentric mindset (DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Grossman & Yuen, 2006; Mahon, 2006, 2009; Westrick & Yuen, 2007), and sometimes the majority of teachers are operating at lower levels of the ethnocentric mindset (Yuen, 2010). Other studies found students score more often in the ethnorelative mindset, suggesting that students are displaying more advanced levels of
intercultural development than teachers (Pederson, 1998; Straffon, 2003). Additionally, no information was found that examined TEs’ development of intercultural competence. If we observe the lifecycle of a preservice teacher, we know the TE might serve an important role in developing both preservice and inservice teachers’ intercultural competence. The absence of literature on TEs and intercultural development is a gap within this field of research and is essential to address if we are to push for an interculturally competent teacher workforce.

**Summary**

Who are our TEs? How do we know what skills, knowledge, values, attitudes, beliefs, and dispositions they carry into their teaching and research practices? It is clear that we know little information about TEs (Ben-Peretz et al., 2010; Goodwin et al., 2014; Wood & Borg, 2010) and to what extent they recognize their values and beliefs in their teaching practices (Loughran, 2014). While self-study research (see Beeman-Cadwallader et al., 2014; Grierson, 2010; McDonough & Brandenburg, 2012; Turner, 2013; Williams & Power, 2010) provide some knowledge to this research field, claims were made that TEs may lack experience and training in actually preparing preservice teachers for working with CLD learners (Edwards & Kuhlman, 2007; Lucas & Grinberg, 2005; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). Thus, exploring and examining TEs’ understanding of interculturalism and how they think about and teach for interculturalism, provides support to the lack of research on TEs’ and how they prepare preservice teachers for CLD classrooms.
As intercultural development crosses into the field of education, it is imperative to examine such literature with a critical eye. Conceptual frameworks and assessments of intercultural competence are evolving, and one must attend to appropriate planning when researching intercultural competence (Deardorff, 2009b; Fantini, 2009). Knowing the difficulties in developing a common understanding of intercultural competence and the demand for EPPs to provide the skills, knowledge, and attitudes of intercultural development, driving the dialogue of intercultural education as a means of fostering interculturally competent teachers, has been suggested (Cushner, 1998; Cushner & Mahon, 2009). Cushner (2011) has argued “facilitating intercultural awareness, sensitivity, and development of novice classroom teachers may be the precursor [to social justice] necessary before such change can occur” (p. 602). However, research on intercultural development in education is focused primarily on inservice teachers (Bayles, 2009; DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Grossman & Yuen, 2006; Mahon, 2006, 2009; Yuen, 2010). More research is needed not only in how to prepare preservice and inservice teachers to develop intercultural skills, knowledge, and attitudes, but to ensure these elements are known and applied by TEs to further facilitate preservice teachers’ learning.

Zhao (2010) called for more culturally competent teachers and a more global approach to teacher preparation vaguely addressing the TE, while Hunter and Pearson (2014) recently highlighted interculturalizing teacher education. Still, little research has displayed the understanding of TEs’ identities nor their intercultural development. The need to address this imbalance does not lie solely within the frame of multicultural education, where similarities and differences of cultures are recognized for more
equitable education opportunities (Banks, 1993), but instead needs to expand to further inquire about one’s own identity. Oftentimes, multicultural education focuses on the importance of social justice with emphasis on systematic change (Hunter, 2014). Nevertheless, Cushner (2011) argued that the social justice approach may not be enough to help future teachers understand social inequities, to bring about change, and to build their global competence. Cushner suggested an intercultural approach should warrant more attention as it promotes multiple perspectives and mutual understanding, as well as reflecting internally allows one to produce external outcomes that are more interculturally appropriate (Deardorff, 2006).

Intercultural competence often is examined from the relationship between teachers and students and the relationship between the TEs and preservice teachers is ignored. An implication of preparing pK-16 students to be global citizens and interculturally competent may hinge on the intercultural skills of not only the pK-12 teacher, but also on those preparing pK-12 teachers. Thus, in teaching for intercultural development, TEs need to acknowledge themselves and their beliefs before they can facilitate or model for their preservice teachers (Cushner, 2014).

Further research is needed to expand on intercultural competency not only as a skill set for preservice and inservice teachers, but to include intercultural education and intercultural interactions (Cushner, 2011; Deardorff, 2006). Calling upon TEs not only to facilitate and model the knowledge, skills, and attitudes in developing intercultural competence for preservice and inservice teachers is important, but also discovering where TEs are developmentally in intercultural competence is equally as important. It is
important for TEs to understand where they are developmentally in intercultural competence in order to teach and develop it within others (Shaklee & Merz, 2012).

Cushner (2011) has reminded us that those who can develop and continue to develop intercultural competence are more effective in understanding diverse perspectives in making decisions and taking action. Additionally, teacher professional development is needed to understand cultural differences, cultural beliefs, and the diverse student perceptions of learning (Yuen, 2010). There is much ahead for TEs as there is “a need for more in-depth and supported cross-cultural interactions in our preparation programs to support our students in developing competencies” (Mahon, 2009, p. 54).

However, the conversation does not end here, as TEs need to ensure they are developmentally ready to facilitate intercultural development. In fact, they also may need mentoring in the process.

As such, this dissertation addressed the aforementioned issues to further add to the body of intercultural research in educational settings by including TEs’ understandings, perspectives, and reflections of interculturalism; how they incorporate intercultural components in their university classrooms; and whether or not the IDI influences the way they think about and teach interculturalism. In the next chapter, I review the methodology and RQs that address the aforementioned challenges brought forth by literature.
CHAPTER THREE

The research design and methods for this study are outlined and discussed in this chapter. This study employed qualitative research methods with complementary descriptive statistics to answer the RQs. In this study, I explored the TEs’ understandings of interculturalism, as well as to what extent and in what ways these TEs incorporate interculturalism in their university educator preparation program (EPP) courses. These points of inquiry provided information on how future teachers are being prepared in developing their intercultural skills, knowledge, and attitudes, as well as how these TEs come to understand interculturalism. To investigate these perspectives and processes, data were collected from individual interviews, course syllabi and rubrics, and IDI scores. Thus, the following RQs were asked:

1. What are these TEs’ understandings of interculturalism?
2. To what extent, and in what ways, did these TEs’ IDI results influence how they think about interculturalism?
3. To what extent, and in what ways, do these TEs incorporate interculturalism in their educator preparation courses?

Qualitative Inquiry

Qualitative research aims to provide an in-depth understanding of specific phenomenon that is often subjective. Investigating this phenomenon is usually
accomplished through observations, interviews, and documentation (Patton, 2015). For Maxwell (2005), the qualitative processes are iterative and flexible, allowing for changes as new processes or data emerge. Similarly, Denzin and Lincoln (2011) affirmed that qualitative research takes on different forms as the field of context changes due to the interpretive manners that “make the world more visible” as one explores the phenomena in its natural setting (p. 3). For me, it was important to explore what one university’s EPPs were doing to interculturalize their EPPs through the implementation of an IB framework, as well as their efforts to internationalization their EPPs’ curricula.

**Interpretivism**

As such, my philosophical perspective for this research study was interpretivism. The interpretative paradigm positions me to “discover and understand how people feel, perceive, and experience the social world, aiming to gain in-depth meanings and particular motivations for their behaviors” (Chen, Shek & Bu, 2011, p. 129). An interpretivist paradigm assumes meanings are not static and that they change based on different interaction and experiences and requires me, the researcher, to interpret the participants’ actions and meanings (Schwandt, 2000). For this study, the interpretivist paradigm was most appropriate as I searched to explore meanings of a specific phenomenon (interculturalism) within its natural setting (EPPs) by understanding the interconnected subjective perspectives and meanings that emerged from the data.

**Mixed Methodology**

I also employed a mixed-methods component to this study by integrating the descriptive statistics from the participants’ IDI results and the intercultural VALUE
rubric scores. These descriptive statistics are housed within a quantitative paradigm that is more objective in explaining the truth, while the qualitative data surrounds a subjective nature of understanding the phenomena. As such, I implemented Greene’s (2007) dialectical approach for mixed methods that allowed the data to “engage” in conversation with each other, given that the data came from different methodological paradigms. The dialectical approach provided an avenue to integrate the numeric data (IDI and intercultural VALUE rubric score) with the verbal and text data (interviews, syllabi, program documents, researcher memos and notes). Therefore, the mixing allows for a conversation between the qualitative and quantitative data (Greene, 2007) by providing “two ways of thinking” (Maxwell, 2010, p. 477) in how these participants understand interculturalism, especially in regard to the teaching and learning processes.

**Research Design**

Originally, I expected to have a larger sample and planned to engage in a full mixed-method research design. However, as the consents were collected and the sample size was established, I decided to focus on what emerged from the data rather than exploring how the quantitative data (IDI scores) would relate to the qualitative data since I no longer could employ a narrow approach of inquiry that measured differences and correlations between the IDI and demographic variables (Maxwell & Loomis, 2003) at a macro level (Irwin, 2008; James, 1984) due to my small sample population. Thus, RQ2 was rewritten to focus on the influences the IDI score had on the TEs’ ways of thinking and teaching instead of the IDI’s relationship to the way the TEs thought about and teach for interculturalism.
In designing a qualitative research study, Maxwell (2005) has recommended an interactive research design that allows for flexible relationships between the RQs and the research components (research goals, conceptual frameworks, methods, and validity). Through such design, Maxwell stated data is collected through an interactive, reflective, and inductive approach that explores the processes, meanings, and contexts of a social experience. By creating flexible relationships in my research design, I sought to explore these TEs’ intercultural development practices in their university education settings.

From Figure 3, the RQs are the central focus of the research design, connecting all components. The top of the design indicates that research goals, conceptual framework, and RQs are all influenced by each other. The bottom of the design indicates that methods, validity, and RQs are intently integrated. The dotted lines indicate the flexibility or “giving” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 5-6) of relationships among the research design components.
Research Setting

The research for this study was conducted at a large research university originally founded as a teacher-training school (normal university). To remain anonymous, the university is referred to as Midland University (MU). MU purposefully was selected because the College of Education added the International Baccalaureate (IB) certification in teaching and learning in two of its EPPs. It is the intention of these EPPs to use these initiatives not only to better prepare their future teachers for the ever-changing world, but
also to begin the conversation about how EPPs might integrate intercultural education across the curricula in their school settings. While the specific demographics of the student and faculty populations in MU’s College of Education were unavailable, within MU’s university system, including all campuses, more than 75% of the undergraduate student population identifies as White in 2014. For the faculty, only gender and minority percentages of the faculty populations were available, and over 50% of the faculty identified as female, while less than 13% of the faculty identified as African-American or Black, Hispanic or Latino, Native American or Alaskan Native, or international.

**Program Context- IB Certification**

The IB, which is often known for its K-12 schools, extended its network beyond the K-12 school establishments and has sought collaboration with university EPPs. MU is just one of 22 universities from around the world that has established a partnership with the IB educational foundation to develop a curriculum that prepares their pre and inservice teachers for the ever-changing world. This partnership has allowed MU EPPs to expand IB’s teacher professional development by offering the IB certifications in teaching and learning in one of the four IB Programmes. For MU, the IB partnership specifically involved MU employing IB certifications programs into two of its EPPs in order to promote IB’s mission of preparing students to develop “the intellectual, personal, emotional, and social skills needed to live, learn, and work in a rapidly globalizing world” (International Baccalaureate, n.d.).

The IB, founded in 1968 in Switzerland, originally delivered its interdisciplinary and globally focused on Diploma Programme for students aged 16-19. Since the 1990s,
IB extended its internationally minded curricula and programs to elementary-aged children through the Primary Years Programme (PYP) and for middle school children through the Middle Years Programme (MYP). Recently, the IB also added the Career Related Programme that prepares students aged 16-19 for career-related and lifelong learning experiences. These four IB Programmes provide an integrative approach to address 21st-Century skills needed to be a global citizen. For example, the IB PYP “focuses on the development of the whole child as an inquirer, both in the classroom and in the world outside,” and “is defined by six transdisciplinary themes of global significance, explored using knowledge and skills derived from six subject areas (language, social studies, math, arts, sciences and physical, social, and personal education), with a powerful emphasis on inquiry-based learning” (International Baccalaureate, n.d.). Schools who wish to use the IB curriculum and/or program must be authorized by the IB to do so.

Similar to its K-12 programs, the IB certification in teaching and learning focuses on inquiry, action, and reflection for pre and inservice teachers, preparing teachers for a future with one of IB’s 3,000 schools and/or experience learning and teaching with an internationally minded, integrated, and interdisciplinary curricula tailored to specific age groups. The domains of knowledge that center around this curriculum are an internationalized curricula processes, learning and teaching theories, varied assessment strategies, and the importance of reflective practices as a means for long-term professional development (International Baccalaureate, 2014.) It is the intention of MU’s EPPs to use IB-specific initiatives to not only better prepare their future teachers for the
ever-changing world, but to also begin the conversation on how EPPs might integrate intercultural development across their curricula.

Participants

The participants in this study were selected because they had preexisting IDI scores. Twenty-seven faculty members (26 females, 1 male) in MU’s College of Education had completed the IDI within the past four years. From the 27 individuals who qualified for this study, 10 consented to participate in this study. To maintain anonymity, I wrote about the participants holistically rather than describing each participant individually.

All 10 participants were female and were associated with the following age groups: 31-40 (n = 2), 41-50 (n = 3), and 51-60 (n = 5). Two participants identify as an ethnic minority. The participants average 9.25 years of teaching in a pK-12 setting and also averaged 13 years of teaching in a post-secondary teacher education program. Only one TE did not have pK-12 teaching experience. Nine of the 10 participants earned a PhD in an education related field. The participants prepared preservice teachers in the following content areas: art, music, language arts, education foundations, science, social studies, history, and literacy, and taught in one or more of the following EEPs: early childhood, elementary, middle school, and/or secondary education.

Five participants did not live nor work in another country besides the U.S., while three participants had lived and/or worked abroad for less than three months, and two participants lived and worked abroad for over 10 years. Moreover, five participants communicate in another language besides their mother tongue language, and, among
these participants, four still communicate in that language today. Five participants did not communicate in another language.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age Rang</th>
<th>Ethnic Minority</th>
<th>Yrs TEd&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Yrs PrK12&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>N/A&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>=Years in Teacher Education in Higher Education, <sup>b</sup>=Years in PrK-12 classroom, <sup>c</sup>=Not available. N= No, Y=Yes.

Data Sources

The qualitative data sources in this study include the participant interviews, course syllabi, course rubrics, and my research notes and reflections. The descriptive data sources for this study are the participants’ IDI scores and the self-reported scores from the intercultural VALUE rubric. The participants’ IDI scores were preexisting data since the participants took this inventory for a variety of reasons not related to this research.

Interviews. One semi-structured qualitative interview was conducted for each participant. The semi-structured interview protocol provided suggested questions that assist in guiding the interview (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). The interview questions were
influenced by previous studies involving international teachers (Merz, Shaklee, & Habib, 2014) and were piloted in the summer of 2014 with four TEs not included in this study. After each interview during the pilot phase, interview questions were restructured to address the RQs being asked. In the final pilot interview, the interview protocol was fluid and had elasticity to allow for flexibility.

Eight interviews were conducted face-to-face in the participants’ office space, while one interview was conducted via telephone, and the last interview was via Skype. The interviews ranged from 48 to 124 minutes, despite all interviews using the same semi-structured interview protocol (see Appendix A). The mean time to complete an interview was 75 minutes. The median length of the interviews was 67 minutes. In addition to the individual interviews, course syllabi and program documents were examined when provided.

**Intercultural VALUE rubric.** The intercultural VALUE rubric is a copyrighted product of Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) (2010) edited by Terrel L. Rhodes and based upon intercultural competence theories of Bennett (1986, 1993) and Deardorff (2006). The intercultural VALUE rubric consists of six criteria on a scale from the lowest of 1 to the highest of 4. I was given permission to modify the rubric by AAC&U in order to have the rubric address the context of a teacher education course/syllabus rather than an intended intercultural exchange. The modified intercultural VALUE rubric still comprised of six criteria, and created a continuum scale from the lowest of 1 to the highest of 4. The six criteria include two components of each concept: Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes. Knowledge emphasized the cultural self-awareness and
knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks. Skills highlighted empathy when reflecting on intercultural experiences, as well as complex understanding needed for verbal and nonverbal communication. The attitudes criterion addressed the curiosity of cultures and the openness needed for intercultural interactions. For more information regarding the rubric, refer to Appendix B. During the interview, the participants completed the rubric and scored their course(s) based upon what they believed they incorporated in their EPP courses.

**IDI.** The preexisting data from the IDI were used in this study. The IDI is an online, cross-culturally valid, and reliable instrument that evaluates one’s intercultural competence on a development continuum (Hammer, 2011; Hammer et al., 2003; Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, & DeJaeghere, 2003). The IDI v3 is a 50-item theory-based instrument that requires a qualified person to administer the tool. Individuals taking the inventory complete 46 statements using a Likert scale of strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree. Along with the psychometric scales, four open-ended questions are answered to provide context to the cultural experiences of the individual taking the assessment. An additional six customized demographic questions are also included. The average time it takes to complete the IDI is approximately 30 minutes, and it can be administered in 15 different languages.

The IDI provides PO and DO of participants’ intercultural development, trailing and leading orientations, cultural disengagement, as well as demographic participant information. The PO is calculated based upon the mean values of all scales (Denial, Defense, Reversal, Minimization, Acceptance, Adaptation) whereas the DO “is
calculated using a weighted formula in which scale mean scores of Denial, Defense, Reversal, and Minimization (ethnocentric stage) are weighted and calculated compared to scale mean scores of Acceptance and Adaptation (ethnorelative stage)” (Hammer, 2012, p. 32). For this study, the IDI PO and DO scores were used to provide an additional lens of how TEs think and teach for interculturalism.

The IDI’s theoretical groundwork evolved from Bennett’s (1986, 1993) Development Measure of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), providing a developmental continuum in which one develops his/her intercultural sensitivity through three ethnocentric stages (Denial, Polarization, Minimization) and two ethnorealative stages (Acceptance, Adaptation). In the ethnocentric stages, individuals relate difference toward others through their own cultural perspective. In the ethnorealative stages, individuals begin to shift their cultural views, perspectives, and their attitudes in the context of other cultures, rather than just their own cultural view. Individuals begin to shift from the ethnocentric stages and into the ethnorealative stages during the latter part of the Minimization stage. For more information on each stage of the IDI, please refer to Table 1 in Chapter Two.

The IDI was validated through a number of studies and possesses strong cross-cultural reliability, both internationally and domestically (Hammer, 2011; Hammer et al., 2003), and has no cultural bias or social desirability effects (Paige et al., 2003). Each version of the IDI (1998, 2003, 2010) underwent iterations of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to test the validation of the
instrument and reliability of the data. For more information on how the IDI was constructed and validated, see Appendix C.

The IDI scores in this study consisted of pre-existing data, since the IDI was administered to the 27 participants as part of a grant-funded initiative involving internationalization of teacher education, as well as for faculty who would be working with the IB certification in teaching and learning. All 27 TEs volunteered to take the IDI. Prior to this study, the IDI pre-existing data was not analyzed or used for any research.

It is normal routine after completing the IDI, to meet with the qualified administrator who administered the IDI. This meeting, called a follow-up session, is typically done individually and the qualified administrator explains the tool and the results. In this study’s sample, one participant received an individual follow-up session, while three participants had a group follow-up session. Six participants did not have follow-up sessions after completing the IDI, and two of the five participants never requested to see their IDI scores. The individual and/or group follow-up sessions were 15-30 minute conversations that allowed the IDI qualifying administrator to provide information about the tool’s report and answer questions the individuals may have about their IDI scores.

**Course syllabi and rubrics.** While self-reporting information from the intercultural VALUE rubric, three participants provided copies of their syllabi to me and associated rubrics. I also emailed the seven remaining participants for a copy of their syllabi and/or rubrics that they referenced while completing the intercultural VALUE rubric. However, only one participant responded to this email and attached their syllabi
and/or rubrics. The syllabi and rubrics provided an additional source of information that I could use to help me understand specific portions of interviews, or questions regarding an assignment that was discussed during the intercultural VALUE rubric exercise. This request became very important as often I noticed that TEs understand what they are teaching very well, but as an outsider to the university, the program and its curriculum, I often had follow-up questions regarding their activities. Thus, the syllabi and rubrics that were available provided additional data sources that supplemented what was clearly stated or not stated during the interview.

**Researcher notes/reflections.** My researcher notes and reflections were also used to supplement my understanding of what transpired during the interviews. My notes written during the interview captured non-verbal communication as well as emotions and behaviors that the participant displayed. These notes became very useful when transcribing the interviews as I could include the descriptors that could not be captured on the audio recordings. Additionally, after each interview, I wrote a few reflective notes about the interview on the interview protocol. These reflective notes were more informal that a researcher memo due to the scribbles on each interviewee’s interview protocol. Typically, these reflective notes addressed my thoughts of how I acted and participated in the interview (which often was a great lesson), overall reaction to the participant’s narrative, allowed me to reflect upon my own biases and assumptions, and my thoughts of what seemed to be emerging from the interview. Often times the latter reflective note also indicated if similar ideas were also displayed from another participant’s interview. The reflective notes became very important as I continued my interviews as I learned to
use the vernacular of the MU’s programs in my following interviews, as well as it assisted me in analyzing the interviews in comparison to another.

**Research Procedure**

Prior to submitting a research application to George Mason University Institutional Review Board (IRB), a one-page email statement, including the purpose of the study, participants’ time obligations to the study, and data sources to be collected, was sent to the MU’s EPPs coordinators via email. Once the approval emails from the selected programs were received, an IRB application was submitted to George Mason University’s IRB. Upon IRB approval (see Appendix D), I obtained the list of the 27 faculty members from a senior researcher on MU’s College of Education faculty. I emailed the 27 faculty members requesting their participation and consent for the study (see Appendix F).

After my first email to the participants, two faculty members consented to the study, four were interested in the study, five declined to participate in the study for various reasons (i.e., leaving university, retiring, lack of interest, disconnected topic) and 16 faculty members did not respond to the inquiry. Three weeks later, a second email was sent to the 16 remaining faculty, and five consented to the study, while two declined to participate. To garner more support and rapport among the remaining faculty, I reached out to a senior researcher on the faculty, who sent emails to the remaining faculty, and soon three faculty members consented to the study and one declined. The senior researcher on MU’s faculty was identified based upon his/her contribution to the field of intercultural education as well as his/her connection to the university. This researcher was
an essential part of the study as he/she provided access to the participants and obtained their pre-existing IDI data to address my RQs (Maxwell, 2005).

In all, 10 TEs consented to the study, eight declined to participate, and nine did not respond to email requests or multiple inquiries after expressing their interest to participate in the study (see Appendix E). Three participants’ consent forms were collected by email. The remaining seven consents were collected prior to the face-to-face interviews.

Six face-to-face interviews were conducted on MU’s campus during September 2014 and two during October 2014. One interview was conducted via telephone and another via Skype in November 2014. During the interviews, course syllabi and the intercultural VALUE rubric (see Appendix B) were discussed and rated based on the participants’ evaluation. During the interviews, I recorded notes to assist in capturing the behavior and expressions from the participants. Also, during the interview, the participants evaluated their syllabi using the intercultural VALUE rubric. Upon conclusion of each interview, I wrote my thoughts on the interview and placed them in the interview file. Specific details of the data analysis are included in the following section.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis included individual interviews with each participant, intercultural VALUE rubric results, IDI scores, and, when provided, document analysis of participants’ syllabi, rubrics, and program documents. In addition, I reviewed my notes from the interviews and my reflection notes I wrote after conducting the interviews. The
IDI scores and self-reported intercultural VALUE rubric results provided supplemental
descriptive statistics that aided the previous mentioned qualitative analysis.

Maxwell (2005) emphasized that spending time with your interview data and
other documents are important steps in data analysis. Thus, I purposefully interviewed the
participants and transcribed their audio-recorded transcripts, allowing me to be involved
closely with the data as it emerged. In the months of October, November, and December,
I transcribed the 10 interviews verbatim. Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) stated that the
power of qualitative research lies in the ability to see and understand the interview at
much deeper level through immediate transcription done by the researcher. Although I
was the sole transcriber of each interview, my turnaround time for transcribing each
interview was not as quick as I had hoped. The delayed transcription was due to my
personal travel schedule and finding the appropriate time to transcribe uninterrupted.
After transcribing each interview, I reviewed the interview’s audio-recording to check for
consistency and errors. I also corrected typos that had occurred while typing each
transcript.

As part of my data analysis, I enacted respondent validation to ensure the
transcription reflected their intended meanings. I also inquired if there were unclear
meanings in the transcripts and if they didn’t provide a the syllabus(i) they used while
self reporting the intercultural VALUE rubric, I kindly requested them to email me that
syllabus. Though I sent member validations to all participants, but only three members
returned an email with clarifications and/or syllabi. Upon receiving or waiting up a month
for a response from the participants’, I began my coding of the transcriptions.
To corroborate my findings, I requested a second coder read through all the first four transcripts. My second coder was chosen as a colleague who had an interest in my research topic. She and I also taught the same undergraduate education foundations classes and we often met to plan our courses so that the objectives and assessments matched and built off each other. Her discussions, questions and contributions provided an additional layer of understanding and credibility for this study.

We used an inductive approach as we applied an open coding scheme to the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). As we employed open coding to the transcriptions, we explored big ideas and categories. Figure 4 represents the first three, broad and initial categories. Here, the participants’ personal experiences appeared as the foundation of how the they were answering questions about anything pertaining to interculturalism. From this foundation, the next layer that influenced their ideas of interculturalism was their teacher education backgrounds (how they got into the profession to where they are now) and their teaching philosophies. Finally, how all the above related to the current discourse of about today’s education context, especially concerning the widening gap between student and teacher diversity also emerged.
As I returned to code the remaining interviews, this coding scheme was not working or answering the RQs. Also, due to the length of the interviews, I felt overwhelmed with all the information in the transcripts, a practicality that is often observed in qualitative research (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). I discussed the options with my second coder and then, with support from my committee, I analyzed the data by the three RQs, which became my etic categories for this initial phase of data analysis. Making such connections to the RQs allowed us to continue to develop the “storyline” about the wealth of data (Maxwell & Miller, 2008).

Through this phase of analysis, I coded the transcripts line by line using the RQs as my primary foundation. I used Maxwell’s (2005) concept of organizational categories, as the RQs represented already established, yet broad ideas of, what was being explored. Upon this coding, we observed categories and patterns that emerged from the data within each RQ. This step in analysis was very important in maintaining the reliability and integrity of the research as my biases were checked and critically addressed as we spoke.

Figure 4. Initial coding analysis diagram created by researcher.
about our categories. As the second coder and I met to discuss our categories, we also reviewed any discrepancies that occurred in this stage of analysis. By the end of our meeting, our inter-rater reliability was high, and we resolved all discrepancies that arose from our separate analyses. Finally, we agreed on 13 categories for RQ1, 12 categories for RQ2, and 14 for RQ3. These substantive categories emerged from our line-by-line descriptive coding of the 10 transcripts (Maxwell, 2005). Most of the categories are represented by etic concepts, with a few categories formed using emic concepts from the participants’ own voices (e.g., challenge, support, investments, watering). Figure 5 displays each category associated with the three RQs.

Figure 5. Categories that emerged from RQs 1-3.

Next, I looked across the RQs for themes that overlapped with each category to see if there were any relationships that connected patterns or themes (Maxwell, 2005). I also returned back to the transcriptions for additionally to see what was not coded and if any
major themes would arise from the “white space.” During this process, I also reviewed
the syllabi, program documents, and memos/notes to provide more context and depth to
my analysis. As I “zoomed out” from this data, connecting patterns and themes arose
from data. Here, not only were there relationships among similarities, but I also looked
for contrasting views.

Based upon my rereading and constantly digging back into all the data, I emerged
the descriptive data into the analysis. By engaging this data with the qualitative data, I
reconstructed some relationships and connections among the themes. Once I collapsed
the categories into themes based upon all data analyzed, I started writing my results. This
was a pivotal stage in my analysis, because, as I wrote, the categories shifted and
collapsed as I described the themes. After a very iterative and interactive process, I
concluded that three main themes emerged from RQ1 (meanings of interculturalism,
influences in TEs’ lives, and their roles in their students’ journey), two from RQ2
(reaction and function), and three themes from RQ3 (planting the seed, reaping the
harvest, and weathering the storm). Subthemes also emerged from each theme and can be
viewed with their main themes in Figure 6. Most themes were worded explicitly from an
etic perspective, while RQ3 used one emic perspective (planting the seed).
Threats to Validity

With qualitative research, it is vital to understand and report how one is combatting threats to the validity of the research. The research design in Figure 3 shows the integrated and interconnected ways in which I focused on retaining validity in my research. Maxwell (2005) encouraged researchers not only to look at the potential validity issues, but to provide strategies on how to combat these issues. In the following section, I discuss how my own bias and reactivity were tested by collecting rich data, employing respondent validation, triangulation, and comparison.

Researcher bias. With any qualitative research, researcher’s bias presents real concerns throughout the research design. Being a teacher educator myself, and having my
own understanding of intercultural development, it is critical that I tried to understand my
own biases as an observer and participant of the research. Failure to acknowledge my
own personal stance of teacher education and thoughts of interculturalism could severely
affect the validity of the research.

During analysis, I realized that I held assumptions about the participants. I was
honored that they shared time with me and realized I was protective of their identity and
their answers. As a doctoral candidate in teacher education, I have an affinity to what
they had to say. I was grateful for the time they gave me to learn about them on a topic
with the potential to make them feel vulnerable.

I also checked myself in my understandings of culture and the IDI. While I
believe the IDI can be used as a reflective tool, I have biases against it. One bias stems
from my interactions with IDI officials, which were less that satisfactory. While there
was some transitioning of staff within the IDI office, I was frustrated with the
inconsistent messaging from them, whether it was trying to gain a deeper understanding
of the tool or defending that I paid my registration. While no one is perfect, these
interactions do play into my bias of what I think about the tool. In fact, I am not certain
we should assess something as delicate as culture or demand an intercultural competency
since we are each on a unique journey of intercultural development. As discussed in
previous chapters, there are various definitions for culture and intercultural development,
as well as various assessments that seek to measure any type of cross-cultural
experiences, including intercultural development. Despite acknowledging my personal
definitions of culture and its components in Chapter One, there are personal assumptions
and biases on how to define culture due to the multiple interpretations of what culture is and how is it represented.

Finally, the way I view teaching is an assumption that I tried to combat as I analyzed data. I am not a didactic teacher and I promote a very student-centered learning environment. I expect TEs to model and facilitate good teaching practices to their preservice teachers. Thus, as I analyzed the documents and interviews, I attempted to be transparent with my biases in how my own teaching philosophy plays an inherent role in how I view the teaching and learning processes.

Acknowledging my biases was one of the first steps in creating my research design and again during analysis. Recognizing my own biases in relation to the topic provides a voice in which my biases are confronted and not ignored (Norris, 1997). My second coder was also able to question my biases, as we analyzed the data, and not afraid to critically engage in a dialogue about the bias or discrepancy in the analysis. This allowed for a fairer interpretation of the data through additional lens.

**Reactivity.** Though “pep talks” gave me the internal understanding of how to center my understanding of my biases, I also was concerned about my influences on each participant as I entered a research setting established by the MU’s senior researcher, as well as connections made by dissertation committee chair. Though such connections provided a “window of opportunity” to establish a rapport with individuals I never met, the effect of how I came to my research site had implications, and at times, such reactivity was strong. For example, during the interview, one participant was cautious on how she answered her questions, since her understanding and perception of intercultural
development were not widely shared with the colleagues in her department. This circumspection could be due to my connections with a university senior faculty member.

So while I cannot eliminate my biases and assumptions, I reminded myself before each interview to set my own ideas aside and to be listener so my subjectivity would be subdued. I accomplished this by giving myself a pep talk before each interview so that I could focus on the interviewee and reminding myself that my role in the conversation was to ask questions and listen. Also, informal reflection memos were written after every interview in which I reflected upon my biases and assumptions. A researcher bias memo was crafted in Chapter One to reflect my personal stance and biases of understanding intercultural components and teacher education.

**Checklist.** To test my validity threats, I employed strategies recommended by Maxwell (2005). The first strategy I collected was rich data from various sources. I not only interviewed each participant for a long period of time, but I also asked to examine course syllabi and rubrics. During the interviews, the participants self-reported their results from the intercultural VALUE rubric, and I also received the participants’ IDI scores. Collecting such rich data from various sources permitted the opportunity to triangulate my data, which gave me a broader understanding of my data (Greene, 2007; Maxwell, 2005). By checking the interview narrative with intercultural VALUE rubric scores, as well as the IDI scores, I utilized multiple resources that aided in preventing my biases from interfering with my data analysis (Wolcott, 2009).

Last, due to my aforementioned biases, I employed respondent validation of my transcribed interviews and findings to each participant. Though many participants did not
respond to my email inquiries, the idea of this strategy provides the participant an opportunity to clear misunderstandings or misinterpretations of the data and/or findings. This also provides a trustworthiness of the data and how it is interpreted (Glesne, 2010).

**Limitations to the Study**

This study sheds light on 10 TEs’ understanding of interculturalism, as well as how they think and teach for interculturalism. However, as with all research, there are a few methodological limitations to this study. The TEs represent different content areas and different EPPs, but work at one university that was purposely chosen for this study. Additionally, while various data sources were collected and analyzed through multiple methods to assist with the triangulation of data, there were no repeated interviews. Collecting data over a longer period of time would provide more data and potentially extend beyond the self-reported information and scores in this study.

Very few studies have provided information about TEs (Ben-Peretz et al., 2010; Troyer, 1986) besides evidence in self-study research (Beeman-Cadwallader et al., 2014; McDonough & Brandenburg, 2012; Ritter, 2007; Samaras, 2002, 2011; Williams & Power, 2010; Wood & Borg, 2010). Although the TEs thought the interviews were a very reflective process for themselves and their teaching, limited research is available to juxtapose the results from this study with other studies. Furthermore, the access obtained to this population and my researcher biases are limitations. I received access to the TEs through a senior faculty member who is well-respected by his colleagues. His influence assisted me in obtaining consent form the TEs in this study and may also have influenced those who decided not to participate in this study. Thus, the influence to participate in
this study is a form of selection bias to the association these TEs had with the senior faculty member.

That being said, while the sample size of this study could have reached 27, only 10 TEs elected to participate. Furthermore, all participants were female; no males participated, even though the potential for male participation could only be one individual. It is important to note the lack of male participants in this study, especially if we consider Wolf-Wendel et al.’s (2006) data where 59% of TEs in that study were males.

Last, though I did my best to subject my biases in this research by declaring my biases in Chapter One, writing researcher notes, and securing a second coder for the analysis, it is inherent that one cannot totally eradicate biases. Thus, with such aforementioned limitations, the results from this study are intended to provide insight on interculturalism within the teacher education field. Moreover, the results in the subsequent chapter further the research and scholarship revolving around TEs.
CHAPTER FOUR

“To each is his own”

The research findings are offered in this chapter. The purpose of this study was to explore TEs’ understandings of interculturalism, as well as to what extent these TEs implement intercultural practices in their university EPP courses. Ten participants who are faculty at a large, public, research university participated in one-on-one interviews, completed the intercultural VALUE rubric, and agreed to share their preexisting IDI scores. In addition, course syllabi, program artifacts, and researcher notes were included in this analysis.

The findings in this study are organized by RQ, beginning with RQ1, followed by the results for RQ2 and RQ3. An interpretivist approach was used to investigate the TEs’ understandings and processes of interculturalism. By disclosing my biases and recognizing my subjective presence in Chapter One, I approached the analysis cautiously to shed light on the various ways and processes TEs’ conceptualize interculturalism.

Due to the small sample size and to keep all identifiable information confidential, the participating TEs’ demographics and backgrounds were not discussed in this chapter or in any other part of the dissertation. I recognize the importance of describing each individual in this study, as their personal and professional backgrounds, the courses they teach, and the content in which they teach influence the information they provided to this
study. However, it is critical to mask these attributes and characteristics to maintain the integrity of their anonymity. Pseudonyms also have been used to maintain the confidentiality of the data and its informant. As mentioned in Chapter Three, 10 female TEs participated in this study. These participants are faculty members at a large public research university and teach in EEPs.

**RQ1—What Are TEs’ Understanding of Interculturalism**

The TEs’ one-on-one interviews, course syllabi, and program documents were used for analysis. Three main themes and corresponding subthemes emerged from data analysis. These three themes include: meanings of interculturalism, influences in TEs’ lives, and TEs’ role in their students’ intercultural journey. The themes and subthemes are addressed in the subsequent paragraphs.

**Meanings of interculturalism.** During the open-ended interviews, the 10 TEs were asked what it means to be “intercultural.” As such, the TEs consistently reflected upon their stated meanings as they talked about their personal and professional lives. Through analysis, two subthemes emerged from the main theme: 1) awareness and recognition, and 2) relationships. Each subtheme provided a deeper inquiry of the TEs’ understanding of interculturalism as they defined it. Every TE defined interculturalism in her own words and relied upon her personal and professional experiences to help articulate her understanding. However, Blair and Sara found “intercultural” to be a nuanced word. Blair spoke directly about intercultural as confusing term for her students, so she doesn’t use it in her courses, though practices intercultural concepts in her courses. “I don’t ever call it ‘intercultural development’, but, then again, I don’t talk about
‘intercultural,’ because sometimes when we label things, until they [students] are ready, they just see it as another one of those theory things.” Sara, on the other hand, struggled to determine how scholars and colleagues were distinguishing intercultural from other terms such as “cross-cultural.” “Seems like many people are using it in exchanged ways so I haven’t really used the term intercultural very much, and when I think of intercultural development, I am a little suspicious of who decides what is intercultural development.”

Despite these nuances, Blair, Sara, and the remaining TEs understood interculturalism as a developmental process. This developmental process revolves around awareness and recognition, as well as creating and building sincere relationships. Such subthemes are discussed in detail in the following paragraphs.

**Awareness and recognition.** This subtheme displayed many characteristics including awareness and recognition of others, self, and difference. Though all TEs understood interculturalism to be a developmental process, their definitions of intercultural were wide-ranging. The two subthemes suggest a progression in development through awareness and recognition to building relationships. Erin articulated interculturalism through the development lens, using Cross’ (1991) five-stage development model of Black identity, which was later adapted by Spring (2004) who applied Cross’ model to more than one racial group,

I strongly agree with the Spring Cross Model [sic] of Cultural Development. That there’s different stages people go through in becoming more open and accepting and getting to the point where it actually changes their identity; of who [sic] they are because of intercultural interactions. I also, when I talk about culture, I talk
about from a very broad perspective, and I’m not just talking race, I’m not just
talking gender, I’m not just talking social class. I’m talking, language,
geographical location, health, ability, disability. And so a person can be
interculturally, very developed in regard to race, but not in a regard to sexual
orientation and I think that’s important for one, each student to understand and
two, they have to make a choice in where they’re going.

Blair also appears to agree with Erin’s understanding of interculturalism as a
developmental process where one is “starting one place and maybe not having much
ability or awareness even that there are different cultures.” Blair expanded her
understanding by suggesting that her preservice teachers need to be able to move in and
out cultures by recognizing their own cultures and the various cultures represented in
their schools. Additionally, Larissa examined this development process as part of an
individualized journey, “we are each on our journey and we have to respect that each is
on their journey.”

Like Blair, Sally also reflected immediately on her own preservice teachers,
expressing her concerns that her preservice teachers live in a “homogenous” region of the
state and they are not exposed to anything that is significantly different, nor do they seek
out such opportunities. She tried to push her students by “getting them outside the bubble,
[sic] there is a world outside of Midland County, and they are not going to look, speak,
think the way that you are used to. So it is just getting them an awareness.” Lucy took a
similar approach as Sally, by acknowledging the importance of self and the awareness of
difference among others, but emphasized that multiculturalism was different from interculturalism;

intercultural has to do with encountering newness and being able to deconstruct your own point of view in relation to other people you meet or the ways in which you interact. It means actually being able to take apart the way you interact with them and look at it from their lens and how they would interpret your meaning from their point of view. So it means actually trying to learn some new cultural skills to meet another learner or another teaching situation.

Nancy and Larissa also expressed the importance of being aware of self and others and recognizing differences. Nancy said that being intercultural is what “makes us be human in our daily lives,” while Larissa expressed that being intercultural is “human beings getting along” and she highlighted this could be very difficult to accomplish.

Finally, Diana, saw “a recognition of the diversity, equality of different mindsets, different lifestyles” as being something vital for interculturalism. Her thoughts included multiple perspectives and seeing the universality that exists as we become interconnected and aware by recognizing each other’s needs and desires, and hopes, and dreams. Diana believed that being intercultural is an orientation or philosophy by which one lives. She gave an example, “I don’t think you can be little ‘d’ democratic [sic] educators without some level of intercultural awareness” Conversely, Erin found that no matter what political orientation her preservice teachers abide by, interculturalism extends beyond political orientations. “Some students are automatically open to issues of diversity. Some students are automatically closed, and it does not matter if they are liberal or
conservative, religious or not religious.” And while this awareness and recognition may allow one to be more open about difference, a few other TEs saw that creating and building relationships are the expected outcomes of being intercultural.

Relationships. Three of the 10 TEs specifically addressed concepts of building relationships as way of understanding interculturalism. Emma needed to talk through her understanding of interculturalism and focused on recognizing difference and coming together,

So I think intercultural has to do with one’s family of ancestry. I think it has to with one’s race, I think, so intercultural then is a coming together of people from different backgrounds, different places of birth or gender, different religions, different races, different you know, different sex, different sexual orientations, I guess coming together of all different people.

Emma furthered her understanding of interculturalism by passionately indicating how she wants her preservice teachers to have “really wide arms.” In this, Emma stated, “you gotta just welcome all your students, all their situations, and all their backgrounds and even if they are profound and especially if they are profoundly different from your own.” Thus, Emma spoke to the importance of not only knowing who the students are, but also developing deep and personal relationships with them.

Sara continued the idea of relationship building as her way of understanding interculturalism. “Intercultural development or intercultural competency, it’s a real interest in each other with respect and care.” Sara thoroughly articulated examples through her own life experiences where she believed genuine curiosity can build human
relationships by “acknowledging differences and similarities and really wanting to get to know each other.” One example from Sara’s life included,

I was staying with one family in Chile and lived with them so close and they had three kids. They were able to speak English so fluently so I didn’t need to speak Spanish, they taught me though, not very much. One of the girls, she was 13 years old at the moment, we were so close, I love her so much and now she is 20 years old and we ‘Facebook.’ And the day before I am leaving, we are sitting in the taxi and she was sitting here [next to Sara] she asked me, ‘Sara, I have a question,’ with a very serious face. ‘You can ask me anything’ and she said ‘I want you to promise me that you are not going to hate me.’ I said, ‘I am not going to hate you and you can ask me anything. And what she said was, ‘Sara, can you really see?’ [laughs]. Because my eyes are much narrower than hers. So in Chile, people from other countries are still very rare, and she had really big eyes too. And then I said, ‘I am so glad you asked me’. So what we did, I asked her to try imitate my eyes and see if she could see. And she said, ‘Oh my gosh Sara, I can see!’

Last, when creating or building relationships, listening to each other for understanding was pivotal. Whether one is communicating with a student, colleague, or stranger, Carina emphasized the importance of being a good listener, which was also highlighted by Sara. Carina said that being a good listener and going through “a process of undoing and rethinking,” makes one challenged to see views from multiple perspectives. By doing so, Carina believed that you are making things more personal and
you are creating and/or building intercultural relationships because “you hear more of what they can offer.”

**Summary.** In this subtheme, the TEs articulated interculturalism as a developmental model where individuals become aware and recognize their self, others, and differences or through creating and building authentic relationships. Seven TEs emphasized the importance of being aware of others and recognizing what others have to offer. They encouraged newness of the culturally different so that their preservice teachers could operate “outside” the traditional bubbles (Sally). Also, exploring others can assist in understanding one’s own identity, as Lucy stated. Furthermore, three TEs stressed the importance of creating and building relationships with other people as ”being intercultural.” Through this, they articulated affective attitudes of respect and curiosity and bridged these characteristics, indicating a real and genuine interest in each other. By creating and building real interest in one another, one is becoming a good listener, which creates interactions that bring people together.

But what influences the TEs’ understanding of interculturalism? Are there life events or specific individuals who have encouraged them to seek out an intercultural understanding? In the following the paragraph, I uncover the specifics of how each TE became inspired or encouraged to learn about interculturalism.

**Influences in their lives.** The TEs described how they came to understand interculturalism with happenings and events in their life experiences. These influences and/or events evolved from personal or a combination of personal and professional involvements. For the purposes of this study, personal influences are defined as
influences/events that have been experienced outside the university’s structure and influence. The TEs often relate their pK-12 teaching experiences as personal. Professional influences are described as opportunities that are encouraged and supported by the university. Not one TE articulated that professional influences solely assisted in her understanding of interculturalism. Rather, a combination of both personal and professional experiences indicated interconnected and/or reinforced opportunities for intercultural growth and understanding. These experiences included activities such as attending conferences, traveling, research agendas, and teaching philosophies. As each TE is on her own journey toward interculturalization, these manifestations occurred through life exposures, events, and influences, both personally and professionally, that were unique to each individual.

In the subsequent paragraphs, the subthemes are discussed. The subthemes include personal and integrated view. “Personal” reflects those TEs who mainly spoke about their intercultural influences from a personal level. This does not suggest that there were no professional influences, but rather that the TEs believed that the majority of their intercultural influences came from a personal level. These TEs also may have recognized the university support for them, but failed to articulate whether or not they were involved in such supports. That said, the “integrative view” reflects the interconnectedness between the TEs’ personal and professional influences. This does not represent an equal split between the personal and professional influences, but rather a view in which these influences are closely connected so that it became difficult to separate the two different forms of influences.
**Personal.** Four TEs discussed their personal influences and events as the main path that helped shape their understandings of interculturalism. Larissa, Sally, Blair, and Carina spoke mostly from a personal level. Sally credits her own background, as she was raised in an interracial suburb; but during the interview, she consistently referred to her teaching experiences as a classroom teacher. She articulated that her minority role as a white teacher in an inner-city school really pushed her as her students’ parents questioned her,

> they [parents] see me as a white suburban teacher, teaching in the city and they questioned me a lot. And they pushed me a lot. And the parents who came to me and said, ‘You are not a parent yourself. You don’t know what my child is going through. You don’t know what we’re going through. You do not know what it’s like to be a Hispanic student or Hispanic in the city who is struggling financially.

Sally stated that, at first, the parents offended her, but as she reflected on what the parents were saying, she began to question her own identity and role in the school. She said this questioning “hit hard” as she really did not know what the students were going through on a daily basis. Thus, she continued to challenge herself to explore new things by “getting out of the bubble” and “experiencing the world” around her, both domestically and internationally. Sally also described her excursions to places around the immediate region and being a “tourist in her own area” as ways to expand her understanding of others. She credited the IB curriculum as having helped make these intercultural realities more tangible for her preservice teachers; but other than that, she believed that no professional experiences have helped her better understand interculturalism.
Similar to Sally, Larissa believed the program is the “beginning of journey” to become more intercultural. For Larissa, intercultural development is very personal and self-directed. From her religious beliefs that intertwined with her personal values, to her everyday identity of playing the “other” in everything that she does day-in and day-out, Larissa has a strong personal connection of understanding of what it means to be intercultural. Larissa viewed her life from a transcendental point of one existence, in which all individuals are interconnected. How individuals live their life “shapes how we teach it” and by being the “other” provided opportunities for her, colleagues, and students to encounter interculturalism on a daily basis. She also believed her university classroom interactions with her students has provided her with a source of influence.

I am richer every semester because I have, 40 to 50 teachers. And I come in looking to learn. That to me, is, you know, value added. So when you go to all these people and sit and have this conversation that would not ever otherwise happen in your life, in space, in your time, oh my gosh! You’re a millionaire! You are a millionaire! That’s why I could come in—just to be in that experience. Even though the classroom is in a university setting, Larissa personally sought out these interactions with her preservice teachers and made it a personal goal to begin such conversations.

Initially, Blair wrestled to pinpoint any specific life experience, either personally or professionally, that helped shape her interest in interculturalism. After some thought, she credited that “knowing how much of a struggle students have and working in a place that’s so different from them. And the more I worked with the more I see these things”
assisted her understanding of interculturalism. At this point, Blair was speaking to her experience as a teacher in graduate school, where some students failed to recognize their own biases and privileges, especially in regard to socioeconomic status issues. Though Blair did not provide concrete examples beyond what has been stated, she did say that her social justice mantra, her passion for diversity, and the subject that she teaches allows her consistently to provide multiple perspectives for her preservice teachers. She acknowledged that her journey has been mostly self-directed and it has been her personal drive and influence to understand interculturalism. Blair also recognized there are intercultural programs and supports from the university, though she did not address explicitly whether or not she took advantages of these opportunities.

Carina, like Blair, situated her influences in a teaching philosophy. The inquiry circle and the ability to observe, interpret, reflect, and plan, as well as the constructivist approach toward teaching and learning, support Carina’s intercultural understanding. She attributed her years teaching, like Sally, in advancing her understanding of working with culturally different individuals. Also, she was ingrained in a family culture from childhood, in which her mom said, “that all children are intentional, they all have a purpose, you just have to figure out what that is and it is not easy.” Carina, inspired by her mother’s words, has continued to be authentic as she can when it comes to understanding what each child brings with him/her into the classroom. She also spends time volunteering at different museums that has provided her the opportunity to interact with many different people. Furthermore, Carina has sought out workshops and professional development that she thinks will challenge her points. For example, Carina
shared an experience she had attending a conference on working with immigrant students and families, a conference she personally was curious to attend,

…the Good Samaritans, which are the volunteer groups that bring water to the desert, blankets; they can’t kick people out, but they make sure that whoever they can find can find water, blankets at night, medical care. So that was really interesting because then I met teachers who were living in Mexico and teaching in the United States and coming and going across the border every day to work. Or families, that because of immigration policies were separated and what that meant to the family. And that was really interesting and liked that a lot. I learned a lot. I have been reading since then, so that was kind of my new recent awakening.

Carina appears open to many intercultural opportunities for her own intercultural development, and she dominates this understanding through her personal influences.

**Integrated view.** The remaining six TEs found their influences to be both personal and professional. These TEs found the professional influences to support their personal events. However, Erin’s pathway to interculturalism was by accident. She referred to herself as a “hick from the sticks,” who grew up in a very racist community. Erin distinctly remembered learning in an undergraduate communications course that Martin Luther King Jr., was the greatest orator that ever lived, a shocking revelation since he was not considered a hero where she was raised. She candidly said she was not accepted to one graduate school program because of her lack of openness to diversity, but later, something happened in her professional life. She was appointed to a Diversity Committee and that was where, after a culmination of events, her view changed. One individual, after
every meeting, took Erin under her wing and “explained to me very lovingly, very gently that I was a bigot.” This continued one-on-one interaction was impactful to Erin in which she came to terms that she was not a nice person. After this realization, Erin’s journey was extremely personal for her. Proactively, she began reading; getting her hands on anything she could about culturally different others.

And if I wanted to become a better human being, I needed to educate myself.

Because when I went to school, there were no classes in diversity. I totally had to educate myself. I started reading, African American history, whatever book I could get my hands on. Native American history, and then when I got to my PhD program, there were classes on women’s history.

Erin became so interested that her PhD studies led her into studying culture. And in the end, what caused this personal and reflective change was self-image. “I didn’t want to be an ignorant person; it was cognitive dissonance.” She continues to explore her interest in interculturalism by serving on different committees at the university, meeting with and listening to her students, reading, and more reading. The college provides her with the opportunity to be a global scholar and to internationalize her curricula. She attends workshops with the support of the university, and she continues to explore her love of learning.

So while this journey for Erin began through professional influences, it became more and more personal to her as she gained more life experiences. The same finding can found in Emma’s case. Emma is figuring this whole “intercultural thing” as she becomes more and more absorbed in it. Though she has traveled some, it wasn’t until she was
exposed to the IB certification program that she really thought about understanding intercultural influences or events. Since then, she has continued to widen her reading about other peoples and their cultures to better understand others.

I remember reading *The Kite Runner* and just being fascinated and wanting to read other things about that part of the world and about the history. You know, the things that inform how and why a woman can be stoned or; so sometimes it’s reading and having a window open, like oh my gosh! That’s fascinating and so different from my own experience!

Emma expressed how much she loves people and all of her influences surrounded her personal inquiry and interests in reading. She consistently spoke of her intercultural development through the lens of literature books—books she reads for her own personal enjoyment and others she uses as part of her course content. She also attends multicultural literacy conferences, is involved in IB trainings, and after reflection, she realized the regularity of intercultural opportunities available in her college.

…you know when you hear yourself think, it’s not as true as you think it is.

Because right here in the college of education we have the Intercultural Center. So now that I say that, I am thinking I get flyers pretty regularly on intercultural exchanges, so now that I say that there are opportunities. Yeah.

Although Lucy stated that she wouldn’t call herself an “interculturalist,” she is greatly interested in how cultural differences shape the way people teach. She also recognized the “complexity” that is involved with such. She believed that the EPP and college offer many opportunities for her to evolve her understanding of interculturalism but also
acknowledged her personal interest of interculturalism. “I think it is just a good fit for me because I am always interested in things such as equity and disparity…there is much complexity.” Furthermore, her personal experiences during her graduate work, scholars in critical theory and cultural differences, the literature she has read, and the travel opportunities that she has had, also have influenced how she comes to know interculturalism. There was one book that had an impact on Lucy in which she read through the college’s support of internationalizing their EPPs’ curricula,

I think the one person who has shaped my thoughts a lot has been a woman named Boix Mansilla. There was a book that I read with the group, called “Educating for Global Competence,” I don’t necessarily know if that’s intercultural so much it was looking at globalization and the way we have to change education for globalization. Her work really made an impact on me because it was saying here are the things that we’re going to be facing, global crisis, unprecedented migration, changes in the environment, changes in the natural order of how things work, being able to competently negotiate things like water conservation or water usages, you know natural resources stuff in combination with all the other kinds of things that are globally important.

Lucy’s research and scholarship, especially in the reconceptualist movement, which are the “ideas of taking a part educational psychology perspectives and looking at it from lenses of power or lenses of gender and sexuality or lenses of critical theory or critical race theory,” have shaped her intercultural understanding as well. Lucy’s office is lined with books addressing equity issues; something she believed was heavily related to
Lucy also explained that any type of travel exposure could be beneficial but, “there is something very much different about the magnitude of change you see from you go from a domestic encounter to one that is a global encounter.”

Though internationalism and interculturalism share common values, they are different. Recognizing this, Lucy believed her experiences, personal and professionally, “opened a lot for me and let me read some new things, lets me get excited about teaching in standardized area, because then adopting the IB allows me to think about the curriculum in a more open way.” As such, the IB program also provided her opportunities to travel and participate in international workshops. After the interview was completed, Lucy reflected and stated, “I didn’t recognize how important the IB has been to the development to the intercultural preparation.”

As Lucy transitioned between her personal and professional influences, Nancy attributed to her curiosity other people as one influence. Nancy sought intercultural work
and believed the intercultural work found her. She accredited her intercultural journey beginning with her personal experiences of being exposed to different cultures at a young age, despite growing up a state not typically recognized for its diversity. She remembered certain instances such as looking at maps of Jesus’ excursions at church and befriending a Chinese girl who was being a fostered by a non-Chinese family,

I went to church a lot when I was little and actually in the back of, you know, my bible, were all of these maps. Like the travels of Jesus, so that’s what I did during all those services, literally I was sitting in Greece or somewhere, you know Paul went here, and then he went here. I can remember, to this day, I love maps and I think did that. And then I think too, um, there was a little friend at my church who was the same age as I.

She recollected how her parents, although tacitly, like to explore things and how she, unlike her siblings, wasn’t scared to move out of the area and explore what life had to offer.

And there is always this great story about my dad, was on Harley before he was married, at the red light in town and decided to go to Indiana. But you hear those stories, and you think, yeah, I want to go somewhere else. Maybe it is genetic on that part. And my mom too, she’d get on a bus to go anywhere.

Throughout her life, Nancy has met people with similar interests and things happened naturally and in an unplanned manner. “I just think along the way, you meet people and you have that interest. I would say there wasn’t anyone holding me back, and I don’t know if there was anyone influencing me.” As Nancy examined her professional
role, she acknowledged that the IB, though not “necessarily intercultural” helped her to understand multiple perspectives, which assisted her in her own personal intercultural development. The more Nancy spoke, the more she realized how important the IB was to her understanding of interculturalism. “The IB just puts me in around international research, around international readings, around that scholarships” and she was afforded opportunities to travel internationally and attend IB workshops hosted in various languages.

Similar to Lucy and Erin, the college supported and fostered intercultural programs and activities for Nancy, especially through the Intercultural Center. Nancy’s involvement in diversity committee work, teaching study abroad programs, participating in the internationalization efforts, interacting with international doctoral students, as well as attending conferences like American Education Research Association (AERA) and the National Association of Education for Young Children (NAEYC) provided opportunities for her to further her knowledge and understanding of interculturalism.

Echoing Nancy, Diana’s interest in intercultural ways were rooted in her upbringing, though she acknowledged her ideas have become “more formalized after my sabbatical” where she spent time working internationally. During this time, Diana became immersed global concerns and “looking at them from a multicultural and international perspective.” Her intercultural focus is consistent and aligned with the IB, making Diana’s years of intentional planning and teaching for interculturalism inherent to the newly adapted IB curricula. Furthermore, she continues to travel around the world, working and learning about countries’ ways of living and infrastructures. Traveling has
caused to her personally reflect on her perceptions, values, and assumptions, similar
reflective thoughts and questions she poises to her students during her courses.

So it [travels] made me reassess my own perceptions and my own assumptions.
So I guess, the traveling makes me think about what we do and what we value,
and are we valuing the right things. I try, I guess I bring these questions in my
classroom through discussion and ideas that I present to them.

Diana stated all of her intercultural influences have been self-directed, but supported by
many different people, both in and out of the college and her department. Though one
individual consistently has played a key role in her understanding of interculturalism (for
the sake of anonymity, this individual is not named). She recalled one professional
experience as a doctoral student where a group of women Soviet teachers were attending
a workshop on her campus,

they [Russian teachers] had a group of KGB with them, so that was pretty wild.
But that was a really fascinating experience and very eye-opening. It made me
really think about these brilliant woman, who had no money, no freedom, no
power, and working hard to trying to do what they can to advance themselves and
have some kind of control, some kind of autonomy.

Comparable to Nancy, Diana’s department and doctoral students have provided her with
intercultural opportunities.

The department’s supports international travel and I have some other colleagues
in a professional society that established these conferences in developing nations
so that was sort of my window to go to. I would say that personal and professional
support…and then doctoral students from Benin, who I worked with and who I continue to work with.

For Sara, multicultural perspectives, especially through the lens of critical theory, have played a key role in her understanding of interculturalism. Qualitatively aligned and fulfilling her dream to be a TE, Sara is “really interested in people’s voices, especially women’s and teacher’s voices.” Like Lucy, Sara has been empowered by professors who challenged her during her doctoral studies. Also, Sara has found comfort in expanding her intercultural ideas at international conferences with and international audience who come with multiple perspectives and from different backgrounds. “I attended one international conference in early childhood. There were people from 19 different countries. But here [at the conference] the people from Kenya, or China, with different experiences, the conversation goes in many different directions,” which Sara has felt had strengthened her understanding of interculturalism.

Sara, like Nancy and Lucy, finds opportunities for her to grow interculturally domestically. MU’s Intercultural Center has seminars, guest speakers, and retreats that she attends. Being involved in committee work, just as Erin and Nancy state, provided another path for Sara to explore her understanding of interculturalism, as she interacts with different people who have different perspectives. While intercultural practices and experiences excite Sara, sometimes she believes the domestic approaches are very western-based, and often questions her own thoughts and judgments of interculturalism.

I know that I need to train myself as well, but in many trainings, I feel are westernized and linear. So sometimes I feel very uncomfortable in that way. Or I
am judging, maybe I need to be more open minded too. But so, I have very mixed feelings of the intercultural training.

**Summary.** While the TEs have personal endeavors providing a foundation of interculturalism, in the ways and how they came upon those influences greatly depended on their own journey. Each journey is framed by the TEs’ understanding of self and the context in which she teaches often created a blurred lined in trying to separate the personal and professional influences. For Sally, Larissa, Blair and Carina, their personal influences and events continuously helped them explore interculturalism. While a few of them mention the supports from the university, these supports were often stated broadly, without explicit indications of whether or not these TEs utilize or leverage these university supports. Interestingly, none of the four TEs acknowledged the present college’s Intercultural Center, which for almost 30 years, continues to promote international and intercultural education for MU’s faculty, staff, and students.

The integrated view described another path in how the remaining six TEs continue to personally and professionally development their understandings of interculturalism. Erin was the only TE who expressed that a professional influence first directed her influences in exploring interculturalism. The remaining five TEs articulated a more personal beginning that has coalesced into an integrated influence. Nevertheless, today all six TEs believe that their influences in understanding interculturalism were a combined effort from their personal and professional endeavors. These influences can be explicit such as in Erin’s case of having someone help her understand her biases, to Nancy’s case where her intercultural work has emerged implicitly. Moreover, personal
and professional influences were often difficult to separate and often function in union, as Diana has articulated. Many of these six TEs recalled the influence of the IB curriculum and the university intercultural activities and programs as supportive events in furthering their intercultural understanding.

**TEs’ role in students’ journey.** The third theme gives tribute to the TEs’ role in their students’ intercultural development as means to understand interculturalism. The TEs’ consistently talked and navigated their understandings of interculturalism by providing examples of where they see their preservice teachers developing interculturally. In this light, the TEs found that their role is to be challenger and supporter. They also recognized the preservice teachers’ individualized journey and self-directedness needed for such growth.

Repeatedly, Larissa talked about the journey of developing interculturally. Through this journey, she has expanded her interculturalism understanding to best meet her preservice teachers’ needs. “We are each on our journey and we have to respect each is on their journey” and “where people [preservice teachers] enter [the journey] is dependent on their experience.” While Nancy did not speak to the concept of a journey, she used the word “continuum” or “stage.” “That’s a natural phase or stage and we don’t want them to get stuck there. But you know, the continuum really speaks to my heart, this is where we all at.” Nancy also addressed whose responsibility it was to assist the preservice students’ intercultural development. “I think it is partly its themselves [preservice teachers] but I think it’s all the faculty and the community. I definitely think it is the faculty and the community and MU’s culture.”
Reflecting on her preservice teachers’ intercultural development journey, Erin found over the years that her students come into her class with more a historical lens of understanding diversity, especially in regard to social class and other inequities,

I think it was because I was going from a position of thinking that my students were at this stage, and they’re actually further along. They are getting more diversity education and one of the reasons, and I started asking my students, ‘how did you become so aware of social class issues?’ Social media. And that’s what came out this semester, social media is playing a bigger role.

Despite this knowledge, Erin stated this growth depended on where the students were developmentally so she could provide “different statements to say to challenge them or to support them” on broadening their “breadth of interest.” Mirroring Nancy, Erin also emphasized the self-directed nature of how the preservice teachers take advantages of the opportunities presented to them. “It depends on the students. I think they are given many opportunities for it, and whether or not they take advantage of them.”

Developmentally, Carina found the age of her preservice teachers, as well as where they come from, were the main factors in just how far they would grow interculturally. “They are so limited that they, yes, absolutely [it’s developmental]. It wouldn’t surprise me that that’s it. They come to MU and a lot of them are from very rural communities where you don’t have neighbors.” But Carina also saw she needed to provide some opportunities for her preservice teachers so that they could be prepared for teaching students that are different from them.
When I see them, they are 20 to 21. It can be good, or it can be like shocking, you
know to them, which can be not good. We have to see, we try to be assertive as
we can as a faculty so we listen to them and helping them to figure it out. But I
think at their age, they tend to revert to what they think is safe, especially when
we they are alarmed. But then that may not be fair.

Lucy expands on this notion, stating she came to understand interculturalism through her
student’s eyes as a varied journey, where it really depends on what exposure her students
had.

I think a lot depends on what kinds of contexts they come into contact with and
how successful they are at doing some of the projects that we’ve asked them to do
in the places in which they are able to do that.

At the same time, Lucy appreciated how her preservice teachers grow interculturally, as it
“depends on the kind of encounters they have with students themselves, or with other
teachers or with the schools that they are placed in.” Here, Lucy referred to the
importance of placing her preservice teachers in classrooms where they are challenged to
look beyond their own lens.

Likewise, Sally and Emma found their preservice teachers struggle to develop
interculturally, and this struggle pushed Sally to realize she needs to expose them to
explicit differences. However, explicitness differences are hard to find in the immediate
area where these students live. With more exposure, both in and out of the classroom,
Sally believed that change can happen.
They are still struggling. I really do not see this huge aha for them yet, because they are still in this bubble. I think once they get out into the field more, they’ll get out of that bubble a little bit more, at least that is generally what I see. But based on their own personal experiences, they just don’t see it. They just don’t see it when they’re going to the grocery store, or they don’t see that there’s a world out there. I think they still have their blinders on quite a bit.

Emma, specifically finds her preservice teachers tend “to be unaware of their own privilege” and thus, they tend to start “othering.” This “othering” poses a challenge for Emma as she has continued to understand interculturalism through the perspective of what her preservice teachers recognize or do not recognize.

Expanding Emma’s and Sally’s notions, Diana, Blair and Sara believe some of their preservice teachers come to their classrooms with open minds and are ready and dedicated towards intercultural growth, while other preservice teachers are not ready. Blair considers that her preservice teachers are doing much better, but she has “super high expectations” for them. Her following statement also best represents Diana’s and Sara’s positions,

Some are still, they don’t quite see it. Or they still see broadly, which I need them to see both broadly, and there’s, for example, equitable classrooms, but you need to think about it broadly and you need to think about students who have specific experiences. Maybe thinking about more deeply, what does it mean to be an English language learners and all its myriad of complexity. Those types of things, so I don’t know. They are doing okay. I always expect them to be far better than
they are. Because I have super high expectations. So in comparison to other years, I think I have more doing better. But no one is where I want them to be, because I have unnatural high expectation.

In their roles as TEs, these TEs expressed understanding interculturalism through the eyes of their preservice teachers. This understanding extends beyond knowledge and encompasses skills, attitudes, and direct engagement needed to further develop interculturally their preservice teachers. Moreover, the TEs express high expectations for their preservice teachers to be self-directed, though they recognize each preservice teacher’s journey is unique. Due to this individualized journey, the TEs see their roles as being a challenger and supporter in their preservice teachers’ intercultural development. Finally, the TEs indicate the journey for their preservice teachers can be a struggle depending on the encounters and exposure the preservice teachers have before the TEs see them in their university classrooms.

**Summary of findings of RQ1.** RQ1 provided a snapshot of how the TEs have come and continue to understand interculturalism. These understandings are articulated through meanings of interculturalism, influences, and the TEs’ roles in their students’ intercultural journey. These snapshots, while lengthy, provide a foundation in understanding the findings for RQ2 and RQ3.

As mentioned in the first theme, the TEs recognized interculturalism as a development journey through two subthemes, awareness and recognition, and through relationships. The majority of TEs (n = 7) understood interculturalism through awareness and recognition of self, others, and difference. This awareness enables one to seek
multiple perspectives and enhances one’s ability to be intercultural. In addition, three TEs understood interculturalism through the lens of creating relationships. Using affective attributes of care, respect, and curiosity, as well as being a good listener, ascribed to creating and building genuine relationships with all people, no matter their backgrounds.

In the second theme, 10 TEs found either personal influences or the combination of personal and professional influences enable them to further understand their own intercultural growth. Four TEs indicated their personal life events firmly influenced their understandings of interculturalism. In addition, these TEs make little to no reference to using or acknowledging university supports for furthering their intercultural understanding. On the other hand, six TEs articulated an integrated approach of influences played key roles in their understandings and development of interculturalism. This theme highlights each intercultural journey as unique and, often, that TEs’ personal and professional roles were unified and difficult to separate. In this shared view, many of the TEs discovered that the college and university support their intercultural development, and often these TEs spoke of opportunities within Intercultural Center on campus. Interestingly, not one TE in this study stated that professional influences solely shaped their understanding of interculturalism, suggesting the personal influences as major contributor to one’s understanding of interculturalism.

Finally, in the third theme, the TEs continued to expand on their understandings of interculturalism through their own preservice teachers’ intercultural growth. As mentioned in the first theme, the TEs reflected upon the intercultural journey as developmental process. In this process, preservice teachers may be in a different stage of
their journey depending on what exposures, encounters, and opportunities they have had in life. Also, the TEs viewed their roles as a challenger and supporter to assist the preservice teachers in becoming self-directed seekers of their intercultural growth. Because of such factors, these TEs believed some preservice teachers are growing interculturally, while others are not. More information about in what extent and in what ways TEs promote and teach for interculturalism is located in the results from RQ3.

RQ2—To What Extent and in What Ways Did These TEs’ IDI Results Influence How They Think About Interculturalism?

This research used data from the TEs’ IDI scores, one-on-one interviews, course syllabi, and self-reported intercultural VALUE rubric scores. Previous to this study, all the TEs had taken the IDI and they took the IDI for various purposes. The TEs took the IDI as part of adaptation of the IB certification program to their EPPs and/or the TEs completed the IDI as a participant in an internationalization curriculum project. A few TEs completed the IDI because a colleague they respected asked them to complete it.

Additional information about the IDI implementation was needed to fully understand these TEs’ thoughts of the IDI. Eight TEs received their IDI scores while two TEs (Erin and Diana) did not receive their IDIs scores. Six TEs did not elect to receive a profile feedback session to discuss their IDI results, three TEs participated in-group profile feedback sessions, and one individual had an individual profile feedback session. The TEs’ IDI scores are not reported individually, though four TEs’ DO scores were in the ethnocentric mindset, while five were transitioning between mindset in Minimization, and one TE was placed in the ethnocentric mindset. The overall mean
development score (DO) was 107.89. This score places one in the higher end of Minimization (To reference the IDI stages, see Figure 1 in Chapter One.). The 10 TEs’ DO scores range was from 74.59 (early Polarization) to 129.12 (high Acceptance), which is less than one point from the final stage of Adaptation. The perceived score (PO), the score that the individual perceives herself to be interculturally, had a range of 103.39 (mid Minimization) to 136.26 (early Adaptation). The mean PO score was 123.75 (high Acceptance), indicating that on average, the TEs thought they were operating toward the higher end of intercultural development. However, the mean DO score indicated that the TEs were approximately one stage below Acceptance and operating in Minimization. Minimization is often referred to as the transitional stage between the lower and upper developmental stages.
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**Figure 7.** Participants mean and ranged scores of the IDI.
The difference between where the assessment believes one to be interculturally (DO) and where one thinks she is interculturally (PO) had a mean of 20.83 and a range of 7.14 to 36.19. The significance of this range suggested the TEs in this study greatly over predicted their intercultural development, and any score below a 7 is considered an under prediction. Carina, who had a 7.14, was the only TE in this study who accurately predicted her intercultural development while Lucy, under predicted her intercultural development. Also, half of the TEs have worked and/or lived outside of the U.S., and interestingly, on average, those who worked and/or lived less than three months in another country (n = 3) produced the smallest mean orientation gap when compared to those who worked and/or lived more than 10 years outside of the U.S. (n = 2) and to those who never worked and/or lived outside of the U.S. (n = 5). However, when taking the outlier orientation gap score away for those who worked and/or lived less than three months outside of the U.S., these TEs’ mean orientation gap was actually higher than those who live outside of the U.S. for more than 10 years or those who live entirely in the U.S.. This may suggest to the complexity and multiple variables involved in developing intercultural dispositions and that living outside one’s native country is not enough to contribute to intercultural development.

These IDI scores represent another data sources to help realize the TEs’ understanding of interculturalism. As such, it is important to investigate what influence the IDI had on these TEs’ understanding of how they think and teach for interculturalism. Results from this question yielded two themes: reaction and function.
**Reaction.** The 10 TEs provided reactions to the IDI and these reactions ranged from being very optimistic to unfavorable, with a few TEs being indifferent about the IDI and their experience completing the tool. Unlike everyone else, Lucy had taken the IDI twice. She took it once as part of adding the IB certification program to her EPP and quickly completed the IDI without much thought. She completed the IDI a second time when she was a part of the internationalization curriculum project. During the second administration of the IDI, Lucy took more time and carefully thought through the questions. However, after taking it twice, Lucy said, “I compared it, but I really still didn’t understand what was good or what was bad [chuckles] to be honest, I was confused on how to use the results.” She further stated, “I also recognize that I didn’t take the first time in the right frame of mind, and that I could have been more thoughtful and deliberate. To be honest, I can’t tell you what I did or how I did it. I don’t remember.”

Lucy was not the only TE in this study who did not fully understand the IDI. Sara responded, “I felt so confused, and I don’t know. It’s maybe I misunderstood, but I felt that the tool was probably very good for the person who is more monocultural.” Sara further elaborated this confusion was mostly when the tool asked her to choose one culture and then answer the tool’s questions based on that one culture.

I was so confused when they said “you” or “we,” “your” society. I don’t know where I should be. I have multiple identities and issues. I can’t do that. That’s not who I am. I felt it is really uncomfortable and made me feel so lonely.
Sara’s reaction was akin to Sally’s, though Sally completely dismissed the IDI. Like Sara, Sally struggled with how to define her culture and the language used around this term. She saw herself through multiple cultural lenses, and defining herself through one cultural lens was difficult for Sally. She was disappointed in her results since she thought her intercultural development was further along the continuum than what the tool indicated.

I was mad. I was mad that I scored so low. I really thought I was better than that. I was kind of embarrassed that I scored at that level. I don’t think I would necessarily change anything, it was just, I was mad about it. You go through that whole frustration, that stupid test that doesn’t know anything. I don’t know. I don’t think I changed anything because I didn’t believe that my results were accurate.

Complimenting Sara’s and Sally’s thoughts about culture, Larissa believed the IDI dominated a western cultural discourse.

It’s done through a western lens and you come with that particular frame, and you know that I am not in that frame. So that’s good for them. Yippee! They have a box to put me in! Hallelujah! You don’t want them going through life thinking, there’s one we missed [laughs]. There must be a box we can put that in! [laughs] Nevertheless, Larissa found some good in taking the IDI. Her spiritual beliefs surfaced to the top as she took the IDI, “My first impulse to these questions is one that is based on my faith community’s belief system.” Because of her stance, Larissa believed the IDI gave way for her to see how people would have problems with her based on how she
views the world. “It helped me name what problems people would have with me. Yeah, it’s looking at ‘oh, I can see why people would have a problem with me’.”

Carina’s reactions to the IDI were quite different than what was previously mentioned. At first, Carina expressed uncertainty about the IDI, but after completion of the IDI, she her reaction changed.

I realized that sometimes I look at tools like that. I think, for heaven’s sake, haven’t you better things to do with your time? Is this really useful? Or is somebody sitting in an office too long? I found it more useful than I thought.

On the other hand, Emma often spoke of the IDI and her feedback session. Her experience with the IDI shifted the way in which she examined herself, exposing her to a wider range of books and opening her worldview. But initially, her IDI scores caught her off guard. Her results were a “a little distressing,” but after her feedback session, she realized,

it is not a statement on the goodness of humanity that you possess. But once I got over the judgment piece of it, if this is where you are, a journey of 1,000 miles begins with a single step, so just take the next step in the right direction.

Similar to Emma, Nancy was reflective about the IDI. She expressed excitement when talking about the IDI. Nancy also said she was always curious about how her preservice teachers and the faculty are developing interculturally. “I think before the IDI, I didn’t realize there’s a natural phase or stage and we don’t want them to get stuck there. That continuum really speaks to my heart.” As with any measurement, Nancy saw the IDI as,
“one marker on one day. I don’t blow it out of proportion,” and like most tools, Nancy realized there was not one tool that is perfect,

I would be open if we found something that. I am on the global ed, teacher ed, website. I just haven’t really slowed down and searched, and my colleague was pretty big on the IDI, and he has 35 years of international education. So part of it could be flawed logic and I trust him. It had been, you know, vetted. It had been validated. It’s reliable.

Nancy indicated that among faculty members who took the IDI, there seemed to be some animosity towards the tool.

I wish there were something better that everybody felt more comfortable with. I don’t think I have the talents or time to develop it or interest to be honest. I do have the interest in looking for more things to see if there is something better.

As for her reflection when finding out her results, initially Nancy was aggravated. This disturbance was felt by many of the TEs as they took an online survey. “It frustrated me [but] good grief, I couldn’t get upset. I thought it was in some ways helpful to think.”

Although Diana and Erin teach in an EPP with the IB certification program, they took the IDI because they respected their colleague who was administering the IDI. Erin and Diana never saw their IDI results, nor did they inquire about them. Diana was brief about her experience with the IDI and expressed the following,

Oh, I don’t know. I thought I wouldn’t say it was hard. I thought the questions were narrow. And so, I thought I should have done better on it [laughs]. Yeah. I mean I took it because my colleague asked me to do it. I like my colleague and
respect him. I have no idea what my score is. I would doubt that I would score in a way that reflected my beliefs. So that’s what I thought. I mean it was a year ago. Echoing Dianna, Erin did not expand much on the IDI and did not recall much about taking the test. Unlike Diana, however, Erin said she thought about finding out about her IDI results, but a life event occurred, and it was not a priority at the time. She stated, “I don’t know. You would think I wanted to know, I just, I didn’t.”

Blair also did not remember much about taking the IDI, but recalled being concerned about her scores. Blair initially participated in the internationalization curricula project where participants took the IDI, but she was switched off the project and never truly followed up with her IDI scores or experience. Due to the nature of this study and preparation for the interview, Blair took it upon herself to revisit her IDI scores for the first time and spoke to other faculty members about the IDI.

I don’t remember much about taking it. I do remember thinking I was going to score poorly because I hadn’t been to a lot of countries. So it’s been a long time, so I don’t actually know much about taking it. I did revisit. I looked at my handout, my feedback. It’s been three or four weeks probably since I looked at it, and I have talked to people about it.

From Blair’s reflection in the weeks prior to the interview, Blair said she would have liked to know more about the tool and to revisit her answers on the IDI.

It didn’t surprise me that there was a gap between what I thought where I was, that didn’t surprise me at all [laughs]. I anticipate everybody’s like that. What’s funny, I probably wouldn’t put myself where the scoring said I was. Like one, so
there’s the scoring that says what you think about where you are, which was pretty high, it was in the top one. I actually, if you asked me, I probably would have said, I am in the one I actually scored at. So I wonder what I actually answered. I would have liked to have known what my answers were.

When juxtaposing the TEs’ reaction with their IDI DO and PO scores and the orientation gap score, there were some interesting findings. First, those who did not seek out their IDI results scored in a similar intercultural development stage and had similar orientation gaps. Secondly, TEs who were critical of the IDI were placed in Early Polarization to High Minimization. These TEs’ orientation gap between their PO and DO scores ranged from 18.94 to 36.19. Additionally, the TE with the highest orientation gap score also scored lower on the intercultural development continuum than any other TE in this study. Thirdly, the TEs who were indifferent about the IDI were placed in early Minimization to High Acceptance and had orientation gap scores of 14 to 25. Finally, those who provided positive reactions to the IDI were placed in Early Minimization to High Acceptance and had an orientation gap between 7.14 and 26.5. While I do not report IDI results to the specific TE for confidentiality reasons, the negative or positive reactions of the IDI did not necessarily relate to how that TE was placed on the intercultural development continuum.

**Function.** The IDI’s functionality and usefulness in the teacher education was also expressed by these TEs. Only three TEs (Emma, Nancy, Carina) indicate how the IDI changed the way they think or teach for interculturalism. The remaining seven TEs held different ideas about the IDI and its relationship to the way they think and/or teach
for interculturalism. For Emma, the IDI and results caused her to think differently about how she chooses her literature books, though there have not been explicit course design changes.

The IDI and the results of that have not yet had a significant impact on how I design my syllabus. I think it has made me more aware that making sure that when you present books to choose from that you have a really wide range represented.

As for Nancy, IDI assisted her to see her students developmentally in stages, so that she can push them toward intercultural growth. In fact, she views the IDI as a reflective tool for her preservice teachers and requires her preservice teachers to take the IDI as part of her course requirements, as well as submit a one-to-two-paged reflection about their IDI experience and the results. As stated previously, Nancy did not see the IDI as a judgment tool or something that explained whom one is. Rather she saw it as opening to a greater discussion on one’s identity, as well as a checkpoint into the effectiveness of implementing the IB into her EPP.

So I think with the IDI, certainly being aware of where my students were, and also being able to say, to reassure students, this is one experience, and this is one little snapshot into you; let’s just keep it in perspective. [I have] tried to help them by saying it is more of a tool for you, a tool for you. It isn’t a judgment. It’s more of a tool. I would say it fortified me a bit with thinking that IB is a good thing, because there is so much emphasis on perspective taking.
The IDI also changed the way Carina thought about interculturalism, but it was at personal and practical levels. Not only did she challenge herself to be a better listener, but she waits longer for her preservice teachers to develop their thoughts when asking them questions. “I will ask more specific questions. I will wait longer. I will encourage the initial question, try to make it more personal so that I hear other people’s points of view.”

While Carina, Emma, and Nancy found ways in which IDI helped them think about and teach for interculturalism, Blair articulated the potential the IDI had, but she did not believe the IDI caused any changes to the way she thought or taught. She was curious if there were another intercultural tool available that would be more appropriate for teacher education, “I would really like that because I think that would be really interesting with my students. I don’t think this one would work with my students.” Blair recommended that faculty in her department take the IDI and the department would pay for the cost. It was then that she received feedback from the faculty and “surprisingly, only one person volunteered,” suggesting that other faculty did not value the tool.

Larissa shared a similar sentiment Blair found among her faculty, even though Larissa and Blair work in different departments. Larissa responded to whether or not the IDI influenced her ways of teaching, and it mostly reflected on how she would engage her students about the IDI.

I don’t think I changed in any obvious way. I guess it’s old age and tiredness too. Accept things you cannot change and change the things you can. So if any of my students were at a point in maturity where they can engage me in a conversation about those results and how to interpret it and what sense I made of them, and
what’s based in me was created to accommodate those results, then we would have a different relationship going forward, but since that’s not possible, and that conversation will not be had. I can’t hold it against my students that they have to meet me at this point in their journey.

On the other hand, Lucy and Sally accredited the multiple features happening in their departments as influencers in the way they thought about and taught for interculturalism. These multiple features and influencers did not include the IDI. The IB, internationalization of the teaching curricula, and “just good teaching practices” were some of the ideas mentioned by both of the TEs. Sally even dismissed the tool, calling it a “stupid test. What does it know?” Diana, Sara, and Erin also did not think much of the IDI, nor did they think it has had any influence on their instructional practices. Sara cautioned about the tool, “Internationalization could be also very close to intercultural. Intercultural development, I feel we need to be very careful.”

**Summary of findings for RQ2.** Three TEs were confused or felt misunderstood about how the IDI was defining culture, which also reflected their reactions and beliefs in the tool itself. Specifically, Diana and Sally dismissed the tool, though Diana failed to express an interest for the tool as she took the IDI to comply with a colleague’s request. Erin and Blair were indifferent about the tool, but were open to further discussion, though this discussion would more than likely not originate from them. Last, Carina, Emma and Nancy were optimistic about the IDI, though Nancy cautioned using the IDI as a tool that judges who one is.
The IDI also appeared to create mixed results on what it could offer in the form of the way these TEs thought about and taught for interculturalism. These mixed results continued to occur when the TEs’ interview data was compared to their individual IDI results. While a few TEs were optimistic about the tool and what it could provide for their instructional practices and preservice teachers’ development, others were skeptical and often leery of how a tool could be helpful. Some TEs believed the tool was too narrow, resulting in unfavorable thoughts and opinions about the IDI and also expressed confusion and misunderstanding while completing the IDI. Examining those who had IDI feedback sessions versus those who had no feedback session, sessions seemed to clear some misunderstandings, but did not solve some strong reactions against the tool. Though not reported individually, the IDI scores of these TEs generally did not sway their opinions about the tool. Though some who scored low on the IDI dismissed the tool, others who scored higher also has strong reservations about the tool as well. The mixed results in the TEs’ experiences and reactions of the IDI and their opinions on whether or not the IDI influenced their teaching practices shed light on the complexity involved in understanding the IDI in teacher education.

**RQ3—To What Extent, and in What Ways, Do These TEs Incorporate Interculturalism in Their Educator Preparation Courses**

For RQ3, analysis included the TEs one-on-one interviews, the intercultural VALUE rubric, and program artifacts such as course syllabi, rubrics, and program documents. Analysis of these data revealed three main themes: planting the seed, reaping
the harvest, and weathering the storm. Each theme is broken into subthemes to elicit deeper and more specific understanding.

While incorporating interculturalism elements are not requested from MU’s program standards or any accreditation organizations, the TEs articulated the ability and to what extent they try to incorporate interculturalism in their EPP courses. With that in mind, TEs in this study were asked to complete the intercultural VALUE rubric. One TE elected to not complete it entirely and generalized that all her scores were based upon her overall understanding of one’s intercultural journey.

Eight of the 10 TEs completed the intercultural VALUE rubric indicating where they believed their preservice teachers were in their intercultural development at the end of the course. The remaining two TEs provided two sets of scores—an aim and reality. They articulated the intercultural aim they wanted the preservice teachers to reach in the course versus the reality in which they saw in the intercultural development of their preservice teachers. Furthermore, half of TEs self-reported their intercultural VALUE rubric using more than one course, using no more than two courses, and often flipping between the two courses. The other half of the TEs reported data from one course. Final reported scores by each TE are located in Table 4. Mean scores were calculated for each criteria and each TE. When a TE provided a range such as 2 to 3, the mean score was computed and used as the mean (i.e., 2 to 3 becomes 2.5). For those who reported two scores, aim and reality, the reality scores were reported. Additionally, while these TEs completed the intercultural VALUE rubric, they reflected upon their teachings, students’ progress, assignments, and in-class activities.
Results from the intercultural VALUE rubric indicate varying degrees in which these TEs reported how they incorporated interculturalism into their courses and to what extent they believed their preservice teachers are growing interculturally. As mentioned in Chapter Three, the intercultural VALUE rubric is comprised of six concepts with three components (Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes). Within the knowledge criteria, Knowledge #1 indicated one’s own cultural self-awareness, whereas Knowledge #2 highlighted the knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks that served as the main point of departures. Skills #1 focused on empathic perspective-building through multiple worldviews, while Skills #2 concentrated on the complex understanding needed for verbal and nonverbal communication. Last, the Attitudes #1 fixated on the curiosity of cultures through complex questions and Skills #2 focused the openness needed for intercultural interactions.

In Table 4, the highest mean ($M = 2.90$) reported across all TEs was Skills #1, which emphasized the degree of empathy the course reflected in offering experiences for the students’ to explore multiple world views. The lowest mean ($M = 2.27$), Attitudes #2, highlighted the degree to which course reflected openness to suspend judgment when interacting with culturally different others. Interestingly, the gap between each shared criteria for Knowledge #1 and Knowledge #2, and Skills #1 and Skills #2, was roughly a difference of $n = 0.20$. However, the difference between the gap in the Attitudes #1 and Attitudes #2 was far greater at $n = 0.43$. Many of the TEs reported lower scores for Attitudes #2, as they felt that they did not provide their preservice teachers interactions with culturally diverse individuals. Only after I inquired about their field experiences, did
some of the TEs consider field experiences as an opportunity for their preservice teachers to interact with others different from them. Also, for this data, not one TE explicitly articulated that interaction in their university classroom and/or diverse faculty members helped provide intercultural experiences for their preservice teachers.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Knᵃ¹</th>
<th>Knᵃ²</th>
<th>Skᵇ¹</th>
<th>Skᵇ²</th>
<th>Attᶜ¹</th>
<th>Attᶜ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Criteria from the Intercultural VALUE rubric, a=Knowledge, b=Skills, c=Attitudes

Sara completed her intercultural VALUE rubric looking at what she wished would be obtained in her courses, versus where she believes the students are at the end of her courses. For the criteria Skill #2 and Attitudes #1, Sara reported that her students meet her aim “4”, but in the rest of the rubric’s criteria, Sara’s aim is one standard above to where she believed her students were after the course. Larissa also expressed that all TEs should be aiming to reach the 4s, but because each person is on their own journey,
and some of this should be self-directed, scoring “4” is very difficult to achieve in a 14-week course. Plus, a “4” represents the peak of something that is a life-long journey.

Table 5 provides the mean scores for each TE for each criterion. These mean scores indicate that across each TE, these TEs report higher scores for the two Skills criteria (empathy, verbal and nonverbal communication) with a $M = 2.80$. The lowest reported combined score was Attitudes ($M = 2.48$). The ranges between the TEs’ individual means are quite drastic. The wide-ranging means may be due to Larissa being an outlier in her thoughts about the intercultural VALUE rubric and placing all her preservice teacher at a “2” in every category. Also, the varying means may reflect the course and content the TEs teach. The course being taught (methods vs. foundations) may have had an influence on the self-reported scores. For example, Erin discovered that the language used on the intercultural VALUE rubric for both knowledge criteria was very similar to her foundations’ course description; whereas Diana found that both the Skills categories and the Attitudes #1 connected to what she has tried to accomplish in her methods courses. Emma reported lower mean scores across most of the six criteria based upon her new and growing understanding of interculturalism and her uncertainty of how to incorporate intercultural components in her university classrooms.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>$M=\text{Knowledge}$</th>
<th>$M=\text{Skills}$</th>
<th>$M=\text{Attitudes}$</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>1st Score</td>
<td>2nd Score</td>
<td>3rd Score</td>
<td>4th Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planting the seed.** Many times, TEs used words that indicated they were starting the conversation with their preservice teachers that would allow the preservice teachers to grow interculturally. While Erin, Sara, and Nancy used the “planting the seed” metaphor, Blair used “unpacking” the difference. Emma stated “moistening the sponge”, and Sally’s was “hoping to plant a seed that later down the line, they’re going to use it”, indicating that she was unsure if the seed had become planted. “I want them to do the first handshake” was Larissa’s take on enabling her preservice teachers to initiate an action toward someone who is from a diverse background.

Planting intercultural seeds noted the beginning stages of growth and the capacity a TE has during one semester. These stages of growth encompassed knowledge, skills and attitudes. Erin stated, “I am planting the seed, and there is only so much, I am not their entire program”, representing the time commitment involved in such development as well as the responsibility of other faculty members to continue to water that seed. As such, how TEs went about planting these intercultural seeds took on many forms during the teaching and learning processes. These forms include instruction, assignments, people, and other opportunities.
Instruction. One avenue that these TEs incorporate interculturalism is by the way they teach. For Sally and Lucy, the IB provided an intercultural platform. They felt the IB curricula are an integrated and provide a more holistic approach that surrounds the idea of an internationally-minded individual. For Dianna and Blair, the acknowledged that explicitly teaching through topics of diversity, such as socioeconomic class, race, gender, religion, language and among others, engages the preservice teachers to seek multiple perspectives and to be empathetic. Blair articulated that social justice and equity issues have helped her teach in regard to these topics and throughout her syllabus this mission is shared in multiple forms (i.e., mission statement, diversity statement). But also, this social justice mantra is shared by her EPP, though some faculty has felt uncomfortable talking about some of the aforementioned topics.

We have a strong social justice orientation and strong teaching for doing all of these pieces; our program really focused on it, social justice that is, and we have been grappling [hiring culturally diverse faculty] it as a program for years now.

Lucy has taught for interculturalism by “deconstructing the power relations” so that multiple perspectives can be encouraged. Erin, influenced by Knefelkamp’s theories of college student development, has taught for interculturalism by providing challenges and supports. At the beginning of her course, her preservice teachers complete an online module (created by Erin), which she believed has allowed them to see themselves as cultural beings.

a majority of my students are white and I realized that the big first barrier to them being open to issues of diversity and to this breadth of interest, is that they have to
see themselves as cultural beings. They see diversity that is something that has to do with other people and they never have to encounter if they don’t want to. And so I designed this online module for them to go to, that gives them a visual; that helps them identify themselves as cultural beings. And that’s where I start because I have them do, because I have found this breadth of interest, it’s key.

Based upon the data the Erin has received from each preservice teachers’ module, Erin has discerned “different statements to say to challenge them or to support them” to help open their minds as cultural beings. Similarly, Emma has taught with opposing views to challenge her preservice teachers’ understanding about literacy and characters in literature. Through open conversations, “talking deeply and reading widely” across topics of diversity, Emma has hoped that she is teaching for kindness rather than “otherness.”

Diana and Sara spoke about the theory to practice connection and the ability to teach for real life application. Diana’s own life experiences have greatly impacted the way she teaches, expecting her students to be advocates for real life change. Her preservice teachers have surprised her as some of them read her travel blog in which she shared her internationals experiences and pictures,

> I wrote a daily kind of travel blog that I sent to my students. They didn’t have to read it; it was by choice. And it’s funny the ones that were really affected by it the most, where the ones I would have never had guess, that really took to heart and then wanted to travel and see the world.

Last, Carina viewed inquiry-based learning and a constructivism as her avenue to teach for interculturalism. “I developed my coursework based on that cycle of inquiry.
That you observe, you interpret, you reflect and you plan; but also constructivist education.” Through this, Carina has focused on her preservice teachers’ development as process rather than the product in her university classroom.

They have a chance to really explore the material and realize that it is a process, you know not a product. Products are good, but the process really gives you knowledge, it’s what teaches you the skills. We try to keep it process-based. Through such, Carina has asked her preservice teachers to see if they understand the cultural opportunities that are available to them at a large public institution and she encourages them to engage in such activates.

These TEs teach through personal lenses that are defined by their professional understanding of their content matter. Though the TEs content expertise is not exposed for confidentiality and anonymity proposes, each TE has incorporated intercultural elements, though it may look differently in its shape and form based upon the content. This also can be seen in Table 5 as these TEs rated their course using the intercultural VALUE rubric. Whether it is teaching for openness, multiple perspectives, deconstructing norms, acknowledging bias, and/or recognizing self as cultural beings, these TEs spoke how they teach using intercultural elements.

Furthermore, these TEs self-reported intercultural VALUE rubric scores provide another lens of how they think about their courses as being intercultural. While only half of these TEs provided syllabi for me to further analyze, all TEs rationalized their scores using their syllabi during the one-on-one interview. These scores played a role in not only
how these TEs think about their course and interculturalism, but allowed them a space to reflect and talk about how they teach for interculturalism.

**Assignments.** The TEs also provided examples that required their preservice teachers to exhibit their intercultural development. Many of the TEs used reflections, readings, and field experience for their preservice teachers to gain multiple perspectives. Sara ensured that each of her courses allows readings from authors who origins are outside of the United States. Lucy has provided many books for her preservice teachers to delve into that focus on issues of inequity, while Emma and Sally have exposed their preservice teachers to fictional and non-fictional youth literature to assist them in reading across various genres and diversity topics. Lucy and Diana have required their preservice teachers to create unit plans that reflect upon a culturally relevant pedagogy and universality of problems to promote civic responsibility. The civic responsibility piece was also shared by Blair who has wanted her preservice teachers to grasp the democratic nature and duty of focusing on people, and in this case, their future students.

Many of the TEs brought forth reflections as way to informally assess their preservice teachers intercultural growth. After completing the IDI in her course, Nancy has requested that her preservice teachers submit a “1-2 page reflection on your strengths and challenges and show what personal and professional goals you set in view of this information.” Sara required her preservice teachers to write an autobiography but struggled to decipher if they were really reflecting, or writing what they thought she wanted to read.
I ask my students write about their autobiographies about themselves as a writer, reader, and thinker. So that, I am hoping, helps them to really reflect back to where there are from, what norms they have, but then I am not sure how much they are really getting it; it’s a paper, they probably want to be please me too.

In one of Blair’s courses, the preservice teachers were involved in equitable classroom assignment to deepen the their understanding of all learners. This assignment provides the preservice teachers to explore, research, and reflect on a topic of diversity. Similarly, Lucy has had her preservice teachers reflect on their own identities while completing parent and family engagement activities. Carina had comparable reflections where her preservice teachers reflect on the “image of the child” and the “image of the teacher.”

Moreover, Blair, Sara, and Lucy have implemented different forms of case studies to help their preservice teachers envision future situations. Blair used real-life experiences from her former preservice teachers, and the current preservice teachers read the problem and articulate how they would best handle the situation. These problem-based learning scenarios provided real-life application to the theories these preservice teachers learn in their university classrooms. Sara urged her preservice teachers to choose a case than was a different exposure to them.

I usually say choose a case study that is very different from you or somebody who needs help or somebody who you want to understand better. There are many students, for example, who decide to work with children that are different from themselves. So even though it is not necessarily, for example, not immigrant children but they are upper or middle class [the students], but many of them need...
to go, for example, to go to Head Start. It is a very different culture for them. So that is cross-cultural for them.

Sara evaluated her course as a “4” on category Attitude #1 on the intercultural VALUE rubric, denoting that this activity helped reach her preservice teachers’ with their curiosity of understanding others. By choosing a case study of someone of diverse needs or background, Sara believed that her preservice teachers reach a high level of curiosity that seeks out multiple perspectives.

Similar to Sara, Lucy has provided the experience for her preservice teachers to conduct a parent-child-teacher case study where empathy is demanded. Lucy also self-reported empathy (Skill #1), as the highest score among all categories on the intercultural VALUE rubric.

They have to develop empathy and understanding from someone who is not like themselves because they have to inquire that person’s point of view on their child, and what it would mean to be in that parent’s shoes—what kind of empathy would they need to structure their classroom experience for that child.

Erin has used her online module, Public Broadcasting System educational videos, and an array of what she refers to as “professional points” that expands her preservice teachers breath of interest. She pushed them to explore professional points, which were either teacher-directed activities or student-directed activities. When Erin noticed a specific preservice teacher needs a certain push, she recommended some activities for them.

I have professionalism points, they have to earn 100 and they have to go outside of class and do a variety of things. So that, and they don’t even know its tied to
diversity until the last day of class when I explain my research. And, but even though I was having them do this, I was finding that they were coming and talking to me about their professionalism experiences and using words like, ‘weird’, ‘this is a really weird culture’, and they really did some ‘weird’ things.

Last, some of the TEs expressed the benefits of field experiences as a way to provide intercultural experiences. As mentioned earlier when reporting the mean scores of the intercultural VALUE rubric, many of the TEs did not think of field experiences as when completing the intercultural VALUE rubric. However, the TEs believed that field experiences had the potential to provide multiple culturally diverse interactions. (The planning and coordinating the realities of field experiences are discussed in the third subtheme).

People. A few TEs, Nancy, Larissa, and Sara spoke about the importance of their preservice teachers interacting with people different than them. While Sara and Nancy both have brought international and culturally different others into their university classrooms to provide exposure and perspectives, Sara has furthered this by focusing on the expression, words, and cross cultural experiences that come with such interactions. Sara rated her course of having a “3” in culturally interactions using the intercultural VALUE rubric, and really hoped that these experiences in her course connect her theory-to-practice approach of understanding self and others through these cross cultural exchanges. Sara’s course requires her preservice teachers to engage with someone who is considered international.
It’s great to have that experience and I want them to have it, but then I know it takes longer time and also I know that some people who really started to be committed to cross-cultural/international issues and things just want one encounter can change them and they started to have a very close friend from China and they started to connect, and after that they become interested. I feel that kind of thing is important and I know that what I am doing that aspect is very limited, but I want to make sure to do it.

To that extent, Nancy brings mothers from different cultures around the world into her classroom as a panel to discuss traditions related to child development.

It is varied, but we reliably had people from the Middle East and Asia talking about birthing practices and naming practices and it’s dating practices and how the kids are raised and how you sleep and how you eat. Just kind of things that a lot of our students might take for granted or think everybody does.

On the other hand, Larissa further elaborated the importance of her role as one of the few minority faculty in the program by revealing her ways of life and knowing to her preservice teachers. “But if my students do not get one exposure, to one non-white person before they go into a country that is browning every day, we have not served them well.” Larissa spoke to how the preservice teachers recognize difference in not just appearance, but in the way she speaks and teaches. She told one story of how the preservice teachers struggled learning in her university classroom because she did things differently, at mid-term I get feedback, I am always wanting to know how I am doing. I know which items on the final student assessment has the most troubling comments or
shows how they are perceiving me and it’s always about organization or something that might be interpreted as being in the speed in which things are moving along. So I asked them, I invited them to write on the board for me, what they thought an ideal lesson looked like and of course, they were spitting back everything they have been drilled to believe happens when a lesson is taught. So they wrote on the board, they explained to me, you do this, then you do that, then that, then that. Okay, so I am going to give everyone a handful of candy. I bought this big box, bag of candy. I gave everyone a nice big handful of candy, put it on the desk. Now, every time you see me do something, that remotely resembles one of the items on your list, I want you to put the candy aside. That is my pile. You make my pile in front of you. And I did my lesson. Everyone had the candy in my pile at the end of the lessons. And that was instructive for all of us.

Larissa spoke about the need to translate how she does what she does because of her minority position. She has come to the “island” (MU) where everyone is different from her, where her preservice teachers represent the minority and she constantly had tried find ways to navigate this difference. She reported that her primary purpose in her role is to show up so that the preservice teachers can disturb her, as an adult, rather than taking any actions of learning about different on children in the classroom,

you can’t have a conversation if you are not in the classroom. As I have said in difficult places with student interactions or reflecting on difficult interactions, let them exude all these spirits that trouble them and cause them to act out in uncivil ways while they are with me. Because I am an adult, I am going to manage that
somehow, but I don’t want them taking that first encounter experience into a classroom with young children who have no defense, who cannot protect themselves from what is happening to them. That can be my only contribution to their journey. It is not going to happen in a curriculum, it is not going to happen in an assignment, it is going to happen in how are you going to negotiate a person of color in the powerful position, because I do give the grade. So I again, when I say sun exposure, you can either can take a lot of sun, or you can’t take sun. I swell up when I stay in the sun too long, so I don’t go out at certain hours. So if somebody starts acting out like they are having too much sun exposure, I can completely empathize with them. You know, you even need to get a real strong sun block or don’t come into the sun. It may not be time for you to be exposed to a non-white professor at this part of your journey, or you have had a really difficult experience at some piece of the program, and so you come with the expectation that this will be a negative encounter.

Larissa’s understanding of herself as the main ingredient in teaching for interculturalism was not alone. Sara expressed similar feelings and beliefs as well. “I feel it’s my roll to share whatever experience or what kind of different perspective, and it is sometimes it is easier for them to hear it from me because I am from a different background as well.” Sara also provided an example where one preservice teacher, who was of similar background, felt more connected having a faculty member that could understand her cultural needs, differences and similarities. Another example from Sara summarized her role as non-native English speaker,
So I want to share and for example, my English. I always tell my students I want [them] to start to hear different kinds of English so I hope that will help you feel more comfortable to ask, ‘Sara, what did you say right now?’ I want to ask them a question about it because my students they would say if they have students/children from different countries, they say ‘oh, he or she can’t speak English.’ Sometimes my student teachers feel if they [parents or students] have accents, they feel like, ‘oh we cannot talk.’ It’s like a mental thing, so I want them to start to feel comfortable to ask questions and communicate. I also bring some people from different countries to my classroom, not the people who need help, but as experts. I want my students to start to see them as; I want to destruct the notion, that ESL students/families we need to help. But actually there are many things we can learn from each other.

**Opportunities.** All the TEs recognized the intercultural opportunities that MU provides for their preservice teachers. They denoted experiences such as, teaching in an international setting, attending seminars and MU’s cultural events, workshops and lectures at the Intercultural Center, among other opportunities. They also identified ways in which they believe they can better their EPPs. Larissa, beginning her 14th year at MU, sees the journey as a beginning, “it’s like a one pebble at a time, adding it all up to, but I wouldn’t call it a mole.”

In regard to field experience opportunities, Lucy stated that being “more strategic” would assist in providing more intercultural interactions. Lucy believed on main concern was logistical as “We have a huge priority to get them in the IB schools,
but it is not that easy because there are not that many.” Nancy noted that more alignment within her EPP is needed to further the preservice teachers intercultural growth.

We got the IB strand, we certainly have with the content areas, and we meet, we kind of have this vertical meeting, and we meet, but how do make it happen it horizontally also? And so that’s where my head starts to ache!

Diana also acknowledged that some of the inner-city/urban schools have provided a new perspective for her preservice teachers, but often some of these schools don’t have the capacity to give attention to preservice teachers, have poor leadership, and “teachers were so demoralized they were really disengaged from our students.”

About half of the TEs spoke of providing international teaching experiences as a great way to expose their preservice teachers to difference and interaction with others in an intercultural way, but the cost and time commitment often deters them from participating. Sally indicated that most of her preservice teachers are non-traditional students who work full-time and family, so that “there’s just not an opportunity for them to travel” to take advantage of this opportunity. Estimating the number of preservice teachers that avail of the international student teaching experience in her EPP, Lucy stated, “I would say probably 2 a semester per block, so maybe six each semester across the whole program of maybe 250.” Lucy and Nancy also mentioned a new and additional opportunity where preservice teachers can enroll in course where it takes them to an international city for eight days to learn about their education system.

**Summary.** “Planting the seed” whether through instruction, course assignments, exposure to people, and/or providing opportunities, were all interconnected ways to
incorporate interculturalism in an university classroom. How these TEs adapted to their content needs in the lens of interculturalism was similar yet unique to their content area. For Carina and Larissa, they emphasized the process over the product, and the journey over the destination when providing intercultural teaching and learning. Nancy discovered it takes the commitment of all faculty members and the EPPs to grow the seeds,

I feel like a lot in my classes I am planting seeds...throughout my course, we keep touching on that, but it really takes the whole program, and different speakers, experiences that they will have to help to solidify some of that.

However, Emma uncovered that just planting the seed could be difficult, “if I can plant that kind of seed, I hope that I am making a different in the life of this teacher as a human being and all those that he or she will teach.”

Needless to say, sometimes planting the seed can be surprising, as Diana discovered when her preservice students read her travel blog. Other times, as indicated by Sara and Erin, the preservice teachers may write and talk in the way they think the TEs want to hear. At other times, such development may be spontaneous as Emma found

Can it happen in an aha moment? I think it sometimes it can. Will it be the same aha for everybody, but no, it might an a-ha for a handful of people and other times, it’s more of a just a, like a trickle. Think of [the] leaky, water faucet, that’s just a drop every 15s onto a sponge and the sponge is hard and dry and ewe. And it might be a process of years before that once hard dry sponge is, you know, really open, and all that.
Additionally, each TE found assignments and opportunities in their respected courses to have their preservice teachers practice and engage in intercultural development. These assignments begin and/or further the preservice teachers’ intercultural understanding during teaching and learning processes. Many of the TEs said this is best practiced through self-reflection and diverse reading assignments. Other TEs provided integrated activities and projects’ connected theories into practice, whether that was a lesson or unit plan or solving case studies.

As for opportunities, many of the TEs acknowledged that field experience placements had a great potential for providing intercultural interactions in a school setting. However, logistical issues and strategic gaps deter this opportunity to being the best it can be. Also, MU offers opportunities for preservice teachers to interact with culturally different others, and the TEs encourage these opportunities as a way to plant the intercultural seed. Last, MU’s preservice teachers have the opportunity to teach internationally, but many preservice teachers struggle to avail this situation for a variety of reasons.

People, whether they are diverse faculty members who teach in the EPP, bringing in culturally different mothers to speak to the preservice teachers about their beliefs and understanding of child development, and/or providing a passageway for preservice teachers to interact with individuals who are different from them, were important to three TEs in this study. In the case of the MU, the minority faculty members who participated in this study emphasized their roles in providing those initial encounters that allow their preservice teachers to ask questions to break down assumptions.
Reaping the rewards. Unanimously, all these TEs believed there were benefits to incorporating interculturalism in their EPPs and they conceptualized these benefits into two categories. The first benefit was they believed that it better prepares their preservice teachers to be more effective educators. The second benefit recognized that the intercultural growth for any individual is evolutionary, signifying that the preservice teachers’ time as students in the EPP was only one part of the journey; that this growth was life-long. These TEs articulated that to prepare better and more effective teachers involved a continuous and life-long journey of questioning self in order to better understand others.

So what does a better-prepared teacher do? For many of the TEs, this meant being prepared to work with children who are different than the preservice teachers. In return, the TEs believed intercultural preparation betters society. Sally revisited her concept of continually finding opportunities to break her preservice teachers out of their bubbles as one avenue that interculturalism helped them to best understand future students. Nancy, like Blair and Erin, captured the importance that a better teacher essentially creates a better person who is more tolerant person that is open and curious. Nancy stated that exploring the unknown about yourself and others appeared to be a scary process for some of her preservice teachers, as “it is easy to get really intimidated by what you don’t know. I see that in our students a lot.”

Blair expanded on this idea, but interconnected the need to understand content and pedagogy, “they will be better teachers. If I didn’t think they would be better teachers I wouldn’t do it. I think it’s better content, it’s content and pedagogy, because they need
to understand this deeper to understand their subjects better.” Emma stated, “I hope that I am making a different in the life of this teacher as a human being and all those that he or she will teach.” Sara also expressed her idea that “a better prepared teacher is a more effective teacher so they can actually enjoy teaching.”

Larissa noted there was no harm in incorporating intercultural elements in her instruction as it provides an opportunity for her preservice teachers to begin welcoming others that are different from them. “I do no harm. I mean them all the good in the world. I want them to go out there and meet a child who looks like me and be the one who says, ‘Come in.’” Diana portrayed similar sentiment that interculturalism was one avenue that “enriches my students experiences in the classroom and I think it better communicates the power and the creative opportunities within teaching.”

All TEs noticed incorporating intercultural elements helped prepare a better teacher. A better teacher is not only efficient in his/her pedagogical and content knowledge, but displays dispositions that reflect a caring, curious, tolerant, and open-minded individual. These dispositions help preservice teachers best understand their future students and flows into a better society.

In addition to providing better and more effective teachers who recognize their future students’ needs, the TEs noted these benefits were lifelong and evolutionary. “Oh, I think the benefits are amazing and delightful. I don’t think we could survive if we didn’t evolve and change” (Lucy). Emma also captured this idea by summarizing that at the end of the day, TEs “teach people” not content.
**Weathering the storm.** The third and final theme for RQ3 represents the hurdles and obstacles the TEs found when incorporating interculturalism into their university courses. While the word “storm” may seem drastic, it also represents the potential challenges and unknowns that come with Mother Nature. Not all storms are disastrous, but upfront, they provide information on how one should prepare for its path. Thus, this theme symbolizes how these TEs articulated the challenges of incorporating interculturalism in these TEs university courses and is expressed through three subthemes:  Self-investment, Assessment, and Lack of Diversity.

**Self-investment.** All TEs spoke of the commitment, time, labor, and energy needed on to incorporate interculturalism in their university courses. Also included are a few TEs responses to further their own intercultural development and how their continuous learning is part of the hurdle of interculturalizing their classrooms. Lucy best introduces this subtheme, “I push them a lot. It depends on how much energy I have at the time,” signifying the will and want, but also taking into consideration one’s capacity to do such. Larissa furthered the energy and commitment that is needed,

*Oh God, every minute is a challenge. It’s such hard work and you do not see the benefits for soooo loooong! You don’t get emails from someone for years before you hear something.*

Erin also indicated that she wished she could provide one-on-one interactions with her preservice teachers. However, with over 150 preservice teachers enrolled in her courses, “It’s really hard to have much one-on-one interaction with that many” to provide individual support and mentoring. Lucy, Emma, Nancy, and Sally also recognized that
the work involved in incorporating intercultural elements was demanding, especially with all the other requirements and materials mandated by accreditation standards, as well as preparing preservice teachers for state learning outcomes, and individual education program (IEPs). Emma summarized this concern as TEs try to balance the demands of content, pedagogy, and other accreditation criteria in a 14-week semester,

I have been at this for a few semesters; feel overwhelmed at the sheer volume of [material to be covered]. I feel this every year, and maybe it’s because I learn more every year; it’s like, somehow I think I can teach them everything I know! I want, like, this is all so important! I’ve got 29 SOLs to develop and 14 IEPs and here’s my, they call them, my third grade reading guarantee kids, I don’t know, how is it happening in 14 weeks? I fear it! You know, I just don’t know! I don’t know!

Blair and Diana understood the concerns Emma and others brought forth, but with many years of teaching in EPPs, they found a balance in how to add intercultural components to their teaching. Diana stated, “Well, it’s more work. Whenever you can contextualize, you have to go beyond the basics. Other than that, I don’t think there is any, it’s fun.” Blair also saw interculturalism as way to be creative by recognizing the obstacles that her preservice teachers recognize and/or will recognize in their future classrooms,

I don’t see constraints in the same way I think that I have to always think about my students because they see a lot of constraints. I see a lot of places to be creative. [laughs] Um, there are constraints in term of time. I only have 37.5 hours with them each semester, really physical, one-on-one time. We can’t count it as
40 because we have exam time counted as class time, but that limits how much you can do with them in a course in that amount time. How much they can get done outside of class. You have to make every moment count. So there’s that. So there are constraints! How much do I know? What do I know? Obviously always a constraint of any classroom is how much the teacher knows and is able to listen and recognize, so I am better at it now than I was 10 years ago.

Complementing Blair’s perspective, Nancy reflected on what it is that she really wants her preservice teachers to understand in her courses,

If you try to everything you end up doing nothing in some ways. It’s like you touch, touch, touch, and touch, on this and other things. So I think, what are really the outcomes, what are really the kind of people we want to create as teachers or help to develop as teachers?

Beyond the time, labor, and commitment, three TEs also saw their own intercultural development and knowledge as a hurdle. Carina and Emma particularly spoke of how they continue to grow interculturally, but how their growth was also limited to what they knew. Carina stated, “The challenges are just me. My own [laughs] limitations are my biggest challenges,” while Emma reflected, “I am going to think that determining myself to continue to grow and educate myself; to seek out those opportunities for exposure. You know I tried to.” Though the intercultural development journey is very individualized, Erin acknowledged she and her colleagues came up through an education system that didn’t recognize diversity. “There weren’t just classes when I went to school in any of these classes, so we are all self-educated,” signifying her
lifelong and self-directed approach towards her intercultural development and understanding. Interestingly, these three TEs’ IDI scores and orientation gaps were varied rather than similar.

**Assessment.** This subtheme spotlights how and by what means the TEs assess their preservice understanding of interculturalism or intercultural development. Most of the TEs indicated they used informal and inexplicit techniques to assess their preservice teachers’ intercultural development through monitoring their reflection, dispositions, and incorporations of multiple perspectives in their coursework. Others believed that assessment is quite tricky. Larissa, Erin, and Nancy discovered that evaluating one’s intercultural development is difficult since it is one indicator that is a snapshot of a day in a semester. Erin noted this by providing an example in which she has allowed her preservice teachers to make choices while she had tried to balance challenging and supporting them instead of assessing them.

I don’t do a lot of assessment. I do a lot of presentations, challenges, and support. And I let them make choices. I don’t do a lot. At the end of the semester, I do an assessment, a self-reflection that they have to do, that they self-report. But I don’t evaluate them. Because what happens to the students who are only brave enough to go to a Catholic service to a Methodist service? It’s their first semester but during their career, does more and more all the time. What about the student like me? If I had been assessed as a freshman as a future teacher, there is no way I would have been a teacher. But the more I got introduced, the more I became interested. So I don’t believe in assessing students on openness to diversity. Now,
if they say something that I think [will make them] dangerous or harmful to children, oh yeah, then we step in.

Everyone’s intercultural journey is unique to them and assessing that formally has its challenges. Carina discovered these journeys are difficult to measure since it very complex, and assessing one’s journey take a lot of time—time beyond the four years in a program, “You know, it takes longer, much longer, than they ever thought it would.”

Instead, Diana acknowledged that all her preservice teachers could grow interculturally, but found some of her preservice teachers “get it” more than others. While Diana looks for diverse teaching materials, opportunities for students to have a voice in their learning, and the interconnection of universal problems, she also said she did not really assess for intercultural sensitivity since it was not a part of what her preservice teachers needed to know at that stage in their teacher preparation.

So do I assess them technically on intercultural sensitivity? No, because that’s not really explicitly central to the course. It’s not what they need to be a skilled or successful teacher. To me, it’s another layer of a kind of wisdom that they will get, I hope eventually, I don’t expect to see in a semester. I hope that in a year, they will write me and say, ‘guess what I am doing?’ And I get plenty of that.

Erin and Sara also questioned whether or not their incorporation of interculturalism in their university courses actually was working. Erin questioned if the graduating preservice teachers were more open and aware than their predecessors who weren’t involved in the IB curricula and whether or not the program is doing a good job of helping these preservice teachers grow. Sara said her program has not talked together
about how they assess their preservice teachers’ intercultural development. “Right now, I am still learning too [how to assess]. Again one of the things that I can see and I am assessing is their case studies. Assessing part I think we really never talked together.”

In addition, three TEs spoke to the difficulties in providing culturally diverse field experience placement that will assist them in furthering understanding their preservice teachers’ intercultural growth. Interactions in schools with culturally different students and families provide hands-on experience for their preservice teachers. Based on their self-reported scores on the intercultural VALUE rubric, this was the lowest reported score. Although commute time and logistics in organizing field experiences pose major challenges, Diana, Lucy, and Blair recognized more needs to be done to better prepare their preservice teachers’ experiences with culturally different students and families. Diana’s statement, “I think every classroom is full of diversity if you are looking for someone whose color is different; you may not see it,” is quite true. However, in most EPPs at MU, the preservice teachers have a choice where they want to be placed, and typically, that placement was somewhere near to where they were raised and in a community that looks and acts just like them.

Additionally, Blair indicated she doesn’t have “control over” where her students are placed,

One of my missions has been to diversify our field placements. Since I have been doing that, we have gotten some field placements in the minority religious school and a second language school in the inner-city. We have done a lot more with IB [schools]. I have had students teaching in places where they are working with
Amish families. And so we try hard to get them in an urban placement, a rural placement, a lower income placement, a placement with disabilities, if we are lucky we get them in ELL placements, but it just depends.

Even with intentionally placing preservice teachers in such schools, Lucy noted it really depended on the preservice teacher and how much she/he will take advantage of the situation. She also expressed that with large EPPs, they tried to do systematic and strategic field placements, but the logistics of doing so was quite difficult. For example, even though they produce preservice teachers with an IB certification, there are only few IB schools in the area, with the closest school being about an hour away. Complicating this matter is that “students aren’t always willing to drive and I haven’t yet find a better way” (Lucy).

**Lack of diversity.** The last subtheme for RQ3 reflects the concerns that some TEs had about the lack of diversity in their EPPs; this was articulated in regard to the EPPs’ faculty and student population. As previously stated in Chapter Three, MU’s EPP faculty is over 54% female, 12.3% identify as African-American or black, Hispanic or Latino, Native American or Alaskan Native, or international. Likewise, 77.5% of the undergraduate student population identifies as White.

Three TEs, Nancy, Larissa, and Sara, spoke to the lack of diversity in their EPPs’ faculty. Larissa and Nancy recalled a situation where one minority faculty member was hired only to leave within a year. Larissa also indicated, “We still can’t keep more than two black faculty members in the 13 years I have been here.” Sara found that her experience working with a CLD faculty has provided multiple perspectives to the given
situation. Larissa also found this to be true and often she has become exhausted being one of the few minority faculty members in her EPP.

Furthermore, Lucy and Larissa noted the need for recruiting more CLD students in their EPPs. Larissa said she rarely taught a preservice teacher who was not from the majority, race, religion, and language. Lucy represented all three of these TEs’ points by addressing where her EPP is in recruiting diverse preservice teachers:

Well, I think one of the challenges is simply that we have a population of students who are fairly, at least in some ways, homogeneous. When you start to dig underneath the surface, you do recognize they have had a lot of various life course events that make them more or less open and that, then you start to realize there is a lot of variation. I think we are doing a better job of appealing to students of color. I think we have a very diverse graduate program because we get students from other countries, and those students in turn teach our undergraduates, which is really awesome. I think we could do better at the same time.

**Summary of findings for RQ3.** Anytime one plants a seed, it must be watered to reap the harvest, but at the same time, contingent storms may create challenges. In the three themes that best articulate RQ3, we begin to understand the way in which and to what extent these TEs incorporated interculturalism in their university classrooms. All TEs believed one of their goals was to “touch,” “plant,” and “moisten” their preservice teachers’ awareness of self and others. Though this takes on various forms in each course, we discovered that many TEs used reflections, diverse readings, and various other exposures, including themselves, to help water the seeds within each preservice teacher.
I also revealed that all TEs believed implementing intercultural components in their EPPs is beneficial and produces a more efficient teacher who is better prepared to work with all children. As I listened to these TEs speak about these benefits, they spoke with excitement and passion about exposing their preservice teachers to reflect on themselves to better understand others. They expressed how this development extends beyond better teaching, but also could better one as an individual in today’s society and how such traits trickle to their future students. They also recognized that benefits and intercultural development go beyond the time enrolled in an EPP. This growth is lifelong and evolutionary, and each preservice teacher is on his/her unique journey. Additionally, the EPP is just one destination during their intercultural journey. Moreover, I discovered some TEs felt more comfortable in doing this than others and their challenges of doing such depended on their own intercultural understanding and development.

With benefits come some challenges. Through the themes of self-investment, assessment, and lack of diversity, these TEs articulated the daily hurdles they must confront in incorporating intercultural elements in their EPP classrooms. Though many of the TEs believed reaping the harvest of interculturalism outweighed the storm’s components, they also faced some hurdles bigger than they, and collaboration among faculty and programs are needed to overpower these challenges.

With self-investment, the TEs found obstacles in their understanding and balance between what they can provide against what they have the capacity to do. Time and commitment were commonly shared as challenges, though some TEs found ways to weather such storms. Others found that, sometimes, their lack of intercultural exposure,
training, and understanding also posed challenges. Additionally, assessing intercultural elements is not easy, and these TEs articulated this in many different ways. They provided support and avenues in which they have assessed preservice teachers’ self-reflections, dispositions, and interactions, though often done informally. They recognized that each preservice teacher has a unique intercultural journey and assessing such can be tricky and complex. Also, some TEs support culturally diverse field experience placements that could aid in assessing their preservice teachers’ intercultural growth; but such opportunities were difficult to create given the logistics and preservice teachers’ motivations to stay near their homes and/or MU. Finally, the lack of diverse students and faculty caught the attention of three TEs as a hurdle. While efforts have been suggested to increase the diversity for each population, the outcomes are barely changing.

**Summary of Overall Findings**

The findings of this study are reported in this chapter and organized by each RQ that sought to uncover these TEs’ understandings and teachings for interculturalism. With RQ1, I discovered these TEs had a different understanding of what interculturalism means and began to understand how their personal and professional life events and influences have been directed due to their understandings of interculturalism. While each TE is also on her own journey, I uncovered a common subtheme—that they also seek to understand interculturalism by examining and reflecting on their roles within their preservice teachers’ intercultural journey.

With RQ2, I explored whether or not the TEs’ completion of the IDI had any influence on their teaching and thinking of interculturalism. These TEs expressed a
reaction to the tool and the functionality of the tool. For the majority of the TEs, the IDI was a confusing tool and they struggled to place themselves in one culture. Others were indifferent about the tool and dismissed it. A few TEs found the tool to be a useful reflective tool for themselves and their students, though they realized that this is a tool that gives a snapshot during one’s intercultural journey. Others believed the IB curricula and college initiatives influence the way they think and teach for interculturalism than the IDI did for them. In fact, in all three RQs, the IB influence was articulated in one way or another.

Finally, I sought to investigate what these TEs were actually doing to incorporate interculturalism in their EPPs. I discovered these TEs all believed they were planting a seed to assist in their preservice teachers’ intercultural development. They saw their preservice teachers on individual journeys that were lifelong and unique to each individual. By self-reporting scores from the intercultural VALUE rubric, I uncovered that these TEs were confident in providing intercultural skills and knowledge for their preservice teachers, but offering culturally diverse interactions was often a challenge. This coincides with the findings that some TEs struggled to assess their preservice teachers’ intercultural development because their field experiences were not as strategic and systematic as they would like the field placements to be. Furthermore, I noted the rewards of incorporating interculturalism in their EPPs aligned with creating better and more efficient teachers who recognize the needs of different children and actively seek ways to best understand these students so they can be successful.
With any benefits come some challenges. Although most of the challenges were not unique and shared, each TE is on her own journey as to how she confronted such challenges. The lack of diversity in the faculty and student population was a programmatic and university concern expressed by both minority and non-minority faculty. Nevertheless, such lack of diversity might directly influence the way these TEs incorporate interculturalism in their university classrooms. Also, some TEs discovered that assessing their preservice teachers needs to be discussed in collaboration with faculty and other EPPs, suggesting a programmatic challenge as well. However, when I dove deeper into analysis, I discovered these TEs understood the complexity of assessing intercultural development, and if and when they did assess it, it was quite informal and inexplicit. Typically, these informal assessments were anecdotal and/or completed by reading preservice teachers’ reflections and adhering to their dispositions. To understand what the findings mean in the greater context of the literature, a discussion of these findings is located in the subsequent chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

The purpose of this study was to investigate TEs’ understandings of interculturalism and to explore the ways and to what extent these TEs incorporated interculturalism in their university EPP courses. Additionally, this study sought to uncover whether or not these TEs’ IDI scores influenced how they thought about interculturalism. Data sources included TEs’ one-on-one interviews, course syllabi, program documents, intercultural VALUE rubric scores, their IDI results, and researcher notes. An interpretative qualitative inquiry was employed, engaging in a constructivist approach that allowed an exploration of multiple perspectives and meanings by understanding the TEs’ processes of and experiences in interculturalism. Moreover, the TEs’ IDI results and their self-reported scores from the intercultural VALUE rubric permitted the use of descriptive statistics to supplement the qualitative data. This engaged a dialectical stance where the data sources “yield a better understanding of the phenomena…as all methods each offer but one perspective, one partial view” (Greene, 2007 p. 79). The RQs that guided this study included:

1. What are these TEs’ understandings of interculturalism?

2. To what extent and in what ways did these TEs’ IDI results influence how they think about interculturalism?
3. To what extent and in what ways do these TEs incorporate interculturalism in their educator preparation courses?

In this chapter, four areas that centralize the discussion are organized by the findings presented in Chapter Four. The four major areas are: interculturalism is complex, teaching for interculturalism, the IDI and teacher education, and university’s role in promoting interculturalism. Recommendations and implications for practice and research are also presented in this chapter.

**Interculturalism is Complex**

While this study highlighted four theories of interculturalism, I found the TEs used multiple avenues to extend their understanding and development of interculturalism, which suggests the complexity of interculturalism. Deardorff’s edited volume, *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence* (2009), offers a variety of ways in which interculturalism is conceptualized, enacted, and assessed in many different contexts. The TEs in this study conceptualized the complexity of interculturalism through the following topics: influences from the field of multicultural education, interculturalism as developmental, multiple pathways in interculturalism, and the need for explicit and systematic assessment of interculturalism. This section concludes with a call for scholars to join forces in promoting a common understanding of interculturalism.

**Influence from the field of multicultural education.** In this study, a few TEs understood interculturalism through building and maintaining relationships (Deardorff, 2009a), while the majority of TEs articulated cultural models that emerged multicultural education frameworks to assist in their understandings of interculturalism. As such, the
majority of TEs housed their theoretical understandings of interculturalism through awareness and recognition of others and difference, by examining similarities and differences of others.

Researchers have offered that intercultural is a more dynamic term than multicultural, because intercultural enacts the idea of interaction, where multiculturalism explicitly elicits more awareness of cultural difference. Thus, confusion between multicultural and intercultural should not be unanticipated as they share overlapping ideas building awareness and address social inequalities (Barrett, 2013). However intercultural extends the conversation by building a level of competency that first focuses on self before others (Hunter, 2014) “in order to work together to address the global challenges that confront us” (Deardorff, 2009a, p. 269).

This finding is not surprising given that these TEs worked in U.S. education settings that promoted multiculturalism rather than interculturalism in teacher education. While Europe embraced intercultural education since the 1970s (Cushner, 2011), only recently has the concept of interculturalism begun to appear more in U.S. teacher education, which could be due in part to study abroad teaching opportunities and university-focused internationalization efforts to respond to the call for globalized education. In the context of U.S. teacher education, the roots of multiculturalism stemmed from national social injustices to create social and systemic change, whereas interculturalism gained traction due to the call to globalize higher education within an international context (Marshall, 2006).
Interculturalism is developmental. The TEs also described interculturalism as being a developmental process, akin to Bennett’s DMIS (1986,1993), which measures one’s intercultural development through a continuum of stages. This result is not surprising given that the TEs completed the IDI, and the IDI evolved from the DMIS framework. Interestingly, during the interviews, the TEs articulated little knowledge about the IDI framework, and most of their developmental understanding of interculturalism emerged from their understanding of their preservice teachers’ personal and intellectual development. As such, the TEs recognized that each preservice teacher is on his/her own unique journey, and TEs must provide the appropriate strategies to challenge and support their preservice teachers so they can become self-directed seekers of their own intercultural growth. However, the TEs also acknowledged the knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Deardorff, 2006) their preservice teachers need to have to be more effective teachers for a classroom that is “browning every day” (Larissa). They saw these attributes to be both external and internal as they completed the modified intercultural VALUE rubric. Thus, the intercultural VALUE rubric designed on Bennett’s DMIS framework and Deardorff’s (2006) process model of intercultural competence and data that emerged from the interviews assisted the TEs in their articulation of understanding interculturalism in their EPP classrooms.

Need for explicit and systematic assessment. Formally assessing intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes demonstrated challenges, and the TEs were not unified in their assessment practices and even articulated that assessing these attributes has not been discussed explicitly in their respective EPPs. When asked how they assess preservice
teachers for growth of these attributes, many TEs in this study implemented informal and implicit assessment methods. Unlike Deardorff’s (2006) study, in which the university administrators and intercultural scholars mutually agreed that assessment was important, some of these participants struggled to see whether or not assessing preservice teachers’ growth was even possible given the delicateness and amount of time it takes to understand one’s own identity. Deardorff (2009b) agreed that assessing intercultural growth is complicated, and she and Fantini (2009) offered explicit steps that may assist in assessing such growth, with the first step of agreeing to a common definition of being *intercultural*. Specifically, Deardorff (2009b) proposed a multi-method model of assessment that captures various components of intercultural growth, but highlights that this approach should be prioritized and cautiously designed. Byram (1997) suggested that with such complexity, one might consider self-assessment through a portfolio-based assessment.

The TEs implemented informal reflections and disposition checks of their preservice teachers, but again, it was not something streamlined or discussed at the program level. Seeking assessment of intercultural growth is intricate since there are multiple understandings and frameworks defining interculturalism (Van de Vijver & Leung, 2009). Even with over 80 assessments for assessing cultural competence (Fantini, 2009; Institute for Intercultural Communication, 2013), it has become imperative for explicit and systematic understanding among EPPs on what to assess, when to assess, and being prepared to create a plan for how to use the results (Bennett, 2001; Benton-Borghi & Chang, 2012).
Call to join forces. Understanding interculturalism through multiple pathways is not a new finding in this research. While this study did not specifically inquire about intercultural competence, Deardorff’s (2006) results are compatible to this study’s findings since the participants expressed varied interpretations of how they understood and assessed interculturalism. For example, Emma stated, “Maybe this is my own bias, [but] unlike a science methods class where there is a heavy focus on science content and methods may be do not lend themselves to much work with intercultural stuff,” indicating that interculturalism may not be applicable for all EPP courses and content areas. As such, the TEs often talked through what interculturalism meant for them through the lens of their own content area. They also believed that one’s interculturalism is developmental, with each person on his/her unique journey, and assessing him/her through this journey is difficult and often accomplished implicitly and informally.

Also, while multiculturalism and interculturalism have different roots, they offer compatible forces to assist teacher education in preparing a more intercultural teaching force (Hunter, 2014) that not only embraces the cultural and linguistic diversity in today’s U.S. classrooms, but also addresses the call for a more globalized approach to the teaching and learning processes (Zhao, 2010). If we look at expanding our multicultural conversation with TEs to include intercultural components, then we add the dimensions of the individual in understanding the cultural process. It is time for us to come together as a joint research community to promote and provide a more effective teacher force that meets the global demands of a diverse and international education.
Teaching for Interculturalism

Coming from the multicultural domain, Banks (1993) stated that teachers rarely recognize their own attitudes toward cultural differences. While Banks was most likely addressing inservice teachers, Koster, Brekelmans, Korthagen, and Wubbels (2005) discovered some TEs emphasized preparing preservice teachers for culturally diverse classrooms. Expanding on Koster et al.’s findings, this study discovered that the TEs not only highlighted the importance of learning about CLD learners to their preservice teachers, but they also reflected on their own values and beliefs about diversity, contradicting Goodwin et al.’s (2014) findings. Furthermore, the participants described their personal and professional pursuits of learning about multicultural and intercultural research and experiences, and sought out professional and personal development opportunities to become more knowledgeable about intercultural development. Particularly, Erin indicated that although she and her colleagues may not be prepared to teach with a multicultural or intercultural lens, they were self-directed seekers in learning more about interculturalism. Ongoing professional development is a standard when understanding the expertise of a TE (Association of Teacher Educators, 2008; Smith, 2005), whether it is self-directed or supported by the college and/or university.

The TEs conceptualized teaching for interculturalism through the following areas: what makes one intercultural, influence of the IB certification program, creating and better and more effective teacher, and direct and explicit engagement. Concluding this section is a call for systematic implementation of teaching for interculturalism.
What makes one more intercultural? Shaklee and Merz (2012) implied that TEs need to model intercultural dispositions to their students, but establishing professional dispositions as a goal for teacher education appears as an administrative concern rather than adhering to the preservice teachers’ dispositions (Katz & Raths, 1985; Raths, 2001). An additional challenge to intercultural dispositions is that current research has indicated that many inservice teachers operate in ethnocentric levels of intercultural development as assessed by the IDI (Bayles, 2009; DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Grossman & Yuen, 2006; Mahon, 2006, 2009; Yuen, 2010). Results from the current study discovered that, on average, the TEs appear to be transitioning from ethnocentric view to ethnorelative views, though four TEs were operating in the ethnorelative mindset. This is significant because K-12 students are operating further along the intercultural development continuum (Straffon, 2003) than K-12 teachers, and this sample of TEs operated between the two mindsets.

Perhaps Willemse, Lunenberg, and Korthagen’s (2008) conclusions provide some insight as they found morally important concepts in a teacher education curriculum vary and depended on individual TE preference. This may be attributed to the varied approaches these TEs took to implementing interculturalism in their EPPs. The TEs in this study suggested that teaching for interculturalism was a moral commitment to preparing a better and more effective teacher that has ramifications for society as a whole. Often, they spoke of dispositions needed for their preservice teachers to become a more intercultural teacher, which they believed resulted in a better and more effective teacher. They addressed skills of empathy and communication that were highlighted by
categories on the intercultural VALUE rubric, alongside moral attitudes of curiosity, respect, care, and open-mindedness, and knowledge of other people, ethnicities, race, countries, sexual orientations and abilities. These attributes not only align with Byram’s (1997) savoir être [intercultural attitudes] but also serve in understanding Deardorff’s (2006) process model that elicits both internal and external intercultural development of an individual through knowledge, skills and attitudes.

**Influence of the IB certification program.** Researchers remind us concepts of culturally relevant pedagogy, multiculturalism, cultural competence, intercultural competence, international mindedness, globalization and interculturalism often are used interchangeably. However, the integration of the IB certification program into MU’s EPPs has appeared to influence the participants’ thoughts about interculturalism. Even though a few TEs felt that the IB framework was too western-centric, they believed that an EPP has to start somewhere and the IB framework provided that medium. Thus, the IB certification program has been one pathway that has helped these TEs “walked the talk” as they prepare preservice teachers for the diversity in today’s U.S. pK-12 classrooms (Edwards & Kuhlman, 2007; Lucas & Grinberg, 2005; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005).

The participants articulated that the IB certification program also has offered a way for them to explicitly address multiple perspectives, extending the research beyond the multicultural or social justice (Cushner, 2011). Allowing their preservice teachers to reflect upon themselves before they enter their CLD classrooms is a practice that has been absent in many U.S. EPPs (Causey et al., 2000; de Jong et al., 2013; Garmon, 2004; Irvine; 2005; Li, 2013; Pohan & Aguilar, 2001; Sleeter, 2001, 2005).
Using various assignments, reflections, field experience, and opportunities, these TEs found ways to “plant the intercultural seed” (among other similar metaphors) in their preservice teachers by providing authentic experiences and direct engagement. Some TEs even saw themselves as role models in creating intercultural interactions in their EPP courses. This is akin to Byram’s (1997) *savoirs* of intercultural competence, especially *savoir aprender/FAIRE* [discovery and interaction] as well as the various course components that Kasten et al. (2013) found when researching how literacy and reading TEs incorporate diversity into their EPPs. Kasten et al. discovered that the TEs also saw themselves as role models in promoting cultural competence, just as Sara and Larissa reported in their interviews. Unlike Kasten et al., the TEs in this study articulated that implementation of the IB certification program has provided a holistic and integrated approach to interculturalize their courses, as the EPPs assume that concepts addressing diversity and cultures are addressed throughout each course, rather than a sole course. According to participants, this pressures the TEs to align their courses systematically in way that every TE is teaching for multiple understanding and interculturalism. This may be a more unique characteristic in EPPs, as Hollins and Guzman (2005) found that teaching for diversity is often a separate or optional course that is often not aligned with subsequent EPP coursework.

**Creating better and more effective teachers.** The TEs discovered the benefits of interculturalism very rewarding. All TEs expressed teaching for interculturalism as a key to helping prepare a better and more effective teacher. This better and more effective teacher produces benefits not only in the immediate classroom setting, but expands to the
betterment of the next generation of youth and society. All the TEs acknowledged that teaching for interculturalism is a lifelong and evolutionary process and the preservice teachers’ time in the EPP is just one destination in this journey. Edwards and Kuhlman (2007) expressed similar sentiment in their proposition of developing a culturally responsive educator. However, explicitly articulating that this journey is lifelong needs to be openly shared with preservice teachers since many studies have discovered that both preservice and inservice teachers do not adequately feel prepared to teach diverse students (Castro, 2010; Deveney, 2007; Young, 2010).

**Direct and explicit engagement for intercultural growth.** Assessing whether or not these seeds actually grow is a topic discussed in the aforementioned finding, and the intercultural VALUE provided avenues that assisted the TEs in articulating the knowledge, skills and attitudes they hoped to develop in their preservice teachers. The skill of empathy garnered the highest mean on the intercultural VALUE rubric. Although McAllister and Irvine (2002) uncovered empathy as one effective disposition for inservice teachers as they worked within CLD classrooms, they and others discovered that more authentic experiences might be needed to help understand others (Deveney, 2007; Ladson Billings, 2009). Interestingly, intercultural interactions (Attitudes #2) on the intercultural VALUE rubric ($M = 2.27$) possessed the lowest mean among the TEs in this study, even though three of the participants explicitly discovered ways to bring intercultural interactions in their classrooms. The direct engagement of intercultural interactions for both TEs and preservice teachers appears to be needed in order for intercultural development to occur, as the TEs must actively be involved in this process.
(Gutiérrez & Hunter, 2014). Thus without this direct and explicit engagement, a gap between the theory of interculturalism and actual enactment of the theory occurs, which unfortunately, is all too common in teacher education (Zozakiewicz, 2010).

Furthermore, about half of the TEs acknowledged that more could be done systematically to prepare their preservice teachers’ for intercultural. But this is a difficult pursuit, due to the amount of time, energy, and commitment needed to assist every preservice teacher’s intercultural growth, combined with the TEs’ responsibilities to adhere to the accreditation standards, the accountability to the standardized testing movement, as well as the demands to publish their research. It has been documented that the standardization movement may undermine the accountability in preparing teachers for CLD classrooms, which directly relates to the challenges faced by these TEs (Sharma et al., 2014; Skerrett & Hargreaves, 2008; Wells, 2014; Zeichner, 2003).

**Call for systematic implementation of teaching for interculturalism.** Zhao (2010) called upon EPPs to globalize their programs so that both future and current teachers can expand their cultural competencies. Hunter and Pearson (2014) have also set forth a cultural process that involves individual growth as a way to interculturalize teacher education. In this study, the TEs reported that various assignments, activities, opportunities, experiences and people can assist in how they teach for interculturalism. We also know that the IB framework assisted these TEs in framing their intercultural course dimensions. The TEs also highly valued empathy as a skill set and often acknowledged the importance of knowing self and multiple cultural worldviews.
However, it still remains that direct and conscious experiences that promote intercultural interactions are needed. Such experiences do not solely have to be accomplished internationally, but with careful curriculum planning both vertically and horizontally, TEs and their EPPs can proactively plan intercultural interactions domestically. If properly scaffolded, these interactions may provide preservice teachers with experiences that demand multiple perspectives. Additionally, this furthers the intercultural cultivating process, by “watering” the seeds by providing more real-world situations of facilitating learning among all students. These experiences might allow for deeper reflection and extend beyond empathetic skills, as the preservice teachers must interact with others in practice, rather than hypothesize a theory in class. Whether this is accomplished through activities such as field experiences, people-to-people exchanges within the university, or informal conversations with students, parents, and teachers, it is important for preservice teachers to gain such exposure to further their intercultural development. Thus, this research calls upon EPPs to provide explicit and direct intercultural interactions for their preservice teachers.

**IDI or No IDI? IDI and Teacher Education**

The IDI has been used in a wide-range of studies in education, especially to address preservice and inservice teachers’ intercultural development. Some studies exposed that students score in the ethnorelative mindset of IDI development continuum (Pederson, 1998; Straffon, 2003), while other research indicates inservice teachers score in the ethnocentric mindset (DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Grossman & Yuen, 2006; Mahon, 2006, 2009; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010). While the IDI was thoroughly tested
and possesses strong cross-cultural reliability (Hammer, 2011; Hammer et al., 2003) and the tool has demonstrated no cultural bias or social desirability effects (Paige et al., 2003), the TEs in this study had mixed reactions about the IDI, which ranged from promising to unsatisfactory. This current study showed that these TEs’ reactions were not dependent on how the TEs scored on the IDI continuum. Although the TEs reported that individual or in-group profile feedback follow-up sessions assisted some of them to understand the tool better, that was not the case for everyone.

In addition, eight TEs overestimated their intercultural development, while one under-predicted her intercultural development and one accurately predicted her intercultural development. This finding furthers the debate between what TEs actually think they are providing and/or modeling compared to what the preservice teachers are actually receiving (Garber, 1995; Smith, 2005; tatto, 1996, 1998; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). This finding also is important as TEs are encouraged to model intercultural skills, knowledge, and attitudes (Shaklee & Merz, 2012), but they might not be modeling what they think they are modeling (Hornbuckle, 2013).

The TEs also expressed concerns that the IDI was confusing. Four TEs found the tool confusing, especially when it came to understanding the culture they needed to identify, possibly suggesting they had different meanings of culture. Understanding the term intercultural is dependent on defining the term culture (Hunter & Pearson, 2014), and if one does not understand one of the first criteria and an important framework of the tool, this can become problematic as the TE continues to complete the IDI. Surprisingly, the TEs also commented on how other faculty members in their EPPs felt about the IDI,
and the reactions from the faculty were not favorable. One TE said she wished there were a better tool that faculty trusted. A few TEs made explicit changes in how they thought about or taught for interculturalism after their IDI experience; these TEs received their follow-up feedback session. These same TEs found the IDI to be a reflective tool, causing them to think or rethink their own values and beliefs, even if it were only for a few minutes. Research by DeJaeghere and Cao (2009) uncovered that using the IDI as a process to guide programmatic teacher professional development over a two-to-three-year period, without intercultural immersions, but with appropriate training, can assist in developing intercultural growth in knowledge, skills and attitudes. Also, DeJaeghere and Cao discovered that some of their teachers were not developmentally ready for some of the intercultural professional development, which might have been the case for the TEs who felt indifferent or dismissed the tool.

**Call for furthering intercultural assessment in teacher education.** Based upon these findings, one may suggest that implementing the IDI, as a reflection tool may be helpful for some TEs if they are developmentally ready to understand its results. For others, their IDI scores might hinder their intercultural growth, potentially countering the purpose of the IDI and their own intercultural development. It is important to use the IDI in concert with other measures, and not as a stand-alone tool, in order to better understand one’s intercultural development. Using a multi-method approach that has explicit goals and outcomes, as proposed by Deardorff (2009b), may provide a more comprehensive way to understand one’s intercultural growth, whether this is the TE or preservice teacher.
If the IDI is being used, the qualified administer must clearly articulate to the participants the purpose of the IDI, as well as explicitly state that the IDI is not a judgment tool about the individual. Additionally, a follow-up feedback session by the qualified administrator is critical if the participants are to clearly understand aspects of their intercultural development. For TEs, this is especially vital as they connect their intercultural development to how they think about and teach for interculturalism. Without such follow-up from the qualified administer, how TEs apply their intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes in the teaching and learning process is not furthering the process of interculturalizing EPPs.

Thus, the IDI has it merits, especially as a reflection tool in teacher education, if only one is provided a follow-up session in which she is able to make connections to her intercultural development to her teaching applications. Beyond that, the IDI appears to be a confusing tool that did not provide explicit connections from one’s intercultural development in relation to her teaching and learning. The IDI may be the most reliable and valid intercultural assessment currently on the market (Hammer, 2011; Hammer et al., 2003), but a more teacher education appropriate measure should be considered if we are really to advance our understanding and calls of how to interculturalize teacher education.

**University’s Role in Promoting Interculturalism**

The TEs also were informed about interculturalism through their personal and professional experiences. This replicates results by Sharma et al.’s (2014) as outside influences attributed to the literacy and reading TEs’ ability to implement diversity
components in their EPPs. In this study, no TE articulated that only professional influences have helped her better understand interculturalism, although four TEs expressed that their personal influences that have most affected their understanding of interculturalism. While six of the TEs found ample support from MU in furthering their understanding of interculturalism, others struggled to find the support or did not acknowledge the support. Though many of the TEs spoke of the Intercultural Center and its events, other TEs failed to mention or recognize the Intercultural Center, even though some TEs’ offices are located in the same building as the center. This finding supplements research associated with the lack of training in preparing and developing TEs (Goodwin et al., 2014; Loughran, 2014; Murray & Male, 2005) as it is assume that TEs are experts in their content areas but not prepared to explicitly mode and articulate the pedagogy of teacher education (Smith, 2005; Wilson 2006; Zeichner, 2005).

Finally, the TEs implicitly acknowledged the role of MU’s international efforts both at the university level as well as within their college. While these activities and opportunities were not expanded upon in depth, they represent a more universal approach of how universities are providing opportunities for their faculty, staff and students. Whether it may be a grant-funded initiative or university-led efforts, these TEs tacitly acknowledged these opportunities for intercultural growth. As such, this section addressed two main areas for discussion: ongoing professional development for TEs, and recruiting and CLD faculty and students. Last, this section concludes with a call for administrative engagement in interculturalizing EPPs.
**Ongoing professional development.** It is no secret that one advantage of working in higher education is the autonomy one has over work and research time. However, with such autonomy, personal drive is needed, which might cause TEs to look for immediate connections in their personal life to make sense of interculturalism, as was the case for some of the TEs in this study. Though this result is not unforeseen, it does further the call by Zeichner (2005), Wilson (2006), and Loughran (2014) to promote a cannon and/or framework(s) to better prepare future and experienced TEs for the demands placed upon them. Additionally, the TEs in this study who worked off the main campus struggled to feel included in the intercultural events, as more time, effort, and energy is needed to attend these opportunities on the main campus. As such, it is time for the academy to be a vocal leader, rather than a tacit teammate, in promoting professional development across all university campuses. With recent research calling on EPPs to interculturalize or globalize their offerings (Hunter & Pearson, 2014; Zhao, 2010), providing explicit preparation and development for the life in the academy appears to be a good investment.

Moreover, TEs’ professional development is critical as researchers have proposed that TEs are one of the most important influencers of preservice teachers (Snoek et al., 2011), while others conclude a teacher is one of the most important factors in shaping a student’s knowledge (Barber & Moursched, 2007; Hattie, 2009; U.S. White House, 2014). Loughran (2014) implied that TEs’ beliefs and values may influence preservice teachers’ beliefs and values. However, what is transferred from the TE and the EPP curriculum to the preservice teacher’s classroom has been strongly debated (Garber, 1995; Tattoo, 1996,
1998; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). This debate continues, as in December 2014, the USDOE drafted regulations making EPPs and indirectly TEs more accountable for their graduated preservice teachers’ students’ success on standardized assessments. Juxtaposing this with the academic achievement gap among minority pK-12 students, it is critical for TEs to reflect on their beliefs they bring into their EPP courses. Cushner (2011) stated that those who can develop and continue to develop interculturally are more effective in understanding diverse perspectives in making decisions and taking action. This becomes a concern as TEs are criticized for not modeling CLD practices (Edwards & Kuhlman, 2007; Lucas & Grinberg, 2005; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). It is time for EPPs and universities to systematically find ways to provide TE professional development for intercultural understanding, so that these knowledge, skills, and attitudes can be modeled to preservice teachers in preparation for their diverse classrooms.

**Recruiting and retaining CLD faculty and students.** Even when providing explicit and thoughtful professional development, there is the lack of diversity within teacher education. Kasten et al. (2013) found only a few TEs saw the lack of diversity in their student body as a concern, and they did not address whether or not they felt the same for the lack of diversity in their faculty. Three TEs in this study found the lack of diversity in the faculty and/or student body as a challenge to incorporate interculturalism in the teaching and learning process. This is a challenge that stems from the university, though accountability should also be placed upon TEs to help recruit and retain the best TEs to help prepare preservice teachers in their EPPs. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) requires universities to document how they are
recruiting culturally diverse faculty and students; but as this study discovered, retaining such individuals is difficult and those who identify as minority expressed challenges to working in a program that tends to see the dominant western view.

**Call for administrative engagement.** Administrators and deans need to be actively engaged in the interculturalization process of teacher education. The call to interculturalize teacher education, which has the ability to promote better and more effective teachers, is needed at all levels, and cannot be accomplished by individual TEs. Whether it is promoting ongoing professional development or choosing a CLD faculty, EPP administration must play a functional and purposeful role in this change. They must promote TEs as reflective educators and appreciate the research that comes from self-studies since this research furthers the TE’s understanding of how they teach.

**Recommendations for Research and Practice**

Although this study provides a glimpse into a small sample of TEs’ thoughts, understandings, and teachings for interculturalism, it does further the research by adding the TE voice, as well as sharing insight into one university’s journey toward interculturalizing its EPPs. It also provides implications for the future of what teacher education and the associated EPPs should consider. This is only the beginning of this research, especially since only recently have Hunter and Pearson (2014) called for interculturalizing teacher education. While many more ideas have arisen from this study, the following four recommendations present a bigger picture of what could be considered in future research.
1. We have attended to the globalization call. So what? The calls for globalizing teacher education (Zhao, 2010) and/or interculturalization of teacher education (Hunter & Pearson, 2014) during the past decade are known, but what are EPPs doing to address this call? What are successful practices? How do we know if what is being done is truly successful? For the TEs in this study, the IB certification programs helped conceptualize and thread the intercultural components in their EPPs and courses. What more can we learn from the IB certification program? Additionally, we only know the TE’s voice in this research, so what are the preservice teachers’ thoughts on what they know? Have they felt prepared to teach for multiple perspectives? Research has stated preservice teachers often feel unprepared to teach in diverse classroom environments (Causey et al., 2000; de Jong et al., 2013; Garcia & Guerra, 2004; Garmon, 2004; 2005; Irvine; 2005; Li, 2013; McAllister & Irvine, 2002; Pohan & Aguilar, 2001; Sleeter, 2001, 2005) or that there is a disconnect between the TEs and preservice teachers’ understanding of a good TE (Smith, 2005). Thus, I encourage that we seek avenues to collect longitudinal data extending beyond the EPP and following the preservice teachers into their classrooms to understand their unique intercultural journeys and to explore specific and explicit EPP curriculum that actively promote interculturalism. This call also adheres to the general regulations the USDOE proposed in making teacher education programs more accountable to their teacher education graduates.
2. TEs’ professional development for interculturalization of teacher education is needed, but how it should be conceptualized is unknown. One factor that makes higher education appealing is the autonomy faculty have to do what they think is most profound to further the expertise in the field. Still, with rapidly changing needs in our world and the dynamic shifts in our education culture, providing TEs with intercultural understanding is very important. While MU offered an array of opportunities for these TEs to become more involved in intercultural components, this may not be the most immediate concern for the TEs. By prioritizing what TEs need to know and scaffolding appropriate professional development that does not hinder day-to-day accountability, teacher education institutions can seek a systematic approach to providing professional development. Wilson (2006) and Loughran (2014) promoted discourse for better preparation and professional development for TEs, but only time will tell if this discourse is acted upon.

3. The IDI has its values as a reflection tool, and it is one of the only cultural competence assessment tools that has been examined for reliability and validity (Hammer, 2011; Hammer et al., 2003; Paige et al., 2003). However, there are some reservations about its applicability to teacher education. While this study only provides a snapshot of TEs’ opinions of the IDI, further research is needed to determine how the IDI might be used as a tool to prepare future teachers. With more research using the IDI in preservice teacher education, we can hopefully use the results in a systematic way to facilitate every teacher education stakeholders’ intercultural growth, as well as provide feedback on how TEs can improve their
intercultural teaching. Without such research, the IDI stands among the 80 other cultural measures as another tool with no clear benefits for TEs and EPPs.

4. Who are our TEs? While searching the literature, I discovered we know little about the demographics of our TEs, how they are prepared to become a TE, and the professional development they received. We need to collect more data on the specifics of whom our TEs are and what this means in the transfer of knowledge, skills, and attitudes to the preservice teacher. We also must consider whom our TEs are, their sociodemographics, and their expertise and professional knowledge.

While it is assumed that TEs are former classroom teachers (Korthagen et al., 2005) in the U.S., limited research has been conducted on teacher education faculty. The last survey on teacher education faculty was a part of a larger study that collected data on all post-secondary faculty in 2003-2004. These results are not available for analysis, leaving us with data dating back to the late 1990s (Wolf-Wendel, et al., 2006). Additionally, there is an assumption that faculty and leadership are culturally competent (Hunter, 2014). If faculty should model intercultural practices, but their students are more culturally competent, what does that mean? Some research shows students are scoring further along the intercultural continuum (Pederson, 1998; Straffon, 2003) than teachers (DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; Grossman & Yuen, 2006; Mahon, 2006, 2009; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010). While the IDI is one avenue to provide individuals an understanding of their interculturalism, more data needs to be collected to determine if these TEs can “walk the talk” (Edwards & Kuhlman,
modeling intercultural practices.

My Final Thoughts

The purpose of this research was to explore TEs’ understandings of interculturalism and how they think about and teach for interculturalism in furthering Zhao’s (2010) call to prepare more culturally competent teachers. While Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) stated there are decades of scholarly work involving intercultural concepts, little is actually known of what is being done currently to interculturalize teacher education. However, as indicated by the results of this study, we continue to find that defining and assessing interculturalism is complex (Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006; 2009a), and it continues to cross into multicultural understanding. Whether it is university administrators, intercultural scholars, or TEs, agreeing to a common definition is a challenge. It is most beneficial if educators operate from similar frameworks to ensure intercultural elements are adequately addressed. For this study, the IB certification programs were one avenue that synchronized these TEs’ understandings of interculturalism, though this synchronization was often accomplished only horizontally across the EPPs.

Secondly, while interculturalism may not appear to be a point for immediate professional development, compared to the importance of learning about the tenure and administration policies, providing novice and experienced TEs, both time and opportunities to engage in intercultural university events and activities should be considered. In general, many TEs are not provided professional development
opportunities to fully understand the concepts associated with interculturalization and/or
their own intercultural development, as well as how to apply this knowledge in their
university classrooms. These professional development activities need to be
developmentally appropriate for the TEs since each TE is on a unique and personal
intercultural journey. TEs may require mentoring as they may not have been included in
the intercultural dialogue within the teacher education domain (Goodwin et al., 2014).

Additionally, the TEs in this study addressed the time, energy and commitment
needed to help their preservice teachers’ in their intercultural journey. Actively pursuing
the inclusion of intercultural research into TEs’ research agenda will move our field
forward and inform our own growth as TEs and as a profession. This allows us to
examine the results of interculturalism within our curricula. But how can we truly ask
TEs to do all of this? Ben-Peretz (2001) stated that the role of TEs is becoming
impossible as more and more is demanded upon them as teacher education takes on
globalized approaches. One starting point is to collaborate with our multicultural
education colleagues to examine how we can better prepare our future teachers. Working
in isolated silos while pursing the same goal of culturally competent teachers only
hinders our field’s growth. While debate will be occur, conversations need to transpire
with good intentions to forward our field’s journey in preparing interculturally relevant
teachers. We have come a long way from being normal schools in the preparation of
teachers to university settings. It is time to consider these changes and find appropriate
and enduring paths to professionalize our field (Loughran, 2014; Wilson, 2006; Zeichner,
2005).
Finally, upon conclusion of each interview, I asked the TEs if they had any reflections about the interview. Many of the TEs discovered that answering the questions and taking the time to articulate ideas about their practice was rewarding. Some found room for improvement, just as Grierson (2010) found in her self-study, while others articulated it was the first time they had come to recognize the influences that have helped shape the way they think about and teach for interculturalism or the way they teach in general (Turner, 2013). Without intention, the interviews provided many TEs with the time to reflect upon their practice. While self-study research is documented in teacher education practice (Beeman-Cadwallader et al., 2014; Grierson, 2010; McDonough & Brandenburg, 2012; Ritter, 2007; Samaras, 2002, 2011; Turner, 2013; Williams & Power, 2010; Wood & Borg, 2010), and strongly encouraged (Zeichner, 2003, 2005), TEs often do not have the time to critically reflect on their practice given the demands placed upon them on a daily basis. With demands to interculturalize (Hunter & Pearson, 2014) and/or to globalized teacher education (Zhao, 2010), among the standardization and accountability concerns set forth by policymakers and state and national accreditation bodies, teacher education institutions should look proactively, rather than reactively, to best prepare their faculty for a changing world.

In conclusion, as TEs, we need to understand how we can best prepare our future teachers to be a better generation of teachers, as they will prepare their future students for intercultural experiences both in and out of the classroom. However, in this conversation, we often overlooked ourselves within this research as individuals who facilitate the growth of PK-12 teachers. As we learn more about ourselves, we must acknowledge that
we may need some mentoring during this process too, and it is okay because, after all, learning is lifelong.
APPENDIX A-SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. What is your college degree?

2. What subsequent training have you obtained after your college degrees?

3. Professional background?
   a. Have you taught in pK-12?
   b. How long did you teach in pK-12?
   c. What grades did you teach?
   d. Do you possess a teaching certification?
   e. What specialization areas are you certified to teach?
   f. Do you speak any other languages?
      i. Have you studied other languages?
      ii. How fluent are you in these languages?

4. How did you decide to make education your career? (especially, teacher education?)

5. How have you prepared yourself to help your preservice teachers in another culture? Please provide examples.

INTERCULTURAL

1. What is your definition of intercultural development?
   a. What does it mean to you?
   b. In what ways in your life do you try to develop your intercultural competence?

2. How does your program foster an environment for intercultural development? Please provide some examples.
3. Have you received workshops, trainings, and/or formal instruction about intercultural development?

4. In what ways do you teach and/or plan to teach for intercultural development? (Is it your responsibility?).
   a. Looking at your syllabi, where you tried to promote the development of intercultural competence based upon this rubric?
   b. To what extent do you think that the curriculum helps future teachers to view issues from multiple perspectives?

5. When you think about your students, do you think they developed their intercultural competence? Please provide some examples.
   a. What knowledge do your students need for intercultural development?
   b. What skills are needed for intercultural development?
   c. What behaviors are needed for intercultural development?
   d. What competencies are needed for intercultural development?

6. Is there anything else that I should have asked about or that you think it would be helpful for me to know?

IDI

1. How did you become interested in intercultural development of yourself and/or your students?
   a. Who has influenced you to explore intercultural development?
   b. In what ways have you been influenced to explore intercultural development? (IDI?)
   c. When/where did your interest in intercultural development occur?
   d. What did the PO score mean to you?
   e. What did the DO score mean to you?
## APPENDIX B-INTERCULTURAL VALUE RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Component</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural self-awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course clearly reflects insights into student's cultural rules and biases (e.g., seeking complexity, awareness of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects new perspectives about student's cultural rules and biases (e.g., not looking for sameness, comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course identifies student's cultural rules and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects minimal awareness of student's cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural group(s) it (e.g. uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course clearly reflects sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects no understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course clearly reflects an intercultural experience from the perspectives of the student through more than one worldview; and clearly demonstrates more than one activity/experience to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects more than one worldview and reflects at least one activity/experience to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course identifies components of other cultural perspectives but activities/experiences in all situations are conducted in student's own worldview.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects the experience of others but does so through own cultural worldview.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Verbal and nonverbal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course clearly reflects a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication (e.g., demonstrates understanding of the degree to which people use physical contact while communicating in different cultures or use direct/indirect and explicit/implicit meanings) and is able to skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and begins to negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course partially reflects some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and is aware that misunderstandings can occur based on those differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course has no or a minimal level of understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication; is unable to negotiate a shared understanding.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Curiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course clearly reflects complex questions about other cultures, seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects deeper questions about other cultures and seeks out answers to these questions.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects simple or surface questions about other cultures.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects no or minimal interest in learning more about other cultures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course clearly initiates and develops interactions with culturally different others and clearly provides activities/experiences to clearly suspend judgment in valuing student's interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course begins to initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others and begins to provide activities/experiences that suspend judgment in valuing student's interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others. Course does not provide activities/experiences that suspend judgment in student's interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reflects no or minimal interactions with culturally different others. Course does not provide activities/experiences that suspend judgment in student's interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C-IDI VALIDITY

The IDI originated (v1) with Bennett’s DMIS framework and a sample of 40 culturally diverse individuals who were interviewed about their experiences with cultural differences (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003). The data that emerged from the interviews comprised the initial 60-item IDI. These original items were also piloted to a diverse population to ensure clarity and content validity of each item. Moreover, seven cross-cultural experts rated the 60 items against Bennett’s DMIS stages using a seven-point scale to test for construct validity.

Secondary analysis by Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman (2003) revealed a five-point scale was more appropriate than the seven-point scale used in IDI v1. Additionally, a five-factor model was the most acceptable modal fit for the 50 items instead of original 60-items (Denial/Defense, α = 0.85; Reversal, α = 0.80; Minimization, α = 0.83; Acceptance/Adaptation, α = 0.84). Additionally, Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, and DeJaeghere (2003) also analyzed IDI v1 with the majority of the sample comprising high school and college foreign language students. One recommendation Paige et al. (2003) proposed was to calculate a single composite score for each individual’s IDI performance. Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman heeded this recommendation and ran factor analysis to develop a “total IDI score” (standardized z-score) that computed two
scores: the development orientation score (DO) (\(\alpha = 0.83\)) and the perceived orientation score (PO) (\(\alpha = 0.82\)).

Last, Hammer (2011) used a sample of 4,763 culturally and linguistically diverse individuals and discovered that the seven-factor modal was the best fit compared to five- and two-factor modals, where Denial and Defense were separated from each other along with Acceptance and Adaptation, producing IDI v3 (Denial, \(\alpha = 0.66\); Defense, \(\alpha = 0.72\); Reversal, \(\alpha = 0.78\); Minimization, \(\alpha = 0.74\); Acceptance, \(\alpha = 0.71\); and Adaptation, \(\alpha = 0.71\)). The DO and PO Crombach’s \(\alpha\) remain consistent from the IDI v2 findings (DO, \(\alpha = 0.83\); PO, \(\alpha = 0.82\)). However, this validation study exposed that a smaller and more homogenous sample is best fitted for a five-factor solution, whereas a large culturally diverse sample seems to be the best fit with a seven-factor modal. Despite this interesting and possible limitation of the IDI, the IDI continues to add more data to further investigate its reliability and validity. For the interests of this study, pre-existing IDI scores are from the most updated version, IDI v3.
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TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS OF INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

RESEARCH PROCEDURES
The purpose of this study is to investigate teacher educators’ perspectives of intercultural education and to explore what this means for their preparation and implementation of pedagogical and content knowledge during the teaching and learning process in their university classrooms. I am requesting your participation for one, 60-75 minute interview, two course syllabi reviews using the intercultural VALUE rubric, and in the summer 2015, I will send you an email with six reflection prompts. Additionally, I am requesting to use your IDI scores for analysis. Please note that the total obligation on your part would range from 90-115 minutes.

The interview that will provide me with your perspectives of intercultural education as well as to what extent you may be incorporating intercultural development knowledge, attitudes and skills into your teacher education courses. Prior to the interview, I am requesting that you take two course syllabi that you teach from in your educator preparation program and use the intercultural rubric to evaluate your syllabi. More details about this rubric will be given when we schedule the interview.

RISKS
There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research.

BENEFITS
There are no benefits to you as a participant other than to further research on how teacher educators in the U.S. perceive the concepts of intercultural education and to what extent these use intercultural education in their teacher education courses.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The data in this study will be confidential. To maintain confidentiality, participants and their work will be identified by pseudonyms only. No names will appear on any of the data, and pseudonyms will be placed on the transcripts, syllabi and emails. Through the use of an identification key, I will be the only one able to link your name and any other identifiable information to the identification key. Additionally, all audio files from the interviews will be securely stored on a Mason computer until the transcription is completed. These audio files will be deleted after five years.

PARTICIPATION
Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason. If you decide not to participate or if you withdraw from the study, there is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. There are no costs to you or any other party.
CONTACT
This research is being conducted by doctoral candidate, Sydney A. Merz, under the guidance of Dr. Beverly Shaklee at George Mason University. We may be reached at +1 703-993-2388 for questions or to report a research-related problem. You may contact the George Mason University Office of Research Integrity & Assurance at 703-993-4121 if you have questions or comments regarding your rights as a participant in the research. This research has been reviewed according to George Mason University procedures governing your participation in this research.

CONSENT
____ I have read this form and agree to participate in the study including the audio-recorded interview.

Name _____________________________________

Date of Signature ____________________
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APPENDIX F-RECRUITMENT MATERIAL

Communication #1

Dear Faculty Member:

My name is Sydney Merz, and I am a doctoral candidate at George Mason University, VA, USA. I am writing to request your participation for my dissertation research on how teacher educators perceive intercultural education. The purpose of this study is to investigate teacher educators’ perspectives of intercultural education and to explore what this means for their preparation and implementation of pedagogical and content knowledge during the teaching and learning process in your university classrooms.

I am requesting your participation for the following for information:

• Your prior Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) scores
• One, 60-75 minute semi-structured interview
• Two syllabi reviews using the intercultural VALUE rubric (15-20 minutes)
• One reflection (to be emailed summer 2015) (15-20 minutes)

The total requested time on your behalf would be approximately 90-115 minutes.

The purpose of this interview is to allow you to speak about your perspectives of intercultural education as well as to what extent you may be incorporating intercultural development knowledge, attitudes and skills into your teacher education courses. Additionally, I am requesting that you take two course syllabi that you teach from in your educator preparation program and use the intercultural VALUE rubric to evaluate your syllabi. More details about this rubric will be given when we schedule the interview. Last, in the summer 2015, I will send an email to you with six reflection prompts.

Your participation is voluntary and, of course, you may leave the study at any time. All identifiable information will be assigned pseudonyms to replace names in order to ensure confidentiality. Please do not feel obligated to participate, but your participation would be greatly appreciated.

Attached you will find the consent form. If you are interested in participating in this study, please sign the consent form and email it back to me at [email]. Once I received your consent form, I will send out an email with potential interview times as well as a detail explanation of how to use the intercultural VALUE syllabi rubric. In the meantime, if you have questions, please feel free to contact me at [email].

I thank you for your time.

Sydney A. Merz
Doctoral Candidate
George Mason University, USA
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