**Internationalizing INTL-I206**

As an anthropologist and someone who straddles two countries and two nationalities, I have always felt that one’s perception, focus and intent are rooted in culture and thus resurface in confrontations with a non-familiar “other.” I also keenly felt throughout my life that decisions made in the Western hemisphere often had an adverse impact on my native part of the world. Thus, I have made it a priority in my teaching to point out to students how cultural, historical and political contingencies differ around the world and how such differences affect the evaluation of current events.

INTL-I206 is a core course in the International Studies curriculum. The course is interdisciplinary and focuses on examining the literature of nationalism, nation-building and state formation in order to understand the nature and function of group identities and boundary disputes around the globe. The content emphasizes both an understanding of historical processes and the evaluation of current events. Originally, INTL-I206 was reserved for majors who chose Nations, States and Boundaries as their thematic concentration. Typically, International Studies majors are eager to debate questions of Western hegemony and evaluation of boundary disputes in the world. The majority have studied foreign language(s), expressed an interest in a particular world region, and have traveled abroad, or intend to travel or live abroad. The course became part of the General Education Curriculum in fall 2012; as a result, the audience of the course changed considerably. Since then, the course has attracted students with different disciplinary backgrounds, little or no overseas experience and diverse learning requirements. It became very apparent to me that I needed to rewrite the learning outcomes as global learning outcomes. Secondarily, I needed to converge the General Education Learning Outcomes with the International Studies curriculum Learning Outcomes. All these factors motivated me to participate in the Internationalization Collaborative Across Bloomington (ICAB).

My involvement with the ICAB initiative built on the Summer Course Development Institute 2012, where I was systematically introduced to the importance of specific learning outcomes in the course redesign process. I perceived ICAB as a natural progression to further tweak these learning outcomes to better reflect internationalization efforts on campus and in the International Studies Curriculum. Through conversations with my ICAB colleagues I not only fine-tuned the course content but more importantly, I aligned what I wished the students to develop – i.e. the ability to demonstrate knowledge about the complexity of group identities in the world – with what the students actually learned. By identifying specific GLOs, I was also able to tailor in-class exercises so that each exercise was intentional; as a consequence I spent less time lecturing and more time involved in one-to-one discussions with individual students and with teams. In essence, outlining specific GLOs allowed me to manage my class time better and be more effective as a teacher.

I specified three Global Learning Outcomes:

- Interpret the role historical and social conditions play in the formation of collective identities, nation-states and international conflicts
- Think ethically about global issues, inequalities, and one’s efficacy in the world
• Apply an interdisciplinary and international body of theory, resources, and methods regarding nationalism and ethnic identification

I created assignments that allowed me to test the GLOs:
• Reading Comprehension Assignments
• Completion of Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI) survey
• Ethnic Restaurant Visit (Event Reflection)
• International Conflict Analysis
• Summary and Reflection

It was essential in redesigning my course that students gradually realize that their own reality is one of many; that collective (especially ethnic group) identities are historically contingent processes that most people take for granted; that the U.S. does not hold a monopoly of power and coercion in world affairs; and that identity and conflict are multi-faceted processes that need to be explained through the understanding of both global processes and local responses.

My teaching pedagogy is centered on team work; however, due to different student learning styles, I incorporated both individual (Reading Comprehension, Ethnic Restaurant Visit, Summary and Reflection) and group (International Conflict Analysis) work. My intention was for each of the GLOs to be assessed in varying degrees through all of the different assignments. This allowed me flexibility in structuring class time and gave students the opportunity to use varied content to evaluate the progression of their learning. In reality, though, the categories proved to be less permeable. Students completed the Comprehension Assignments with little or no reflection about “one’s efficacy in the world.” On the other hand, the Summary and Reflection assignment, and the GPI results demonstrated that what students thought about their place in the world at the beginning and at the end of the semester differed.

Students overall responded positively to the GLOs. Throughout the semester, I regularly experienced heightened constructive criticism through team work; increasing attainment of comparative perspectives regarding the complexity of international conflicts; and increased reflection about the flexibility and contingency of group identity. I requested feedback from the students on a regular basis, including the formal course evaluation process at the end of the semester. I was particularly interested in assessing GLO #2, i.e., thinking ethically about global issues, inequalities, and one’s efficacy in the world. The GPI results were especially useful in that respect.

As part of the ICAB, I was given the opportunity to administer the GPI twice in the course of the semester: once in January and in late April/May. The table below illustrates changes in students’ perceptions according to qualitative categories identified in the GPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowing</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post test</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whereas there is no significant statistical difference in the categories of Knowing, Identity, Affect and Interaction, the Knowledge, and Social Responsibility categories showed qualitative increase. More specifically, the GPI results demonstrated that students not only acquired knowledge (i.e., content) about international relations, conflicts and cultures; they also gained insights about these interactions that resulted in a heightened sense of social responsibility, an increased awareness and acceptance of cultural and ethnic differences and a shift in relativism when confronted with settings of right and wrong. More importantly, students reflected on their own ethnic and national identities vis-a-vis the rest of the world.

In addition to the GPI results, students offered feedback throughout the semester and in course evaluations. Below is a sample of their responses:

“The course has provided a new lens through which I can analyze global issues. It has shown me that people, in conjunction with their pursuits for autonomy and sovereignty, are affected not only by the actions of their own governments, but also by those of encroaching, meddlesome outsiders.”

“I liked the open discussion format and accepting the views of others.”

“As shown in class, readings, and presentations, associations with others quickly become inclusive in some aspects and exclusive in others. These associations can be expressed through food borders, symbols, customs, ethnicity, government, racism, or simply imagination.”

“Essentially, in many other areas of the world, collective identities are more closely defined and rigid, requiring a certain genetic make-up or family history. In the United States, inclusion is much more flexible.”

Assessment of GLOs
All three GLOs were assessed in each of the class assignments with varying degrees of success. Because my teaching pedagogy is centered on team-based Learning (TBL), assessing each GLO separately would be a challenge. Rather, each assignment contained significant elements of each GLO. The culmination of the student’s team work was exemplified in the International Conflict Analysis which brought together the evaluation of the historical processes in group identity formation (GLO#1), the ethical dimensions of policies and discourses (GLO#2) and the interdisciplinary research involved in planning, writing and presenting the analysis (GLO #3). Appendix III illustrates how the GLOs were assessed in the International Conflict Analysis assignment as well as selected examples of student work.

In conclusion, two of the biggest rewards in redesigning INTL-I206 based on specific GLOs were the ease with which I conducted my teaching and the students’ positive response regarding their learning. I will be teaching this course in fall 2013 and will tweak the assignments, especially the Restaurant Visit, to better reflect specific GLOs. I will also revisit and evaluate the rubrics I have used to assess GLOs; based on student comments and my own observations, there is considerable room for improvement. Finally, I will fine-tune the GLOs in order to address the varying levels of the incoming students’ global awareness and the degree to which the latter
inhibit understanding of complex issues. This may necessitate slightly adjusting the proverbial “learning bar” in order to further foster student learning and to cater to those students who come less prepared to address world issues.

\[\text{For additional information about the GPI are found at: http://gpi.central.edu}\]
\[\text{For detailed GPI results, see Appendix II}\]