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Abstract

Graduates increasingly need to operate across national and cultural boundaries. This paper discusses the need to ensure that all students are equipped to operate within complex and diverse multicultural environments.

The work builds on three earlier studies. Using these, the author has created a new theoretical framework and designed an intervention which aimed to increase diverse students' awareness of intercultural differences and their ability to function effectively in multicultural learning (and thus work) environments.

The paper evaluates this highly innovative training. It concludes that it was effective in making a wide range of students aware of issues around cultural difference and competence. The training significantly changed the outlook of students who took part in it. Whilst the framework was robust, effective, and generalisable to other contexts, there are a number of issues which will be addressed in the re-running the programme.

Introduction

UK Higher Education is increasingly multicultural and international. Over the last ten years the number of students studying in the UK from outside the country has grown rapidly. For example, in 1996/7 the total number of non-EU students at UK HEIs was 109,940, whereas ten years later their numbers more than doubled to 239,210. The UK HEI population is also very multicultural (see HESA, 1998 and 2008).

The implications of this development are that UK HEIs need to prepare their students to learn within a diverse learning arena. Traditional pedagogic methods have not always taken such an internationally diverse student population into account. In the current global economy there are compelling reasons to prepare students effectively for the intercultural situations which they will meet at work or in their studies.

This paper takes as its starting point the need to identify the learning needs of all groups of the UK student population and builds up a theoretical framework which espouses an inclusive approach to intercultural learning. The paper shows how this framework was used to devise an innovative learning method, and evaluates the learning intervention and the original theoretical framework.

This framework firstly takes into account the needs of Home (UK) students who often lack exposure to international/intercultural experiences, and who need assistance to develop such opportunities (Herzfeldt, 2007). Secondly, it looks at the needs of international students, who require help in acclimatisation to UK-based learning approaches. Such students' traditional learning approaches are not without merit and should not be discarded (Ippolito, 2007). These students also bring with them intercultural capital which will be of benefit to home students. Finally, to show just how complex learning is in an intercultural context, a third dimension is introduced. It is clear that, to gain maximum benefit in designing a learning intervention, each student has to be regarded as bringing with them a unique learning approach built up from their life story (Welikala and Watkins, 2008).
From this framework it is proposed that effective intercultural learning must build on a variety of learning approaches. This intercultural learning is most effective when it looks at the needs of both home and overseas students. Finding a way to help all students to maximise their learning and to develop shared experiences is an effective way of developing in them skills to be used in a variety of intercultural situations. This paper seeks to test these propositions and to contribute to intercultural learning practice by suggesting innovative ways in which such learning can be developed. Unlike many previous studies (Ramburuth and McCormick, 2001 are a notable exception), instead of concentrating on either international or home students, the work seeks to develop a model which can be used for both groups.

Having developed the theoretical framework, the author set about the development of a learning approach and a language which could provide the flexibility that the framework implies. This is where working with the MAP Consortium began. The MAP are artist practitioners experienced at working with partners on the development of innovative, evidence-based learning interventions.

Literature Review

The work in this paper looks at developing students’ abilities to perform effectively in multinational/multicultural learning situations. As a result of the current populations within higher education, the literature is rich in studies analysing development of such skills. Martensson et. al. (2008) and Carroll and Ryan (2008) are amongst authors who have recently taken as their starting point teaching practitioner reflections on their own experiences and innovative practice. There is no lack of earlier literature in this field. Jokikokko (2005) produced a study of an introductory programme for newly qualified teachers. The conclusion of Jokikokko’s paper is that conceptions of intercultural competence in the context of education form three categories: an ethical orientation such as values, personality etc; an efficiency orientation which includes organisational skills and competencies; and a pedagogical orientation which includes any intercultural learning competencies. Pyne et. al. (2007) take a similar approach. Working on the basis that logisticians, who were the subject of the study, would need intercultural skills in their working lives, the authors (as in this study) questioned participants before and after intercultural interventions. Again, as in the current paper, Pyne et. al. tested the hypothesis that language-related or socio-cultural experience will affect an individual’s intercultural competence (as Monthienvichienchai et. al., 2002 do in their study of teachers in international schools). Finally, again as in this study, carefully managed group work and greater opportunities for social interaction amongst different groups are suggested as the way forward. Antal and Freidman (2007) suggest similar interventions to increase students’ intercultural competence.

The study by Ippolito (2007) is also similar in objective and design to the current survey. Ippolito’s case study analyses a module designed to facilitate intercultural learning within a multinational/multicultural group. Ippolito identifies the ‘deficit models’ which often exist in learning approaches, which see international and widening participation students as a deviation from a norm, rather than part of a diverse population whose learning approaches are equally valid. Ippolito’s study is important in re-evaluating the patronising approaches to the learning of international
students which has often been in evidence in the UK. Ippolito's approach forms part of the theoretical framework developed later and her findings match those discussed below.

A narrative of participant perceptions in this and Ippolito's paper demonstrates that differing levels of linguistic skills and unchallenged preconceptions are the biggest barriers to greater understanding in the classroom, and that awareness-raising and reflective practice can improve this. Aronson's study of first year medical students (2005) takes this approach, suggesting that 'experiential intervention' as a complement to more traditional pedagogic methods (what Ely and Thomas, 2001 call 'the integration-and-learning perspective') is effective. Once again, the importance of reflection is emphasised.

An interesting theme, which was one of the main reasons why the intervention in this study was introduced, is the different learning styles of international and UK students (Deakins, 2009). Less publication time has been devoted to home students, but they are an important element in intercultural situations. Herzfeldt's study (2007), the second work which underpins this paper's theoretical framework, has this as a central theme. Two perspectives have to be addressed: the need to find ways to help students to adapt to HE in the UK (Zhou et al, 2008) and the lack of intercultural competence of home students (Herzfeldt, 2007). "One of the major educational goals of the internationalisation of higher education is to prepare students to function in an international and inter-cultural context" (Volet and Ang, 1998, p.5). HE institutions are potential hotbeds of intercultural learning, as students from a range of nationalities and ethnic groups meet and learn together. Interaction between different groups (particularly home and international) is not, however, always the norm (Volet and Ang, 1998). These authors, too, evaluate the importance of finding ways to encourage experience of learning in mixed groups. This is where the final text which forms the basis of the theoretical framework needs to be introduced. Welikala and Watkins (2008) underline the complexity of devising learning which reaches into the individual learning needs of each student. They remind us that the divisions of home and international are not always clear, and that each learner will bring their own story to the classroom.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework which underpins this paper is based on three previous studies (see Table 1).

Herzfeldt's work (2007) investigates cultural competence amongst undergraduate students. Her research shows that the effectiveness of an individual to work in international group situations increases incrementally with the number of international or intercultural experiences that person engages in. In summary, anyone who has studied foreign languages or has spent time studying or working abroad will be a more effective international learner than those who have never been abroad or studied another's culture. According to these criteria, many students lack cultural experience. This low cultural competency has a negative impact on group and collaborative work, and on the student and staff experience. At the very least, it is not maximizing students' learning experience. For this reason it is important to increase the opportunities for cultural experiences. This may be by making extra-curricula
language tuition available, arranging study trips abroad, or ensuring that students have the opportunity of experiencing the kind of innovative intervention which is the subject of this paper.

The theory underpinning Herzfeldt's study is the model of cultural learning developed by Yamazaki and Kayes (2004) and based on Kolb's (1984) experiential learning cycle. Such development increments over time, as the participants gradually learn about different cultures, getting used to different norms and building up new forms of behaviour. This links with the second set of theories which underpin Herzfeldt's work; that of personality (Van Oudenhoven and Van der Zee, 2002). Her research suggests that those who have more cultural experiences not only operate more effectively in intercultural situations, but also develop a greater 'multicultural personality' (specifically, open mindedness and social initiative). Their ability to reflect on life in general is increased.

Importantly for this research, Herzfeldt found that UK students showed less cultural competence than international students. This was due to their lower number of cultural experiences and to the UK's individualistic learning culture, as compared to the communalism experienced by many overseas students (Waistell, 2009). This led to the first strand of the framework underpinning this research: the need to increase the cultural experiences of UK students.

The second strand of the theoretical framework is encapsulated in the work of Ippolito (2007). Ippolito asserts that 'deficit' models are often used to frame international students' assimilation into UK education. There is much research on how overseas students can be 'enabled' to succeed academically in the HE environment rather than acknowledging what such students can bring to the UK learning experience. In order to ensure that overseas students can achieve in the same way as home students, learning and teaching must be more inclusive. The theory which underpins Ippolito's work (linking critical pedagogy with intercultural communications, Hellmundt, 2003) challenges assumptions that international students should merely adjust to how learning is oriented in the UK. Furthermore, the cultural experiences of overseas students can be used to increase the cultural experience of their home-based peers in the classroom (Ward, 2001).

The natural corollary of the framework which is being built up is that, as well as finding ways which increase the intercultural capital of both home and overseas students, one needs to build intercultural training that is much more flexible than has traditionally been the case. (See also Kember and Gow, 1991.) Welikala and Watkins (2008) say this training must avoid stereotyping. The premise of their work is 'the concept of cultural script' (p.2), and the importance of taking into account learners' varying scripts. Rather than the traditional view of the lecturer as the 'respected guru' (p.16), these authors suggest that peer interaction is important (p.48). Learning should be based on a set of interactions between participants with different cultural scripts. Welikala and Watkins suggest that these scripts are important learning resources rather than barriers and they use the discourse approach to intercultural learning espoused by Scollon and Scollon (1995).
Welikala and Watkins assert that all students can be helped to benefit each other to develop intercultural competence. This third strand of the theoretical framework brings the first and second strands together, as set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this theoretical framework, an innovative intervention was designed and run in autumn 2007 in a certain Business School. The School looked for a practical way in which it could use the theoretical framework to increase the international/intercultural experience of all its home students, help the international students to combine their learning approaches with UK-centric approaches, and ultimately devise an interactive intercultural awareness workshop which suited everyone. Students could thus go out from the University able to make a greater contribution to the international community as more effective international managers. At the same time, School managers wanted to create innovative and inspiring learning. The School linked up with the MAP Consortium, which, building from the original theoretical framework, devised an innovative intervention to inspire and develop the intercultural team-working skills of the Business School final year students.

The relationship between arts practice as a means of reaching out across cultures is well analysed in the literature (for example, Bailey and Desai, 2005; Liddicoat and Diaz, 2008). Wolf (2008) analyses the effectiveness of moving away from traditional teaching methods and theories towards more student-centred and expressive methods of addressing culture in the classroom. She shows that such a method helps students to evaluate, reflect and act in a culturally inclusive way. The reasons for these results are explained by Wesley (2007) and further emphasised by Crichton and Scarino (2007), identifying the importance of interaction as the key principle in the development of intercultural awareness (p.15). A theme of much of this literature is that greater cultural competence comes from active learning. Through the arts, people can learn more holistically, they have a greater chance of interacting with different nationalities and cultures and form connections with others more easily.

For this intervention, final year lectures were cancelled for a day and each student was asked to undertake a compulsory half day of intercultural training. Developing this training was challenging and resource intensive. Running such training is something that the MAP consortium is used to doing within smaller-scale company contexts, but not on this large scale. The brief MAP were given included the theoretical framework, but also involved a focus group with a few students to ensure that the training was appropriate for this cohort.

The session began with warm-up exercises designed to break down common misconceptions and get the students thinking outside their normal sphere of understanding and comfort; exploring perspectives, and providing tools for new ways of connecting with other students. Then the students were divided into small groups, based on the groups to which they had just been allocated for a compulsory module.
The idea here was to develop further students' mutual understanding within these groups so that they could be more effective in understanding multiple educational, multicultural and multinational backgrounds.

Each group was allocated an artist facilitator across a range of different media, who used their specific medium to help the students to explore aspects of learning in an intercultural context. The session ended with a sharing of work and an opportunity to debrief on the distinctive ways of working that can develop cultural competence. The reaction was mixed. This did not unduly upset us, as learning theories show that some discomfort is often a sign of effective learning (Tummala-Narra, 2009; Piccinin et. al., 1998; Vallume and Brandt, 2000).

Survey

The research for this paper was carried out via two mixed method online surveys with the participants on the programme, before and after the intervention. Each survey incorporated quantitative background data and reflective qualitative responses to the intervention. This methodology was used as it was similar to that employed by Herzfeldt (2007) and Ippolito (2007) described in the literature review above.

Prior to the Cultural competence training an online survey was sent to all final year students who would be taking part in the training. The total population was 483.

Table 2 shows the number of respondents by Home and International status. The respondents reflect the overall make up of the overall population.

(Table 2)

Table 3 shows the number of responses by Home/International status. No tracking was used between the two surveys, so it was not possible to see whether the same students were responding to both.

(Table 3)

Results

Prior to the Intervention

As the researcher was interested in capturing the range of international experiences which the students had had, and because multi-lingual experience is one of these, students were asked about their first language. The results show that the majority of students participating in the study had English as their first language (72%) and that other students offered a range of other linguistic backgrounds. Students were also asked whether they knew more than one language. 60 students spoke a second language, 42 stated they did not speak any other language.

A number of students stressed that they had not had any expectations of the training. Most students stated that they were hoping to gain more understanding of other
cultures and “how to work in teams with members from different cultures”. They gave specific examples of this from their own experiences. One home student expected “a greater appreciation of the differences between different cultures and the difficulties they face when working in groups at the University”. Another wanted “to learn about the culture of others in terms of what their expectations are for working and learning”. One student was hoping to overcome stereotypes. Several students pointed out that “this is something that we do on a daily basis due to the diversity of ethnic students here”. Many students expected to improve their interpersonal skills. Some recognised that by learning how to communicate more effectively they could ensure every group member’s contribution. One student was expecting to learn “strategies by which members can support and encourage others to take and share responsibilities”.

Several students commented on the fact that due to the training they would be missing a day of lectures: “I am paying to learn my chosen subject field, not be told how I should interact with people of different cultures. I can do that already!” “Why could I not have attended my lectures? These are far more important than the training.” The immediate authorial comment is that this showed that the training was needed.

After the Intervention

Best aspects of the training: The majority of students surveyed found the best aspects of the training were in spending time with their group and socialising in an ‘out-of-work’ context. Some thought that bonding as a team made the training more relevant. Several expressed their hope that getting to know one another in a fun environment was going to help them work better together. A few students agreed they appreciated an opportunity to learn from each other.

The training itself was praised by many for having been light-hearted and providing new perspectives, as it involved working in different ways. It was good to hear this because this had been one of the objectives of the intervention design. Only a small number of students thought that the training was of little or no use.

Worst aspect of the training: The worst aspects of the training varied in students’ opinion. For some it was the length of the training and for others it was the timing. A number of students believed that it would have been better placed in the first year. This was a common theme and was picked up as an important point in the evaluation. Some students were critical of the fact that they had to miss a day of lectures. A large number of students found that the training did not address as many specific cultural issues as expected, or was not relevant for intercultural work.

The training was good in its own right, but it did not meet my expectations in respect of its lack of focus on cultural points. I see a real importance, for example, of integrating people from different cultural backgrounds in order to be a success at university, and this did not really aid this process.

A couple of students thought it was patronising, others that it was too abstract. One student offered an opinion that “it was difficult for those with poor English to participate”. This is an interesting comment given that the intervention was designed
to ensure that it did not rely on oral ability, rather that it drew on activities where no student would be at a disadvantage.

Did the training make you rethink your approach? Some students thought that the informal approach of the training was its main success in helping them to rethink approaches to communication with other students. Several students noted that they were going to make changes in their attitudes or habits as a result of the workshops.

I am more flexible in my approach, more fluid in my thinking, and less inclined to take things personally.

I do not always follow the lessons taught during the training session, but now I will try to make it a set practice for myself and all the groups I work in.

Some thought that as a result of the training they were going to be more open and aware of others.

I will be a lot more patient with people in my group and have realised members of my group may not always understand what is being said.

Were Expectations met? A large majority of those who replied agreed that the training exceeded expectations, although some started by saying that they had no expectations! The approach was praised variously as interesting, unexpected and fun.

It was quite different to my original expectations; however, it did address the issue of how different people view the same situation in a different manner.

I came out with a better understanding of group work involving team members whose first language was not English.

Aspects useful in studies: A small number of students did not think that the training contained anything useful for their studies, but others thought that it would be helpful in terms of future group cohesion, cultural understanding, as well as “an appreciation for the different ways in which people work and the existence of many different perspectives on a situation”. A large number of students reported that they would benefit from the training in terms of their group work. Once again, they reiterated that getting to know their groups was seen as very beneficial for their studies.

Several students reported that they found that they learnt something about themselves:

I also learnt things about myself at the training, e.g. my preferences regarding the way I think and work etc. [which] will allow me to adopt strategies that best complement my personal preferences.

The communication aspects of the training were also found to have been helpful, and one student pointed out that “people have a lot to give if you take time to listen to them. To listen well is a much harder skills to do than talking.” Improved
communication skills in terms of learning to read body language or understanding of the importance of being patient had, some thought, resulted in increased confidence. The majority of respondents were of the opinion that the training helped them to get to know one another better and, as a result, they were going to develop more effective communication and bond better as a group. Representative quotes were:

I hope we will all be able to better convey my thoughts and opinions using the ‘I notice that ...I think this because ...’ exercise. I will definitely try and use this method.

To take culture into consideration more ... and encourage the group to share their strengths and weaknesses so we can quickly establish an effective and collaborative team.

**Suggestions on how to improve intercultural training:** The overwhelming majority of those who responded agreed that the training would be most useful in the first year. Firstly, it should have been undertaken before they had any experience of group work, and, secondly, missing a day of lectures would have had a smaller impact.

Some students found the artistic approach uncomfortable and thought it could have been more structured.

**Language not culture?** One final comment is worth quoting in length because is sums up a number of the issues which this intervention attempted to address.

Speaking to fellow students and from my own experience at University, the problem with working with some international students is not that they have a different culture. I find it very interesting to find out about other people’s views and ways of thinking. The problem with working in groups with international students is that communication can sometimes be difficult because their standard of English is not good enough to express their views properly on the chosen subject, and that their written work is full of mistakes.

**Discussion**

The students were generally open to engaging with the issues surrounding working in an intercultural environment. They stated in the pre-training survey that they were already working to undermine prejudice. From the pre-training survey it was clear that the respondents showed a good knowledge of the issues surrounding intercultural team work. The students in the population surveyed were very diverse in terms of ethnicity and nationality. Perhaps they should have had this training earlier on in their university careers and the intervention would be better directed at first year students. When designing the original intervention, the author had chosen final years because of their ability to engage with and find the relevance of such in intercultural training.

Some of the answers in the survey and the language used come over as harsh, self-centred and patronising, particularly towards those not from the UK. This saddened the author and confirmed the need for the training. Some students focussed on the lack of English language ability. The author is concerned that this was just an excuse.
for not engaging with the real issues, which were about culture. If we go back to Herzfeldt’s (2007) original findings, maybe this concentration on lack of linguistic ability was in fact an expression of lack of cultural experience from those who replied. This is where it would have been good to track the change in responses from individual students. Having said this, the language used generally in the post-training survey was much less arrogant and seemed to demonstrate much more tolerance of approach. There were still some students who did not appear to have understood the purpose of the training or for whom the training was inappropriately directed.

Many students in the study were looking for a “quick fix”. They wanted to be given a blueprint which they could use, rather than have to engage for themselves in the learning process. The author believes that this was because they were accustomed to more passive forms of learning. When challenged by a new, more involving approach many students were uncomfortable, gave negative comments, but ultimately they engaged and many of them gained from it.

Despite this, the post-training survey also showed that students liked some of the less formal aspects of the training. It allowed them to socialise effectively and get to know their work groups in ways that they might otherwise not have done. It created a safe place where students could learn to socialise with people whose approach to socialisation was different from their normal ‘crowd’. Because it was light-hearted and humorous it got them to think about some of the issues in new and more open ways. These ways are similar to the work of Welikala and Watkins (2008) who used story telling as a way of discussing difficult concepts of difference. The simplicity and individuality of this approach creates an immediacy and relevance from which it is possible for every participant to learn. As in this intervention, it creates a new language which can help students learn in innovative ways and to reach greater understanding. It is not the blueprint which they were looking for, but it is longer lasting than that.

Conclusions

In summary, the training was successful; the majority of the student population attended and took something from it. A large number of students indicated that they were going to change how they operated as a result of it. They noted more openness in group work, more awareness of the need to set the scene and develop shared understanding for each new piece of work. For most students expectations were exceeded, there were lots of positive statements in the post-training survey and on the luggage labels which each of them filled in giving their intentions for the future.

The training was perhaps less successful in overtly providing intercultural training than helping with the management of group dynamics. This is a good outcome given that group work and its management is a major preoccupation of this multicultural student population. By far its strongest outcome was the ability to encourage reflection and the creation of virtual social space (Volet and Ang, 1998) which facilitates “opportunities for intercultural interaction” (De Vita, 2005, p 81). Negative comments were mostly due to prior expectations. Many students were expecting to be given that blueprint. When they did not get it they were perplexed.
Limitations

There are a number of limitations to this part of the study which it would be beneficial to overcome in further work. The first issue is the response rates. Although within acceptable levels, response rates of 22.8% (pre-training) and particularly 10.4% (post-training) may not have given a true reflection of student opinion. Secondly, due to ethical approval issues, the study was not able to match the responses of those who replied pre-training with their post-training and also link to their cultural background. This means that the research did not yield a sense of whether the training changed the views of specific students. The results appear to confirm that there was some change in attitude, but the data does not tell us whether the same students replied to each survey. It can only be assumed that this is the case given that the same population was being surveyed. Tracking of this kind would have yielded more definite data on the effect on the cohort of the intervention. Thirdly, the study did not look at the results of the students (either individually or in groups) in their module group assignment. It would have been interesting to look at the results achieved in the group assignment over the last few years and see the effect of the training.

Finally, and perhaps fundamentally, there was no control group so that it was not possible to chart changing attitudes of those who did not undergo the training.

Summary of salient findings

Some students did not appreciate the approach, but made suggestions which will be incorporated into future workshops. While not the solution many students were expecting, the intervention was generally successful at raising awareness, helping communication in intercultural group work and creating a shared virtual social space where people could collaborate together.

Other work has concentrated on international students’ learning, forgetting that they often have much more intercultural capital than their home colleagues. The deficit model which Ippolito (2007) talks about is aimed at international students. This research suggests that both groups are in deficit and it is important to find a way to take the best of each and allow them to gain a shared valuable outcome. Additionally, the home/international student nexus is more complex than is at first apparent – this is what Welikala and Watson (2008) take as their starting point.

The theoretical framework which forms the basis of this paper (Herzfeldt, 2007; Ippolito, 2007; Welikala and Watkins, 2008) has been found to be effective in underpinning the integrative learning of students both from UK, EU and overseas. The framework can be used in a series of different contexts in developing HE learning. The paper provides an evaluation of an innovative research-informed learning approach, which can be adapted to many situations in order to aid development of diverse students.

In practice, this framework can now be used to create further interventions to help students develop the intercultural group working skills which they will need in their studies and provides them with a key competence as they become global managers. The artistic practice approach has also proved a particularly effective method of learning.
It is clear that the training was worth doing, and worth doing in this way. As a result of this analysis the following changes will be made to future intercultural training at this institution:

- The training will be continued and widened out across the institution because there was a clear positive effect
- The training will be targeted at first year students when they are just beginning their first group work assignments
- The training will be more integrated into the studies of the first year students, by relating it to both theoretical academic lectures and also making links with specific tutorials and interactive learning events. It should not be seen as an add on or complementary but part of an integrated whole
- The training should continue to be presented in an interactive and inspirational way which challenges students and which gets them used to the fact that it is not only subject content which is important to learn, but also the so-called ‘softer’ transferral skills which employers are looking for in the global workplace. Students need to be introduced to more active and less passive ways of learning from the very start of their university careers before their expectations that most learning is passive are formed
- The training will be advertised and presented in a slightly different way to manage expectations and make clearer focus of the learning points

Final Summary

This study comprises four separate stages: a review of secondary sources; the development of a theoretical framework; the development of a learning intervention based on this framework; and primary research using a mixed method approach and synthesis of findings, before and after the intervention. The main theoretical contribution is to the development of a framework which takes into account the learning approaches of the increasingly diverse student population. This model acknowledges the different backgrounds of UK students and their international counterparts and suggests a flexible learning approach which identifies each learner as an individual. The main practical contribution is the use of the theoretical framework to design innovative and effective intercultural training. Although this proved effective in a specific situation with undergraduates, there is much potential to develop it in other learning contexts.
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Table 1. Framework for developing Intercultural Awareness training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home students</th>
<th>Overseas students</th>
<th>All students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The effectiveness of individuals to work across cultural boundaries increases with the number of their international/intercultural experiences</td>
<td>It is important to challenge the deficit model of intercultural training where the UK approach is seen as the best</td>
<td>Building training on individual stories rather than stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental learning theories</td>
<td>International communication theories</td>
<td>Discourse theories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Number of pre-training responses by status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th>% of whole cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>19.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Number of post-training responses by status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th>% of whole cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word count: 6919