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Executive Summary

The University College Dublin (UCD) Strategy 2020-2024, Rising to the future, articulates four major objectives to address global challenges under four strategic themes: Creating a Sustainable Global Society, Transforming through Digital Technology, Building a Healthy World, and Empowering Humanity. Intercultural Learning has been identified as an area for development under Core Objective 2: ‘Provide an inclusive educational experience that defines international best practice and prepares our graduates to thrive in present and future societies.’

Focus group enquiries were conducted between December 2019 and September 2020 (both face to face and online) to understand perspectives of UCD students and staff about experiences and perceptions of intercultural teaching and learning, to inform best practices for intercultural teaching and learning in UCD. We invited participants to bring artefacts to the focus group discussions and used these as devices or prompts to help participants articulate their experiences and understandings of Intercultural Learning. For this project Intercultural Learning is defined as the opportunities and experiences of working with and learning from people across different cultures.

Key Findings and Developments

1. Staff and students consider Interculturalism as important and relevant to learning and crucial to broadening insights and understandings. Diverse cultural backgrounds and experiences of the UCD student community is a valuable resource yet somewhat ‘hidden’ and an underutilised vehicle for Intercultural Learning in UCD.

2. Several practical recommendations to incorporate and embed Intercultural Teaching and Learning Strategies into the classroom and curriculum were highlighted by staff and students. These have been collated and developed into a ‘Intercultural Teaching and Learning 101 Tool’ (Appendix 4)

3. Participants highlighted a lack of awareness of the value and relevance of Intercultural Learning among staff in UCD. The benefits of internationalisation and a diverse student community are predominantly perceived as (narrow) economic gains and market targets rather than opportunities for richer inclusive education experience and (broader) social goals. There remains a competing tension for staff to balance time and space required to provide meaningful opportunities for Intercultural Learning with pressure to increase student numbers and research responsibilities.

4. ORCA Conceptual Framework for Intercultural Learning. We developed and tested a new conceptual framework that underpins our definition of Intercultural Learning. The framework consists of four key elements: Opportunity, Relatedness, Competency and Agency.

Recommendations

1. There is a need to promote awareness and deepen understanding of the value and relevance of Intercultural Learning among staff via provision of opportunities for staff training and support. Dissemination of the Intercultural Learning 101 Tool through university communication channels such as ‘UCD Teaching and Learning Community’ posts is recommended. The ‘Teaching Across Cultures’ module offered by the UCD Centre for Teaching and Learning is a valuable asset in this regard and support and resources to expand this programme should be considered.

2. Intercultural Learning Champions. There is a need for horizontal integration of intercultural values and learning across existing global, pedagogy and policy platforms in UCD. Intercultural Learning ‘champions’ should be identified within the pillars of Teaching and Learning, UCD Global, Widening Participation and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion to drive this agenda.

3. Intercultural values and principles should be central and visible to curriculum design, development and enhancement projects going forward. For example, intercultural values should be embedded in programme mission statements and programme learning outcomes and teaching strategies that promote Intercultural learning should be articulated.

4. Ensure that students from diverse backgrounds are included in curriculum design, development and review processes.

5. Meaningful staff engagement to promote Intercultural Learning opportunities takes time and effort. This should be acknowledged and rewarded/incentivised by embedding recognition for innovations for Intercultural Learning into the Faculty Promotions Framework.

6. Senior university management should ensure that Internationalisation policy extends beyond ‘means’ or mechanisms (e.g. increasing international student numbers) to include strategies that achieve the intended ‘results’ and outcomes by supporting Intercultural Learning values and strategies as described above.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Internationalisation has been a key priority for universities over the last three decades with many stated benefits including affording students and graduates the opportunity to develop global perspectives and intercultural competency in order for them to be prepared to work in the modern global and interconnected world, (Robson, 2018). Strategies to promote internationalisation in higher education have focused on diversifying and increasing numbers of international students, international mobility opportunities and international partnerships with other institutions or networks. While these are examples of ‘means’ or mechanisms of internationalisation, they do not in isolation guarantee the intended ‘results’ or outcomes which Lopez-Rocha (2021) defines as development of intercultural competence: ‘awareness of the interconnectedness of global issues, to consider different perspectives and understand dynamics of multicultural settings, to work and communicate more efficiently in a globalised world and in general to function as responsible professionals in a changing global environment’, (Lopez-Rocha, 2021).

Over the past decade, many authors have stressed the need for meaningful and deeper consideration about internationalisation within higher education, to ensure that its definition and understanding is not limited to political and economic drivers only, but that greater emphasis is placed on the potential for Internationalisation to achieve the ‘ethical, social, cultural and academic goals’ of higher education, (Robson et al, 2018). There have been calls for universities and higher education institutions to enhance and amplify Internationalization at Home (IaH) strategies, (Robson et al 2018); strategies which strive to promote ‘purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments’ (Beelen and Jones, 2015) to harness classroom diversity to achieve such goals.

The work of this Teaching and Academic Development Fellowship has centred on the concept of Intercultural Learning as an essential vehicle to drive development of intercultural competence for all students in higher education. Based on our review of the literature, we developed a definition of Intercultural Learning to guide our project as follows:

“Intercultural Learning is about the opportunities and experiences of working with and learning from people across different cultures.”

This definition is underpinned by four key concepts which combined represent our conceptual framework: ORCA: Opportunity; Relatedness; Competency and Agency. This conceptual framework was tested during fieldwork and data gathering.

Research Aim

The aim of this project is to deepen understandings and inform best practice for Intercultural Teaching and Learning in UCD. Our research explored staff and students’ (undergraduate and postgraduate) experiences and perceptions of intercultural teaching and learning.

Research Questions

The objectives/research questions underpinning our project are listed below:

• What is our (researchers) evolving understanding of the concept of Intercultural Learning?
• Where is Intercultural Learning positioned within national and institutional scholarly and policy literature?
• What is our operational definition of Intercultural Learning?
• What are the experiences of staff and students of Intercultural Learning in UCD?
• What are the perceptions of staff and students regarding their role in facilitating Intercultural Learning in UCD?
• What are the perceptions of staff and students about the value of Intercultural Learning in the classroom?
• What are the knowledge skills and attitudes required by staff and students to facilitate Intercultural Learning?
CULTURALLY DIVERSE UNIVERSITIES

Reflecting universities worldwide (Leask 2015) classroom diversity in UCD is increasingly the norm rather than the exception across many programmes. Whilst increasing cultural diversity is in the main attributed to internationalisation (Coelen 2017) this can mask the complexity of student diversity in real terms. For example, while UCD data from 2019/2020 indicates that 29% of students and 32% of staff are international, data also confirms (UCD 2019-2020) that 32% of the student cohort in UCD is drawn from targeted, indigenous underrepresented groups. This is important as it challenges us to problematize our understandings of diversity beyond internationalization and more particularly ‘who’ constitutes the diverse or, when negatively defined, ‘other’ (Ahmed 2004) student. This is a complex and challenging terrain and it is unsurprising therefore to see that discourses and debates on cultural diversity have resulted in a complex literature nomenclature which traverses intercultural, multicultural and cross-cultural contexts in addition to culturally blind contexts of absences and invisibilities (Palfreyman & Mcbride, 2007). Underpinning each of these interpretative frames is first the wonderfully nebulous if problematic concept of ‘culture’ (Dunne 2011) and second the equally challenging notion of ‘diversity’.

Stewart Hall (1993, p. 361) has claimed that ‘the capacity to live with difference is ... the coming question of the twenty-first century’. In this era of interconnectedness, when we have and are witnessing both celebrations of such diversity and at the same time increasing levels of distrust and uncertainty characterised in social and spatial distancing of ‘others’ (Jackson et al 2017), it is clear that diversity matters seriously for how we view and navigate our world. This raises the question within higher education: How then do we, students and staff negotiate these differences and our different experiences? Otten (2009) very helpfully distinguishes between two discourse streams on cultural diversity: international mobility and domestic multiculturalism. The former highlights the importance of international mobility as a driver for Intercultural Learning, the latter refers to the various, overlapping and temporary patterns of social distinction (and equality) such as gender, age, disability, profession or academic discipline’ (p409) and that cultural encounters are just one of many potential experiences of ‘otherness’. They caution that this important distinction is not intended to minimise the learning options that international mobility bears, but rather remind us of the broader array of social occasions that call for altering perspectives in modern societies (ibid).

Otten (2009) observes that universities fulfil a double function in society as transmitters of cultural values on the one hand and incubators of (inter)cultural exchanges on the other. As a result they display an ‘entire spectrum of values and ideas of a society, including their historical development’ (2009, p409). However, engaging, or ‘encountering’ diversity is not unproblematic. Gill (2016) persuasively argues that ‘the presence of diversity must be accompanied by pedagogical endeavour so that there are proactive processes (curriculum, teaching and learning, informal settings, and so on) to engage with diversity’ (p491).

Killick (2012) notes ‘diversity in the student body is not only represented through those from another country or culture’ a statement that challenges the tendency to consider diversity in the context of, or in relation to internationalization. Rather, acknowledging the specificity and intersectionality inherent in and across both concepts, our consideration of cultural diversity spans both international and indigenous student/staff. We also share with Killick the understanding that our higher education institutions, our community of learners and graduates live in an increasingly culturally diverse world in which:

“...gender, ethnicity, nationality, social class and many other dimensions of difference materially impact upon an individual’s freedoms to conduct his/her life in ways which will give him/her reason to value it. University education makes a difference to...an individual’s subjective capabilities for leading such a life...” (Killick, 2018, p72)

Killick (2018) drawing on Sen (1999, 2008), brings together the materiality of student diversity, i.e. the idea that identity and difference matter in material ways (economic and cultural resources, opportunities, discrimination, belonging, in/exclusions etc.) for how
we experience and live in the world and the notion of a life valued. This takes on a particular resonance in the context of the challenging geo-political context in which we live.

Our Geopolitical World: Problematising the HE Agenda

Political events in Ireland and the US (Presidential elections, Black Lives Matter movement), the UK (Brexit), and Europe (migration) in recent years have revealed troubling and deep-rooted social divisions, (Robson et al 2018). Marginson argues that ‘higher education is soaked in politics’ (Marginson, 2011). It seems timely for a renewed focus on internationalisation of higher education to promote social and values-based goals (Robson et al 2018). Now more than ever, there is a need for universities like UCD to provide a platform to address attitudes towards religious, ethnic and cultural diversity.

In addition, political and economic drivers are often (and worryingly) perceived to be core to Internationalisation such as international student numbers, market positions and university ranking systems (Robson et al, 2018). There is a need for greater discussion and debate on the impact and potential for internationalisation of higher education on ethical, social, cultural and academic goals. The literature suggests that internationalisation and cultural diversity can contribute to the quality and relevance of higher education. A key benefit should be the opportunity for students ‘to develop international and cross-cultural perspectives to prepare them for their role in a globalised workplace and in an increasingly global economy’ (Robson et al 2018).

This is a very interesting argument, particularly in the context of ongoing debate and discussion around financing of higher education. It is no surprise that during government budgetary discussions, primary and secondary education take precedence, due to perceptions of universities as being individualistic, exclusive and elitist. Marginson further challenges us to think about the role of universities in terms of the common or ‘Public Good’ (2011).

The contribution of universities towards the ‘Public Good’ needs to be interrogated and communicated. He considers the different global common goods produced by universities, in the context of individualised and collective contributions that universities make - See Figure 1 below (from Marginson 2018).

Some educationalists are tackling these issues and questions head on. For example, Simon Marginson provocatively proposes that universities could be considered replaceable:

“Other agencies could issue certificates for work; research could be run from corporate or government laboratories, scholars and humanists could be sent back to private life to finance their activities themselves, and students who want real knowledge could buy e-books. The cultural and critical functions of Universities could be left to the media and the Internet.” (Marginson, 2011).

The contribution of universities towards the ‘Public Good’ needs to be interrogated and communicated. He considers the different global common goods produced by universities, in the context of individualised and collective contributions that universities make - See Figure 1 below (from Marginson 2018).

Figure 1: Examples of individualised and collective contributions of higher education (common goods in bold type) (Marginson, 2018)
For many people, the impact of higher education is considered at an individual level: a graduate has achieved competencies and has enhanced capacity, capability and career opportunities. (This thinking is certainly evident in how programme learning outcomes are articulated). However, there is more to higher education than individual benefits - there is a ‘collective good’ which might be interpreted as having political and socio-cultural dimensions and which reflects our vision for our world and by association our institutions including within education. It is possible to consider Intercultural Learning as a vehicle or mechanism which facilitates negotiation and movement between the individual, national, global and institution.

Policy Context
A review of National and Institutional policy documents suggests a strong awareness of the potential value and impact of the university experience. By leveraging the cultural diversity of our university community students and staff can have the opportunity to share insights and experiences and develop perspectives which will allow them to participate in an increasingly global and interconnected world. The most recent International Education Strategy for Ireland, 2016-2020 sets out the vision for international education in Ireland and four strategic priorities. Central to the vision is a higher education experience that prepares students and staff to be ‘active and engaged participants in an interconnected global world.’ The report urges HEIs to incorporate an international and intercultural dimension into their curricula to ensure that all graduates are equipped with the skills and attributes to participate in an interconnected global world and address global challenges.

Local to UCD, harnessing cultural diversity and internationalisation permeates all aspects of the university’s strategic themes and core objectives. The value to students of ‘learning in a diverse multi-cultural environment where alternative perspectives and ways of working can be experienced and where the intercultural competencies necessary to work successfully in our global society can be developed’ is recognised, (UCD Strategy 2020-2024, Rising to the Future). This is echoed in UCD’s Education strategy which sets out to ‘provide students with opportunities to develop interpersonal, intercultural and life skills within and outside of the classroom’ (Priority 2). Supporting the integration and inclusion of international and culturally diverse students into the university community and harnessing the opportunity for all students to share and learn from diverse cultural perspectives is integral to achieving these objectives.
Having considered the merits and challenges outlined in the scholarly and policy literature we decided to concentrate our broad interrogative lens on interculturalism. There has been a surge in interculturally specific scholarship over the past decade growing out of the proliferation of the international agenda but also increased calls for more ‘ethical internationalisation’. There is also exciting work on ‘New Interculturalisms’ and aesthetic interculturalism where subjective performativities are to the fore (McIvor 2016; Boreli 2016) in how we might ‘do’ interculturalism. One approach to understanding the specificity of interculturalism to our education worlds is Knights’ process of integrating an intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of education (Knight 2003, p.2). This intra-institutional, mainstream focus is also reflected in the title of INTRA’s (2006) guide to implementing Intercultural Education: “Culture Is Our Focus, Diversity Is Our Normality”. There are also attempts across the literature to connect internationalization and interculturalism through a focus on institutional commitment to systematic, broader socio-cultural change (Knight in Robson 2011, p621), as seen for example through dedicated ‘Intercultural Universities’ in the purpose (Mateos Cortés, Gunther Dietz 2016). Closer to home, the Irish Universities Association (IUA, 2005) locate internationalization as an opportunity to promote cultural diversity and foster intercultural understanding, respect and tolerance among peoples. Gill (2016) too links diversity and intercultural possibilities. She makes the helpful observation that ‘rich diversity can become a potential source of conflict due to the increase in otherness, but at the same time, it also presents an ideal lifelong learning opportunity for engaging with the “other” through intercultural… education’ (2016, p484-5).

Adopting this intercultural lens is not unproblematic. It is challenging for any singular concept to make meaning of uber-complex situations such as we find in higher education and interculturalism is no exception. Harshad Keval (2014) highlights the potential shortcomings in adopting an intercultural (over a multicultural or other cultural) lens or approach to our contemporary socio-cultural landscape characterised by the persistence of racism and classism. Tochon and Karaman (2009) also draw out the challenges in adopting an intercultural position. Locating their critique in the broader context of social justice education they highlight a specific set of ‘moral encounters’ with the paradoxes of Intercultural Learning. However, on balance we have been convinced by interculturalism, the ‘sense of openness, dialogue and interaction’ it represents (James, 2008, p2) and as a way to reinstate the fluidity and importance of culture across our university campus. We do not adopt this approach naively and are cautious of any attempts to reify interculturalism or indeed any single concept.

Of critical importance here is that regardless of the lens we adopt, intercultural or otherwise, our curriculum design and delivery should meet the learning needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds to facilitate effective learning, (Croze 2011, Leask 2009, Langelier C, 2006). Additionally, meaningful engagement in teaching and learning contexts requires all those involved to interrogate their own internal, often unconscious biases and cultural norms, especially those from within dominant, potentially hegemonic cultural groups and contexts. Holliday’s work is helpful here as he situates interculturality in education as a part of a multi-principled approach to ‘making sense of experiences’ (2018, p4-5). Drawing on Fred Dervin’s (2016) compellingly tentative definition of interculturalism within his book “Interculturality in Education: A Theoretical and Methodological Toolbox” as a reflexive awareness of Self and Other, Holliday highlights the importance of intersectionality and the centrality of justice to intercultural education that “takes us well and healthily away from any naïve positivist attempt to catalogue or quantify measurable intercultural competencies and skills’ (2018, p6). This broader, more subjectively driven approach to interculturality sits well alongside Welikala & Watkins 2008 invitation to adopt an ‘Intercultural Stance’ as educators and offer the following as their approach to interculturalism: ‘that through recognition of our own culturally embedded beliefs and values, articulating them and encouraging others - academics and students - to articulate theirs, we may create a culturally synergistic space that is of benefit to all’ (2008, p55).
A clear implication of this position for teaching and learning is that attending to diversity in our classrooms through Intercultural Learning approaches is something that should apply to all classrooms, all programmes, and all disciplines within our universities, the presence or absence of international students notwithstanding. This certainly accords with the approach to Intercultural Learning we have adopted throughout this study.

**Intercultural Learning Working Definition**
Reflecting the breadth of consulted literature, the experience and insights of the researchers and our reflexive engagement with the project to date, we have developed a working definition to guide our project as follows:

Intercultural Learning is about the opportunities and experiences of working with and learning from people across different cultures.

This working definition is underpinned more specifically by four key concepts which combined represent our conceptual framework. These four concepts are as follows: Opportunity; Relatedness; Competency; and Agency. Whilst these were present in an earlier iteration of this study, our recent interrogation has both refined the scope of each concept and reinforced their relevance to this project.

**OUR 4-D CONCEPTUAL FRAME: ORCA**

**O: OPPORTUNITY**

It is widely acknowledged that students migrate towards people and communities that they share cultural backgrounds with (Clarke et al 2018, Robson 2011, Killick 2011). One of the challenges we grappled with across this intercultural project was how we could enhance mechanisms for acknowledging the significant levels of diversity within our indigenous or home-based students and in addition foster increased opportunities to link home and international students on our campuses. How can we design the curriculum, learning activities and assessments and shape the institutional ethos to give our students opportunities to work with and learn from people from different cultures? One of the ways we have developed this notion of opportunity is through the concept of the ‘encounter’ (Kudo et al 2019, Atkinson 2017; Gill 2016; Valentine 2008) which we explore across our research. The notion of encounter has been stretched and interpreted across a range of disciplinary contexts resulting in a rich canvas from which to situate and reflect on encounter specific to Intercultural Learning and Higher Education (HE).

**R: RELATEDNESS**

Relatedness refers to the way in which we, as humans, are engaged in social relationships across our lifeworlds, including our educational worlds. These relationships are subject to power relations and dynamics. In addition, they are spatial, provoking a sense of belonging in some which foster levels of alienation and detachment from our social and educational worlds in others. One of the ways we can read and understand the complex interplay of these relationships is through Gert Biesta’s (2009) three functions of HE namely: Qualifications, Socialisation and Subjectification. As relational ideas they also have a socio-cultural dimension in which the role of culture is understood to have both formative and constitutive elements: i.e. culture is both constituted by a range of socio-cultural, economic elements and interactions and simultaneously constitutive of these very same processes. All three embrace the idea of self and/in society and self and/in the world and therefore one way to progress this idea is through Merleau Ponty’s (1962) inextricable triangle (in Killick 2011) in which highlights an intersectional engagement between the self, world and others. This inextricable triangle is at once social and spatial and conjures powerful images and responses that relate to the idea and sense of belonging (Yuval-Davis 2006; Antoncich, 2010), a concept that we argue is central to how we conceive relatedness in relation to intercultural learning.
Intercultural competencies are well researched across the literature and include knowledge for example skills and attitudes (Deardorff 2006) and feeling competent or believing in oneself (Gunay 2016). We have extended this interpretation in two ways. First, to include the idea of Cultural Intelligence which reflects a person’s ability to interact, adapt and perform in diverse cultural contexts (Thomas et al 2008). Such cultural intelligenes (Blasco 2009) can be ‘measured’ or more broadly contextualised by drawing on the Early and Ang’s (2003) notion of CQ – or a cultural quotient and pushed further again through connecting it to the idea of ‘social intelligence’ developed by Crowne (2009) which encapsulates both emotional and cultural dimensions. Emotional intelligence (EI) which is comprised of components such as self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills (Goleman 1998) is increasingly considered in relation to models of intercultural competence (Guntersdorfer and Golubeva 2018). Second, we extend our consideration of competencies to the broader university community, to include both students and staff. While this might seem apparent in relation to lecturers and teaching staff on the ground it is also of huge relevance for staff in senior management roles and positions of power.

Variously defined and interpreted across wide-ranging, disciplinary contexts this is another unwieldy, nebulous concept. However, Covert’s (2014) description of agency as one’s ability to make purposeful choices and then pursue a course of action based on these choices (2014, p168) is helpful for our unpacking of agency and agentic acts in the context of higher education and Intercultural Learning. Also helpful is the observation that agency however is potentially multi-dimensional and agentic actions are often socially situated (Haraway 1988) and are therefore also potentially politically infused. Feminist theory is helpful in framing agency as a social and power-filled phenomenon understood through the ‘multiple and complex interacting powers that may be based on intersecting social statuses of gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, class, religion, age, etc.’ (Spencer-wood 2016, p481).
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Qualitative Methodologies
Qualitative methodological approaches underpinned our Fellowship Project. Mitchell (2008) notes for an increasing number of those engaged in social science research the idea that data collection, in and of itself, can serve as an intervention is crucial in that it can be transformative for participants (p366). By adopting a qualitative approach, we encouraged engagement and meaning-making on the part of our participants and offered them a lens through which to illuminate their own cultural insights, understandings, questions and dilemmas. Whilst qualitative methodology provides the broad frame in which to situate our research, we have identified Phenomenological Research as particularly suited to our project given its iterative nature.

In simple terms phenomenological research is concerned with the lived experiences of the people involved, or who were involved, with the issue that is being researched (Groenewald 2004). At its root ‘the intent is to understand the phenomena in their own terms — to provide a description of human experience as it is experienced by the person herself’ (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998, p. 96). The relevance of phenomenology to education research is clearly articulated by Hopkins et al who observe:

“Issues arising in educational contexts are inexorably related to our human nature, our individual perceptions and our interactions with others. Consequently, every member of an educational community – whether student, clinician, basic scientist, or administrator – has a unique perspective on those issues that arise from their enculturation to the field, previous experience, personal beliefs and values, and daily work.” (Hopkins et al 2017, p20)

In our study the object or phenomena of our research is ‘Intercultural Learning’. Our intent is to deepen our understanding by looking directly to participants’ experiences and perception of Intercultural Learning through their particular lens or worldview. This is a subjective process. Heidegger speaks of the reciprocal and inseparable relationship between human beings and the world (that we make sense of the world as we exist within it) as being-in-the-world (Hopkins et al 2017; Killick 2011). As researchers this means we need to be reflexively self-aware and open to our own biases and pre-knowledges, scripts and experiences present in the research process so as to be open to the insights and richness that may emerge through the shared experiences of others.

Research Ethics
Acknowledging the risks involved in working with our students as research participants and the additional risk that students become distressed within the context of our focus groups, full ethical approval was sought. This was granted by Research Ethics UCD for our research project in November 2019.

Research Sample
We sought to bring a culturally diverse group of international and home/indigenous participants to each of the six focus groups through our purposeful sampling strategy. However due to the limitation imposed by recommended focus group size and the breadth of cultural diversity, (across race, class, ethnicity, nationality etc), a fully representative sample was not possible.

Research Design
This research project used a qualitative design comprising 5 stages:
1. Comprehensive review of the scholarly and policy literature.
2. Data collection using focus groups with key university stakeholders including: U/G students; P/G students; academic staff and support staff.
3. Data collection drawing on participant artefacts.
4. Data Analysis using dedicated MAXQDA software for analysing qualitative data.
5. Report writing and dissemination of research findings institutionally, nationally and internationally.

Focus Groups
Focus groups have been identified as an effective way to engage research participants.
1. During this fellowship, six focus groups were conducted with between 3 and 6 participants in each group.
2. Focus groups were undertaken for each category of participants (students; 3 focus groups, support staff; 1 focus group, academic staff; 2 focus groups).
3. The focus groups were audio recorded and facilitated by two facilitators, (Two PIs); The discussion was led through thematic guide questions that speak to the specific research objectives.
4. Duration: Each focus group lasted between 1 and 1.5 hours maximum
5. Topics for discussion: Questions explored participants’ insights, experiences, roles and value, benefits and challenges associated with intercultural learning in UCD.
6. Artefacts were used effectively as a device to prompt conversation, increase confidence by giving participants control over the initial agenda and place participants at ease within the process.

Note: Due to Covid-19 restrictions the focus group format pivoted from face-to-face to online encounters using the video calling software Zoom. Participants received an invite to the focus group with a password to access the meeting space and a standard zoom protocol was followed.

Artefacts and ‘Cultural Scripts’
A particular innovation of this research was our decision to draw on artefacts as a device/prompt to drive the focus groups and to help participants articulate the experiences and understandings of intercultural learning. Artefacts are everyday objects that have been left behind or made by people to satisfy needs or wants or to express an idea or belief (Norum 2008). There is no definitive list, examples may include photographs, items of clothing, social and multimedia imagery, a piece of sculpture or art or any form of writing. They become data through the questions posed about them and the meanings assigned to them by the researcher and thus provide a rich source of data within qualitative research. We consider artefacts in this research process through the lens of the ‘cultural script’. Our expectations and understandings of behaviour, both our own and others, is closely related to the ‘cultural scripts’ (Welikala & Watkins 2008) we generate and which are at times, generated for us. The term ‘cultural script’ refers to a technique for articulating culture-specific norms, values, and practices in terms which are clear, precise, and accessible to cultural insiders and outsiders alike (Goddard 2006). There is a danger that as educators holding explicit positions of power and majority students reflecting dominant cultural norms, that we impose our own cultural scripts, always subjective and contextually realised, onto others. Inviting participants to share their ‘cultural scripts’ through their chosen artefacts as opposed to the scripts we might ascribe, and which can be stereotypical and idealised (Prud’homme van Reine & Blom 2017), gives participants a great deal of say over what is talked about, in what way, to what extent and in what terms. By framing the discussion in this way from the outset, we aim to give the participants a sense of control over the research agenda giving them the space and freedom to talk about issues and experiences that they feel are most relevant to their experiences within UCD.

Coding and Analysis
The critical thematic analysis of our research data is underpinned by Braun & Clarke’s (2006) 6-step framework, summarised as follows: Step 1: Become familiar with the data, Step 2: Generate initial codes, Step 3: Search for themes, Step 4: Review initial codes, Step 5: Define themes, Step 6: Write-up (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The broad aim of thematic analysis is to identify themes from within the research data and to use these themes to address the research question or contribute knowledge about an issue. Themes can be understood as patterns that emerge from within the data that are important or interesting. Critical thematic analysis is much more than simply summarising the data, it involves interpretations and sense-making. Braun & Clarke (2006) distinguish between two levels of themes: semantic and latent. Semantic themes are captured as follows: ‘…within the explicit or surface meanings of the data and the analyst is not looking for anything beyond what a participant has said or what has been written.’ (p.84). In contrast, the latent level looks beyond what has been said and ‘…starts to identify or examine the underlying ideas, assumptions, and conceptualisations – and ideologies - that are theorised as shaping or informing the semantic content of the data’ (p.84).

All focus groups were recorded and transcribed verbatim using Rev.com. Transcripts were read and re read by the principal investigators (PIs; AQ, COS) and a coding tree was agreed based on major thematic domains. Using this tree, coding was conducted by a research assistant using dedicated MAXQDA software for analysing qualitative data.
Six major codes represent the deductively identified themes that were established at the beginning stages of the project, (Opportunities, Relatedness / Social Relations, Competencies, Agency, Teaching and Learning, Culture/Interculturalism). They were identified through the literature review and engagement in the fellowship research process.

The ORCA framework had been derived from the literature and was used to generate 4 major thematic codes. Figure 3 shows the ORCA tree codes, their sub codes and their colour identifiers.

Figure 3: ORCA Tree Codes

Teaching & Learning is an overarching theme of the fellowship research project and so a major code was generated with the same name. Figure 4 shows the Teaching & Learning tree code, its sub codes and its colour identifier.

Figure 4: Teaching & Learning Tree Code

Culture / Interculturalism is an overarching theme of the fellowship research project and so a major code was generated with the same name. Figure 5 shows the Culture / Interculturalism tree code, its sub codes and its colour identifier.

Figure 5: Culture / Interculturalism Tree Code

Inductive codes were identified through themes that emerged in the facilitation and participation in the focus groups and in the transcription process.

All sub-codes were inductively identified and can be seen under their associated major code in Figures 3-5. Thirty one sub codes were deliberated and agreed upon in the code identification process and they are located across the 6 major codes. They are not narrowly defined; some appear twice and some have multiple names e.g. Sameness/Difference/Diversity. The reason for this is to allow for sub themes to overlap across the major themes and for ideas and opinions of participants to be interpreted in broader ways and nuance captured.

Two extra codes were created inductively for the purpose of specifically tracking participants’ descriptions of their ‘Artefacts’, and ‘Participant Recommendations’ for fostering and progressing intercultural teaching and learning in UCD. They are not major codes nor do they contain sub codes.

Mind maps were then used by the PIs to represent a coding hierarchy: main topics or sub codes within the thematic domains were firstly presented with secondary branches used to include more concrete illustrative ideas, (Burgess Allen and Owen Smith, 2010). Burgess Allen and Owen Smith, (2010) describe mind maps as diagrams ‘used to represent concepts, ideas or tasks linked to and arranged radially around a central key word or idea’. See Appendix 2 and 3.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS

Overview
A total of 32 people participated across the six focus groups: (17 students, 9 academics and 6 support staff (clinical tutors, student advisers, access officers). The focus groups were illuminating, and participants gave freely of their opinions, insights and experiences. Participants interestingly spoke of the opportunity the focus group provided to have an otherwise invisible conversation. This chapter focuses on the key findings relating to the following themes:

- Teaching and Learning
- Culture/Interculturalism
- ORCA Conceptual frame: Opportunity; Relatedness; Competencies; Agency (and/as Artefacts)

TEACHING AND LEARNING

Participants offered varied and rich perspectives relating to Intercultural Teaching and Learning. Within this domain, six themes were identified (Mind Map 1, Appendix 2) as follows: student attributes, pedagogy, practical intercultural learning (ICL) tips, curriculum, staff competency, and pastoral support.

Student Attributes
A recurring viewpoint was the diversity of student attributes and characteristics, (cultural backgrounds, experiences, and understandings) as a strength of the UCD community. However, diverse cultural backgrounds and experiences whilst valuable were also seen as somewhat ‘hidden’ and an underutilised vehicle for ICL in UCD.

“...the dynamics of the pedagogy could benefit from a more diverse perspective. And that’s perhaps a little hidden within the diversity that we have within the classroom already.”

[Participant 2, Academic Staff]

Pedagogy and Practical ICL Tips
Group work was a common practical ICL tool discussed. It was viewed as an important vehicle for Intercultural Learning and exchange. Group work needed to be engineered to harness the diversity of the university community and promote ICL. Whilst it is important the students are not overburdened with assessment tasks relating to work with different groups, students should be exposed to group work to facilitate development of important intercultural skills. Lecturers/module coordinators should allocate students to groups with attention to mixing gender, cultures, age, citizenship. Group work may involve completion of assessed assignments but may also take other low stakes forms such as: in-class group conversations, group problem solving or case scenarios, using role play and storytelling.

“I introduce a lot of group work... Assign certain roles to each member within the group, to ensure that each member is sufficiently contributing to the group’s tasks. Because to a certain extent... one can end up with a black box, where you just see the end product, but you don’t see in terms of the contributions of each member. And, that can have a cultural dimension, in terms of people being left out, or left behind, or not being sufficiently encouraged.”

[Participant 5, Student]

Curriculum
Opportunities for Intercultural Learning was deemed an important part of higher education by participants, particularly in relation to preparing graduates for work and life in a global society. Discussions sometimes centred around Intercultural Learning being ‘embedded’ into curricula, being core to the mission and philosophy of programmes and aligned to the mission and values of UCD.

“What does UCD stand for? What does UCD look at from another viewpoint? You are training the students to be the future workforce of the world. You’re not just an island. Then what are the values that the future workforce should have?”

[Participant 15, Student]
The need to internationalise the curriculum and ensure diversity of resources and contributors was highlighted.

“How are we looking at our curriculum and actually talking about diversity and inclusion if that’s not really rooted in say, broad subjects?... How do you get that different lens in there if everything is stemming from a very Western way of thinking?”

[Participant 8, Student]

“Curriculums all end up looking the same anyway. If you go to do an undergrad, wherever you are, it’s going to be the same faces and writers. ...You know what everyone else knows but we’re just repeating the same type of learning. That’s very un-inclusive.”

[Participant 8, Student]

ICL can be promoted in both formal and informal teaching environments. Teaching environments that incorporated ‘safe space’ for students were advocated to allow students to be open and exchange experiences and perspectives.

“Some of them will become more expressive and once they know it’s a safe place they start to ask questions and other stuff. Often they come over afterwards to the lecturer and ask questions. So there are different ways of interacting and if we create different types of settings within the same module, small group discussions and so on, then gradually they will learn to be open.”

[Participant 27, Academic Staff]

“This notion of sharing is very important... We, faculty, want to create a safer space, we want our students to share their experiences of diversity et cetera... so we should start sharing something. That’s the easiest way to build trust. It’s a dual process... We are asking something very intimate, for people to share their lives. We are in a position of power, we are on the podium, so we should start sharing something about us.”

[Participant 28, Academic Staff]

Staff Competencies

Staff competencies and teacher attributes included: being open to change teaching approaches and materials, being sensitive, being encouraging and facilitatory. Lecturers should have some understanding of the cultural diversity, including diversity of Irish students, within their classrooms.

“I think it’s vital to consider culture in our approach to teaching and learning because students are not a vacuum, they come with their own background and they have their own process to embrace, to adapt to what we are sharing with them.”

[Participant 28, Academic Staff]

“I don’t think enough of the teaching staff have enough perception of where some people, who are Irish, may be coming from, whether it’s a very rural background or a working-class background. And we just need to be more aware.”

[Participant 30, Academic Staff]

The importance of building rapport and having some insight into student background was discussed. The competing demands of providing pastoral supports and building relationships and trust with students against increased student numbers and workload demands was highlighted.

“Faculty, directors, or whoever, should have some working knowledge of the political context of the countries. It is actually quite important so that you can ask the leading questions. You don’t have to know everything about it.”

[Participant 3, Academic Staff]

“Nothing beats the knowledge and rapport that you have with individual students on the program... But it is very intense, and the students all have different needs.”

[Participant 3, Academic Staff]
"The peer support is fantastic, and it caters for and takes care of a lot of 'socially related things' like, 'where do I find?', 'How do I get to the bank?', 'I'm having trouble with registration fees' etc.. But the peer support is never going to sort out those deep individual problems... that psycho-social support. And, they see you as the person. But then we've got the demand by UCD to increase numbers and added to that, you've got colleagues who are swamped."

[Participant 1, Academic Staff]

CULTURE/INTERCULTURALISM

Six overlapping sub codes or themes were highlighted in the domain of culture/interculturalism as follows: identity, national and international identity, local knowledge and cultural hierarchies, assumptions/ stereotypes/biases, racism/classism, value of culture (Appendix 3, Mind map 2).

Identity, Local Knowledge and Cultural Hierarchies

Culture was closely related to identity in terms of social class, race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, age. Social class as a cultural entity was discussed in many focus groups and perceived to be underemphasized and undervalued. Perceived cultural hierarchies both within Irish society and between Irish and other cultures were acknowledged.

"Recruiting foreign students is a legitimate way of trying to redress the budget issue, but there is a social class issue that I think has been undervalued and has been underemphasized."

[Participant 29, Academic Staff]

"My parents chose a school where the Dublin accent wouldn’t have been as strong, quite deliberately, not that I realized as a child, but in order to make sure that I did not go around with the slang, the vocabulary, the accent, because it wasn’t perceived as one that would go anywhere."

[Participant 30, Support Staff]

"For example, Irish people are wise, Western people care about climate change. I joined the climate strike earlier, but for me like the dissidents in China, we care about human rights, but these kinds of topics are not so, I don’t know how to describe it, but we care about two different things. It’s like your topic is superior but we are still on the ground."

[Participant 10, Student]

Assumptions/Stereotypes/Biases/Racism/Classism

Linked to cultural hierarchies were both suppressed and overt experiences of classism/racism and assumptions, stereotypes and biases as they relate to culture:

"A big part of what I would call my cultural identity is rooted in class, and it’s maybe true that different experiences of education I’ve had, it’s not usually encouraged to think of a working class identity as a cultural identity. But I think very much is, and has been suppressed or attempted institutionally to be suppressed at each level."

[Participant 20, Student]

"It’s about stereotyping... All Asians are not monolithic or the same... but we are lumped together in one, you know? And I love some people who say, ‘Why don’t you go back to China?’ And you’re thinking, why do I need to go back to China? I’m not from China."

[Participant 5, Student]

‘ORCA’ Conceptional Framework Analysis

Our ORCA Intercultural Learning Conceptual framework evolved out of a process of sustained engagement with the scholarly literature. It also reflects the combined histories, teaching and research trajectories and their commitment to Intercultural Teaching and Learning. The ORCA framework underpins our definition of Intercultural Learning and comprises four key elements: Opportunity; Relatedness; Competency; and Agency. Whilst these were present in an earlier iteration of this study, our recent interrogation of these concepts through the focus group qualitative research has both refined the scope of each concept and reinforced their relevance to this project.
Opportunity is the first of our ORCA Intercultural Learning themes to be explored. It emerged across the research in interesting ways posing questions of the university as an institution and as a university community. A range of opportunities were articulated including the opportunities to do more, to do better in relation to diversity as discussed above and harnessing the enormous intercultural potential across the university community including students and teaching, support and management staff.

Seeking to make sense of the breadth of opportunities articulated across the focus groups and building on the researchers’ own commitment to reflexive practice as pedagogues and researchers we embraced the idea of the ‘encounter’ (Atkinson 2017; Gill 2016; Valentine 2008). This helped our analysis and conceptualisation of ‘opportunity’ as the first component of our ORCA conceptual framework and which we developed in (at least) three particular ways:

- first, the focus group as an opportunity to bring people, students and staff, together as an ‘encounter’,
- second, the Intercultural Teaching and Learning opportunities gained through the research as ‘pedagogic encounter’,
- third, the Fellowship project as an important professional ‘encounter’ opportunity (collegial and friendship) between the researchers.

Focus Group as Encounter

We are contextualising the focus groups themselves as a form of ‘double encounter’ both between the focus group participants and the large and complex ideas of interculturalism and diversity. Inspired by participants’ reflections on the FG process and their experience within it suggests that the FG and research project provided the opportunity for a distinct intercultural and relational encounter as we see in the following exchange between 2 participants:

“More opportunities for conversation in general, because even a conversation like this [Focus Group] we wouldn’t really have an opportunity for through our course. Maybe through other things like VO [UCD Volunteers Overseas], which you learn a lot from. And it’s not like somebody is talking at you as well. You get to figure out yourself how you actually think, because for some people these conversations might be their first experience to talk about different things.”

[Participant 18, Student]

“I completely agree with Participant 18 there because for me this is quite out of my depth, in my course there’s no conversations like this or anything like that. So, even this conversation for someone like me is really eye opening where you take away things…So yeah, just conversations like this, really I think this has been amazing.”

[Participant 19, Student]

Participants embraced the focus group opportunity to engage in nuanced, reflective conversation about culture, diversity and the potential of Intercultural Learning to deepen understandings across our university. As discussed in relation to Intercultural Learning, participants shared a range of interpretations and understandings of the nebulous concept ‘culture’ as explored in Chapter 2:

“The world is just made up of people and cultures are just labels, they’re just ways for us to categorize our world, like genders or all the rest, so it’s always important to not reduce people to the kind of culture that we attribute to them but to always go beyond it on both sides, both for them and also for us.”

[Participant 29, Academic Staff]

Comments suggested participants’ engagement with culture was sophisticated and expansive:

“I think sometimes people perceive culture as something more related to perceptions and representations as a symbolic way but ignore the fact that culture also has to do with power, social class, race, ethnicity, and so on.”

[Participant 28, Academic Staff]
The positive dimensions associated with opportunities to share learning with others and embracing diversity through intercultural approaches were highlighted within the focus group conversations:

“It’s so exciting. Like, it gives you opportunity, it deepens your education, especially if you have mature students in the room as well, I think that’s such a valuable thing.”
[Participant 5, Student]

There was however a palpable sense of lost or missed opportunities in terms of harnessing the potential that institutional diversity and interculturalism holds.

“The philosophy should be focusing on inclusion, because by default we’re diverse. But what are we doing with the diversity?”
[Participant 28, Academic Staff]

This indicates a sense of frustration with the institution’s lack of clear direction and intent regarding this diversity and the failure to maximise it as a resource. A similar sentiment was raised in relation to UCD and our responsibility to embrace the opportunities available to us as a global university.

“If I could do something I would like to encourage conversations of the responsibility of being a global university, what exactly does that mean for management, for staff, for all academics, even for research. Make it true that we are a global university. That we value all sets of cultures... That we give a space for all the voices and that we recognize that will come with a lot of problems on itself, that diversity will come with challenges, and we’re not just swiping it under the rug but we are exploring them and using them as an opportunity to be global leaders in higher education.”
[Participant 32, Academic Staff]

However, it was also acknowledged that there were challenges that impacted the opportunity to fully harness intercultural potential of our institution including the complex psycho-social implications of identity suppression. This took on particular resonance through the contributions made in relation to social identities including social class, race and age and the need to create opportunities for sharing in relation to these lived experiences.

“And for whatever, you know, be it a people’s ethnicity, their religious backgrounds, … their class, whatever it is, that people are a lot of the time, maybe hiding or have suppressed, or maybe have never thought about the fact that they have had to suppress something at some point in their life, and there is a lot of value, I think in sharing that, in me saying, “yeah, this is something that I’ve been told, always, it’s not great.”
[Participant 20, Student]

‘Pedagogies of Encounter’
Drawing on Gill’s (2016) Pedagogies of Encounter we sought throughout this process to harness teaching and learning opportunities gained from the insights shared through the research. This becomes manifest in real terms through our Intercultural 101 Teaching Tool which presents key pedagogic insights from the research project and includes first-hand narrative accounts of our participants through direct quotes. This tool was generated from insights gained from focus groups and married with international literature. The tool centres around 7 areas for reflection namely: Orientation/ introduction, Group work, Internationalisation of the curriculum, diversity of contributors, space for ICL, using artefacts to drive ICL and visibility of ICL. Underlining these are questions of in/visibility, diversity and inclusion which can raise interesting tensions. One such tension, articulated across the literature and articulated by participants, was between international interculturalism on the one hand and home student diversification on the other:

“I mean human experience sounds better than inter-cultural. Intercultural is more of even big ideas, you think Africa, you think America, you think global context. Whereas human experience, it can be the difference of growing up in Dublin and growing up in North Kerry as you say. It’s different.”
[Participant 12, Student]
A clear opportunity to address this was identified by breaking down these oppositional relationships:

“We’re students as a whole, and I think that’s proven quite difficult... not seeing us as one student body. And I really think it is internationals versus domestic, and I think that that’s something that needs to be broken down.”

[Participant 15, Student]

The interplay between visibility and invisibility across our campus community was also addressed particularly in relation to representation.

“I think the university should hire more diverse staff also. Visibility is very important, and yes we are very proud that UCD is global, and we have this amount of international diverse students, but how about faculty?”

[Participant 28, Academic Staff]

Invisibility was also highlighted as a key challenge to harnessing the opportunities and potentialities across cultures and social identities. Many participants focused on social class as an example of cultural invisibility across our campus and emphasised the need to give voice to issues of invisibility. Creating opportunities to talk, to initiate conversations about identity experiences including social class was identified as an important factor, not just in relation to positive mental health and well-being but also in terms of representation and challenging these invisibilities.

“Everybody feels ashamed about it, not just working class people are ashamed about it, middle class people are ashamed about it, upper class people are ashamed about it. It’s some cascade of shame... unless you actually talk about it, you can’t address issues such as under-representation of social class minority in UCD and so on.”

[Participant 29, Academic Staff]

Fellowship as Encounter

This institutional Fellowship can itself be viewed as an Encounter, or series of encounters. First, the research project offered opportunities for multiple collegial encounters between the two ‘research fellows’ as we navigated our working relationship and juggled at times competing timeframes and temporalities between academic trimesters and the particular lifespan of the project. Spatially, these encounters happened over coffees and snatched meetings across a busy campus before migrating to a wholly virtual environment as the backdrop of the global pandemic, Covid-19, gained more and more traction and impacted our research in so many ways. Second, the Fellowship can be read as a series of complex intellectual encounters across disciplines, knowledge bases and methodologies spanning the life sciences and social sciences. These rich exchanges deepened and expanded our intellectual understandings of Intercultural Learning. Third, given that it is an institutionally supported and funded Fellowship, it also took the form of numerous professional encounters between a number of institutional stakeholders including the researchers, the UCD advisory committee, the UCD peer community of teaching and learning fellows and our dedicated international advisory champion/expert. Through this multi-layered lens of ‘encounter’ we can make visible and interrogate the institutional politics and complex intersectional dynamics at play within intercultural approaches to teaching and learning. These encounters will continue to be explored during the project dissemination phase and will build on the encounters that informed this research with UCD Teaching and Learning and UCD Global in particular. Opportunities for more formal encounters within senior leadership
policy generating spaces have been planned in 2021.

Evident across these various ‘encounters’ is the importance of people, or place to the evolution of these opportunities both of which are developed in the second ORCA theme Relatedness.

**RELATEDNESS**

The emergence of relatedness as one of the four elements of our conceptual framework, ORCA traverses notions of connections, relationship building and encounters. It resonated across our focus groups and our different participant constituencies. The importance of the relational is highlighted by Thushari Welikala and Chris Watkins (2008) in their work on the capacity for cultural scripts to improve intercultural learning experiences in higher education. They emphasise the need for more attention to “relational” participation, for providing a discursive space for students to unpack culturally loaded language, and for tutors to incorporate caring in their work with international students (2008). Central to relationality is the notion of belonging a messy, multidimensional concept. Here Nira Yuval-Davies’ (2006) work on the ‘politics of belonging’, provides a helpful starting point. She articulates 3 clear dimensions of this belonging: temporal, intersectional and spatial. There are clear synergies between Yuval-Davies’ (2006) work and Antoncich’s work to identify a number of characteristics of belonging: citizenship, nationhood, gender, ethnicity and emotional dimensions of status or attachment; ‘modes of belonging’, as a way to capture the endless variety of attachment to places, groups, cultures, etc; and the notion of ‘differential belonging’, the ways in which this attachment is performed (in Antoncich 2010, p645). However, in order to counter the danger of conceptual ambiguity and what Elliot-Cooper calls ‘chaotic concepts’ (2019) Antoncich helpfully distinguishes two major dimensions of belonging, personal and social.

The personal he describes in terms of a sense of ‘place-belongingness’ which conjures a personal, intimate, feeling of being ‘at home’ in a place. The social he captures through a ‘politics of belonging’, a more discursive resource that constructs, claims, justifies, or resists forms of socio-spatial inclusion/exclusion.

The following participant captures something of the personal and social interplay that underpins Antonic’s conceptualization of belonging:

“\textbf{I think perhaps the speaking up, if you’re unsure of yourself or if you’re too much of an introvert could be eased if groups were to meet in a more colloquial setting, that is not a class setting. If, for example, students were invited to meet outside of classes, because I sometimes feel it’s a shame we have so little time together.}”

[Participant 8, Student]

Even when students were at the point of accessing the university there were concerns about being different to the typical student profile they would encounter. Reflecting Bourdieu’s (1986) ‘fish out of water’ experience these concerns can be seen to emerge where there is a lack of congruence between one’s habitus and the social world, including our education worlds, in which one finds oneself (West et al 2013). “\textbf{One of the first questions I hear every year… “Will I be the oldest?” And that could be from a 30 year old or a 60 plus student.”}”

[Participant 22, Support Staff]

Shared in one of the first focus groups this articulation of this orphan like liminal state impacted hugely on both researchers and spoke to the acute challenges and complexities of interculturalism.

“Because as for me, I’m always in such a confusion status because I’m Chinese. Sometimes I don’t feel included in this society. But also I don’t feel included back in China because I have the different value with my people. Some of them are really patriotic or pro-Communist Party, but I’m not. And most of my other Chinese friends are the same with them. So sometimes it feels like an orphan.”

[Participant 10, Student]

Conversations across the focus groups also captured the challenges social class can pose to one’s sense of belonging. However, as we see in the following exchange, this is not entirely straightforward. Pride, suppression, fear, anxiety speak to the complex interplay
of elements influencing place-belonging in the context of university.

“A big part of what I would call my cultural identity is rooted in class, and it’s maybe true that different experiences of education I’ve had, it’s not usually encouraged to think of a working class identity as a cultural identity. But I think very much is, and has been suppressed or attempted institutionally to be suppressed at each level.”

[Participant 20, Student]

“You resonated with me quite a bit on the working class because that’s my background, and that is my identity and I wear it with pride.”

[Participant 15, Student]

In addition to individual feelings of place-belongingness Antoncich elucidates five factors, which he argues can contribute to generate such a feeling namely: autobiographical, relational, cultural, economic, and legal (2010, p647). Importantly in the context of this research the Relational factors Antoncich develops refer to:

‘the personal and social ties that enrich the life of an individual in a given place. These ties vary from emotionally dense relations with friends and family members to what Buonfino and Thomson (2007, 16) call ‘weak ties’, i.e. occasional interactions with strangers with whom we come to share public spaces’. (Antoncich 2010, p647)

We could interpret relationality in this sense as emerging from, and at once contributing to, a continuum or spectrum of relationships that help us makes sense of our higher education worlds and ourselves. Recognition and representation within a place culture are important aspects of this process:

“So, there is that being within the country and yet not being part of the culture that is dominant within the institution, and while I know things have changed to some extent it is rare that I hear a pure Dublin accent on the student’s side.”

[Participant 30, Academic Staff]

This conversation also raised the coexistence inclusion/exclusion in a complex interplay of the dynamics of belonging. Reflecting on the strong sense of cultural identity or ties some students make to their programme, the following participant also acknowledged how this can have inadvertent implications on ‘other’ students:

“I think then it’s such a culture as well that if you’re not part of it, you might not belong if you don’t understand it. So I think you know when there’s a real strong culture there and a lot of our students identify with it, it’s a great thing, but it can also exclude people, too.”

[Participant 26, Support Staff]

This is particularly useful as we seek to deepen understandings of higher education, our university or campus environments and the range of interactions and relationships we build within this university community. The idea of ‘weak ties’ as occasional interactions is particularly useful given the spontaneous nature of much of the informal campus engagement by our student population.

Participants captured this sense of the personal and social dimensions of belonging and the challenge of having to navigate a space almost entirely constituted of ‘weak ties’ particularly at the beginning of an educational journey:

“Purely from a social perspective where I’m alone, and what if people don’t understand me? What if people don’t get why I’m doing this? I think that for me is the most daunting thing, it’s just being one person. When I came into the course, it’s like 99% of people here are Irish. What am I going to do? Who am I going to talk to?”

[Participant 14, Student]

Interesting temporalities were also characteristic of people’s attempts to navigate their belonging or connectedness. The timelines associated with generating a sense of belonging, of taking something and investing time in it is to create something more meaningful is evident in this participant’s description of developing friendships in Ireland:
“... the six of us are from different countries, but it took like one month now. Now we share everything. We don’t seem that there is a normal distinct identities for us. We have developed a friendship. So I think it takes time. It’s timing.”

[Participant 9, Student]

There was also a keen sense that this process of belonging was performative – that it was something that needed to be supported, that things needed to be done.

“You have a huge campus. You have the ability to have lots of students. That’s probably something that UCD is strategically looking at. If that’s the case, you need to ensure that students feel comfortable and that they feel welcomed in.”

[Participant 8, Student]

And it was clear that UCD is already aware of this requirement to be an active player in this process. A number of participants spoke of the institutional efforts to welcome them and to ease their transition into a new country.

“And I thought the whole briefing package was wonderful, really wonderful that they put together. So I knew what to expect already including that I will be welcomed at the airport should I wanted to avail myself to these services.”

[Participant 5, Student]

However, this notion of comfort, or being comfortable was also identified as complex process that required both the institution and student to actively experience comfort and that that might also include embracing moments of discomfort:

“I think we should just use the idea that everybody should feel comfortable, but that also that they should learn to be comfortable also when they are exposed to opinions that they might not like or to ideas that they might not like, or even to things that they might.. feel to be personally offensive or discomforting.”

[Participant 29, Academic Staff]

COMPETENCIES

As outlined in chapter 2 there is significant scholarship on intercultural competencies in higher education that highlights the acquisition of skills, often conceptualised through a student-centric lens. From the outset as researchers and teachers we were keen to embrace a broader approach to intercultural education that would acknowledge the need for competencies and simultaneously extend beyond a limiting positivist interpretation of competency as ‘measurable skills’. We were keen to explore the emotional and cultural dimensions of intercultural competencies. We include a dedicated ‘prompt’ within the focus groups on values and listened carefully for participants’ responses. It was evident that a wide range of soft skills were valued across the university community and not purely targeted at students.

One participant suggested that we re-consider the relationship between skills and competencies to one that blended hard skills and emotional intelligence and values:

“Well, I just think it’s really important because you need to create a sense of inclusiveness. It’s not just diversity of numbers. It’s inclusiveness that matters. And the workforce of the future is about being inclusive and being emotionally intelligent. So the more they get it at the universities, the better they are as a skilled future workforce. Just like with digital skills.”

[Participant 8, Student]

The importance of emotional intelligence, measured through the idea of emotional quotient (EQ), was discussed in relation to the personal values we develop. It was linked to broader questions of who we are and by extension how we interact or engage with others:

“Maybe if it’s not about national identity as such, but what is important for me personally? What are the characteristics I value about myself that make me a valuable part of this group or whatever, or what do I value in other people? Maybe that does stem from our cultural background, but not necessarily from
our nationality. I think maybe bringing that in, might be smarter than talking about what is it like being a German?"

[Participant 4, Student]

The development of empathy as a particular form of emotional intelligence (EQ) was associated directly to high level functioning within professional contexts:

“Cultural learning teaches you empathy, and unless you have that ... Having that empathy really helps you as a healthcare professional to connect with that patient and getting them to understand that they have to do their rehab or whatever it is.”

[Participant 18, Student]

Tolerance was also identified as something to be considered within the context of broader intercultural competencies:

“So that whole tolerance piece for me is really important that students see that there’s many different ways to look at a problem. That there’s many different ways to look at how people approach different things.”

[Participant 26, Support Staff]

As referenced above, the reflections on competencies were not limited to students. Participants, both students and staff, brought a critical conversational lens to considerations of staff competencies, skills and attitudes.

“I don’t think all lecturers are open to this, I personally don’t think that all lecturers have their minds open. And you’re assuming that all ... Lecturers are people too... I do wonder is there a learning curve there for lecturers? And staff?... Not everyone’s as great as you guys, and not everyone’s as in tune, and I do wonder is there something on a higher level that staff need to do as a whole, as a community of the university of UCD.”

[Participant 15, Student]

This sentiment also extended to people in ‘top management’ positions, those higher up on the food chain of institutional decision making and accountability, who were identified as being a necessary part of this conversation and as such they should not be exempt from engaging with education and training opportunities in this area.

“I think instead of the teachers who are probably lesser somewhere there in the hierarchy of different sections of UCD, it should probably be the top management people who should be taking up courses on intercultural and diversity things.”

[Participant 17, Student]

These comments and reflections reinforce our determination to consider intercultural competencies beyond the realm of the student and limited to hard skills’ acquisition. Rather intercultural competencies should be targeted towards our entire campus community as part of a broader process of promoting intercultural emotional intelligence, dialogue and awareness.

### AGENCY

Agency is the fourth and final element within our ORCA conceptual framework. As discussed in chapter 3, it reflects our capacity to ‘act’ and ‘do’ in the context of existing societal power dynamics and structures. As such, agency provides a way for us to consider questions such as who am I/what can I/how can I ‘do’ within higher education and for what purpose? In order to develop our thinking here we will draw on what we have termed affective intercultural agency in our higher education worlds.

Affective intercultural agency (Clough 2017; Stewart 2007) builds on our theme of Relatedness in that it explores what Billet (2008) describes as the relational interdependence between personal and social agency.

There are also potential synergies here with what Silver et al (2020) describe as a ‘sense of agency’, the phenomenology associated with causing one’s own actions and their corresponding effects and is argued to be a cornerstone of human experience (Silver et al 2020). This form of agency also acknowledges the relationship between power knowledge (Foucault, 2007) and though representing a complex interplay of elements was insightfully captured and reflected upon across the focus groups.
The responsibility of higher education institutions to acknowledge the power dynamics at play in our pedagogies and curricula and moreover the long-term impact of these knowledge bases in professional – post HE – contexts was evident in the following:

“I do think institutionally these schools absolutely without a doubt have a responsibility to educate people that are going to be professionals in positions that gives them power, that one should understand that there is a power difference between a professional and a patient, be it a physio, doctor. And that people’s different cultural identities, be it race, class, ethnicity, whatever it may be, has a huge bearing on that as well.”

[Participant 20, Student]

Participants identified agentic possibilities in relation to Intercultural Learning through its capacity to provide a platform to broaden insights and understandings. Agency here can be seen in the emphasis on problem solving. By actively encouraging students to delve into more nuanced understandings of whatever issue is before, new perspectives become possible:

“...students see that there’s many different ways to look at a problem. That there’s many different ways to look at how people approach different things.”

[Participant 26, Support Staff]

One of the major ways we can ‘see’ affective intercultural agency is through the experience of the artefacts.

**Artefacts as Conduits of Affective Intercultural Agency**

The artefacts were used very effectively during the focus groups to facilitate participants to articulate their experiences and understandings of Intercultural Learning. In simplest terms they were used as ice-breakers to initiate conversation and drive discussion but also gave participants control and freedom to speak to issues and experiences relevant to them. For listeners, the use of artefacts helped to focus and expand understanding of concepts presented. Listeners frequently asked questions regarding the
artefacts allowing deeper exploration of insights and meaning. However, on an analytic level the artefacts presented also offer significant insight into participants’ intercultural experiences. A summary of the artefacts is included in Figure 7 however particular examples are highlighted below particularly as they relate to ‘affective intercultural agency’ and its personal and social dimensions.

The coffee pot was shared in one of the first focus groups and it captured something of the agentic capacity of students to not just embrace their new context but to engage in planned interventions in a play to harness the intercultural potential of new student encounters.

“Because I like coffee and I wanted to make it economically the way I know. So that’s why I brought this. And it was easy to bring, as well. So, that’s good. And, more importantly, I also thought that it would be a good piece to create conversation with my roommates or with other cultures.”

[Participant 9, Student]

Their personal decision to bring this artefact to Ireland was a deliberate plan to foster social interaction and thus blends ‘sense of place’ with Silver et al’s (2020) ‘sense of agency’.

This sense of agency was also clearly evident through the pedagogic reflections that accompanied many of the artefacts introduced by participants. For example, the agentic potential of teaching to generate and create new insights, new perspectives was communicated through the artefact of traditional tissue paper used in Mexico to celebrate the Day of the Dead:

“But at the end of the day, it’s a learning process coming back and forth, creating new things, creating new perspectives and coming up with something completely different in the process.”

[Participant 32, Academic Staff]

Music’s agentic capacity to reinforce commonalities over power hierarchies in complex intercultural contexts was captured in another artefact – the choir. Here the desire is to transcend difference quite literally through the act of singing and through this act the agentic dimension of intercultural exchange is captured.

“I like this idea of movement, fluidity, that it’s always changing. But also the notion of resistance, because Peru is, as most countries in America, an incredibly hierarchical society where... Whiteness is synonymous with beauty and all the good things, so indigenous people are at the bottom of this racial hierarchy. And the hegemonic groups represent indigenous people as something homogenous, static, but this is a way of resistance of these people to show they are diverse, that they’re constantly changing and they’re also interpreting and producing culture.”

[Participant 28, Academic Staff]

Similarly, the artefact of the retablo, a Peruvian-Andean representation, can also be interpreted through this agentic intercultural lens in particular its metaphoric reference to resistance and fluidity:
CHAPTER 6

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There is a need to promote awareness and deepen understanding of the value and relevance of Intercultural Learning among staff via provision of opportunities for staff training and support. Dissemination of the Intercultural Learning 101 Tool through university communication channels such as ‘UCD Teaching and Learning Community’ posts is recommended. The ‘Teaching Across Cultures’ module offered by the UCD Centre for Teaching and Learning is a valuable asset in this regard and support and resources to expand this programme should be considered.

2. Intercultural Learning Champions - There is a need for horizontal integration of intercultural values and learning across existing global, pedagogy and policy platforms in UCD. Intercultural Learning ‘champions’ should be identified within the pillars of Teaching and Learning, UCD Global, Widening Participation and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion to drive this agenda.

3. Intercultural values and principles should be central and visible to curriculum design, development and enhancement projects going forward. For example, intercultural values should be embedded in programme mission statements and programme learning outcomes, and teaching strategies that promote Intercultural Learning should be articulated.

4. Ensure that students from diverse backgrounds are included in curriculum design, development and review processes.

5. Meaningful staff engagement to promote Intercultural Learning opportunities takes time and effort. This should be acknowledged and rewarded/incentivised by embedding recognition for innovations for Intercultural Learning into the Faculty Promotions Framework.

6. Senior university management needs to ensure that Internationalisation policy extends beyond ‘means’ or mechanisms (e.g. increasing international student numbers) to include strategies that achieve the intended ‘results’ by supporting Intercultural Learning strategies as described above.
CHAPTER 7

OUTPUTS AND DISSEMINATION

The outputs relating to this Fellowship Project are outlined below.

RESEARCH OUTPUTS

- Final fellowship report (March 2021)
- Publications
- **Article 1:** Drawing together the ideas of ‘threshold concept’ (Land & Meyer) and ‘threshold experience’ (Killick 2011) as a mechanism to engage with our own reflexive journey through this research project and through our developing understanding of Intercultural Learning. We will use our ORCA framework to locate and navigate a pathway between Intercultural Learning as a threshold concept to Intercultural Learning as a threshold experience.
- **Article 2:** Focus group paper
- Conference contributions

Abstracts will be submitted to the following conferences:
- European Association for International Education (EAIA) Conference Barcelona (2022)
- European Conference on Educational Research - ECER 2022, Armenia

EDUCATIONAL OUTPUTS

- Teaching 101 tool for promoting Intercultural Learning in the classroom and in programmes. (Appendix 4)
- Professional design services will be used to transform the content of the 101 tool to infographic and video formats to facilitate dissemination.

‘POLICY’ OUTPUTS

We consider the key stakeholder ‘conversations’ as a mechanism to raise awareness of this Fellowship Project, deepen intercultural understandings and inform UCD emerging strategy on interculturalism. We have deepened our understanding and clarified our approach to these stakeholder conversations. These are now conceived as a series of ‘critical encounters’. The potential to influence policy development and institutional practice in the area of Intercultural Learning is acknowledged by both the fellows and advisory board and has been emphasised in our findings. A strategy to harness this potential has been in development from the outset and has now crystallised as a series of ‘critical encounters’ with key stakeholders. These encounters have been built into the project as a mechanism to enhance our thinking and fine tune our design and critically, as the work advances, as ‘strategic encounters’ to communicate the main findings and challenge institutional responses to the Project/Fellowship recommendations.

Fellows have to date sought out opportunities to engage with several stakeholders and experts in the field of Teaching and Learning and Internationalisation including:
- Fellowship International Mentor: Prof Sue Robson
- Fellowship Institutional Mentor: Dr Terry Barrett
- International Expert: Dr Elspeth Jones
- UCD Institutional Key stakeholders: UCD Global, Dr Douglas Proctor and Caroline Mangan.

These discussions have been very useful in terms of framing our project relative to literature and current thinking on Internationalisation but also within the UCD specific context.

The remaining critical encounters will now take place over the next 6 months, beginning with a presentation to the UMT Global Engagement Group on June 16th 2021.

DISSEMINATION

To date, we have presented our project at two UCD events as listed below. Both served to raise awareness of the project, and generated interest from attendees in terms of both participation in focus groups and future findings. We will also lead a seminar in May 2021 as part of an Intercultural Learning Symposium hosted by UCD Centre for Teaching and Learning.

- Presentation on Intercultural learning as part of Teaching Across Cultures module (UTL40250); on the University Teaching and Learning Programme, March 2020
Presentation on Intercultural Learning at the UCD Global Insights Seminar in collaboration with UCD Equality, Diversity & Inclusion, called Multiculturalism and the University: Strategies to Develop Intercultural Competencies on Campus, February 2020

Encountering Artefacts Exhibition: this will represent the main element of a UCD Intercultural Learning awareness raising programme. This will include dissemination of the Intercultural Learning 101 tool and Artefact ‘stories’.
REPORT CODING PROCESS

Introduction
The coding process involved creating a coding schema and coding segments from the focus group transcriptions.

The coding process consisted of the following stages:
1. Transcription
2. Generating a series of main tree codes based on in-depth knowledge and familiarity of the FG transcripts.
3. Creating complete coding Schema using MAXQDA

1. Transcription

Transcription was the first step in the coding process. It involved sending the audio recordings from the focus group sessions to Rev.com for transcription. Rev.com is an American based online transcription service that has a quick transcription delivery. Once delivered the research assistant took the Rev.com transcripts to proof and verify. This involved reading the transcripts and listening to the focus group audio recordings for context specific errors such as colloquial expressions and idiomatic phrases. It also involved listening to segments that had been deemed ‘inaudible’ by Rev.com to clarify whether they could be heard and subsequently inserted in the transcript.

The participants were then assigned identifiers, such as ‘Participant 1’. Each focus group was given a number, such as ‘FG 1’, and an identifier based on the make-up of the participant group, such as ‘Graduate Students’, shown in table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FG 1 Graduate Students</td>
<td>Participants 4,5,6,7,8,9,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG 2 Faculty</td>
<td>Participants 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG 3 UG (Undergraduate) Students</td>
<td>Participants 11,12,13,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG 4 UG/Graduate Students and SU (Student Union)</td>
<td>Participants 15,16,17,18,19,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG 5 Faculty &amp; Support Staff</td>
<td>Participants 21,22,23,24,25,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG 6 Faculty &amp; Support Staff</td>
<td>Participants 27,28,29,30,31,32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Focus Group and Participant Identifiers

Time spent engaged in the transcription process allowed for recognition of nuance in the participants’ input and aided in the identification of themes and the creation of the coding schema described in stage 2.

2. Creating Coding Schema

Thoughtful consideration was given to the creation of the coding schema taking into account the literature review, the researchers’ engagement with the project, the focus group sessions, and the engagement and time spent on the focus group transcriptions. Themes were first identified and from them codes were created.
The identification process of codes is described below.

**Code Identification Process**

A shared spreadsheet was used to collaborate on this process. To start, a broad range of major themes and subthemes were identified deductively and inductively. The researchers consulted and interrogated these identified themes. They then clustered subthemes under major themes. Time was then taken to reflect on the major themes and clustered subthemes in order to consider the value of each and if they could be refined. A hierarchy of value of the themes and subthemes was then negotiated and some subthemes were merged or moved to another position. If there was uncertainty as to whether meaning or value might be lost by moving or merging a subtheme, then it was retained and tested as a subcode under the most appropriate major code(s). Eventually a set of 6 themes and 31 subthemes were agreed which were then used directly to create the coding schema. 2 extra codes were also identified inductively at this point for organisational purposes. Each code was given its own colour identifier.

**Deductive Codes**

6 major codes represent the deductively identified themes that were established at the beginning stages of the project. They were identified through the literature review and engagement in the fellowship research process and are outlined below.

**Major Codes**

The ORCA framework had been derived from the literature and was used to generate four major thematic codes. Figure 1 shows the ORCA tree codes, their sub codes and their colour identifiers.

**Major Code 1: Opportunities; Major Code 2: Relatedness / Social Relations; Major Code 3: Competencies; Major Code 4: Agency**

![ORCA Tree Codes](image-url)
Major Code 5: Teaching & Learning is an overarching theme of the fellowship research project and so a major code was generated with the same name. Figure 2 shows the Teaching & Learning tree code, its sub codes and its colour identifier.

![Teaching & Learning Tree Code](image)

Major Code 6: Culture / Interculturalism is an overarching theme of the fellowship research project and so a major code was generated with the same name. Figure 3 shows the Culture / Interculturalism tree code, its sub codes and its colour identifier.

![Culture/Interculturalism Tree Code](image)

Inductive Codes

Inductive codes were identified through themes that emerged in the facilitation and participation in the focus groups and in the transcription process.

All sub-codes were inductively identified and can be seen under their associated major code in Figures 1-3. 31 sub codes were deliberated and agreed upon in the code identification process and they are located across the 6 major codes. They are not narrowly defined, some appear twice and some have multiple names e.g. Sameness/Difference/Diversity. The reason for this is to allow for sub themes to overlap across the major themes and for ideas and opinions of participants to be interpreted in broader ways and nuance captured.

Two extra codes were created inductively for the purpose of specifically tracking participants’ descriptions of their ‘Artefacts’, and ‘Participant Recommendations’ for fostering and progressing intercultural teaching and learning in UCD. They are not major codes nor do they contain sub codes.

The next stage involved using MAXQDA to import all the transcripts, input the coding system and apply the codes to segments of the focus group transcripts.
3. Coding the Focus Group Transcripts using MAXQDA

MAXQDA is a qualitative and mixed methods research software and it was used for this project to code the focus groups transcripts. MAXQDA was used in the following order:

a. The proofed focus group transcripts from stage 1 were imported into the programme.
b. The code system was set up with its colour codes using the coding schema agreed by the researchers in stage 2.
c. The codes were tested by coding one focus group transcript and consulting on the results.
d. All the transcripts were read, sometimes re-listened to, coded and exported for further analysis.

Upon completion of this coding process, the researchers undertook a word search across all focus groups for the terms ‘curious’ and ‘curiosity’. They created an additional code to highlight and understand the participants’ usage of the terms which reappeared across focus groups and emerged as an inductive insight in the process of coding. It is not a major code.

4. Export of Coded Segments

In stage 3 the transcripts were read, re-listened to for clarification and nuance, and then coded. When this process was complete the coded segments were exported as a document and excel spreadsheet for the researchers to read, agree to the coded segment or highlight for further deliberation and subsequently conduct an analysis.
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101 TOOL
Intercultural Teaching & Learning 101 Tool

**Seven reflective questions to help you embed intercultural learning opportunities for your students**
Dr Cliona O’Sullivan and Dr Aideen Quilty
2021

Background

Cultural diversity is the norm rather than the exception in higher education. By leveraging the cultural diversity of our university community, students and staff can share insights and experiences and develop perspectives which will allow them to participate in an increasingly global and interconnected world. There is a need to incorporate an international and intercultural dimension into curricula to ensure that all graduates are equipped with the skills and attributes to participate in an interconnected global world and address global challenges.

Intercultural Learning is about the opportunities and experiences of working with and learning from people across different cultures. This tool is designed for all teachers and tutors in UCD who wish to promote Intercultural Learning opportunities for their students in classes, modules and programmes.

The tool consists of seven reflective questions that may help you to create opportunities for your students to engage in Intercultural Learning. For each of the seven domains, suggestions and examples are given. The examples given will work in a physical teaching environment but also using online learning environments.

This tool is based on research undertaken in University College Dublin as part of Fellowship in Teaching and Academic Development 2019-2021 and review of international literature. Quotes included are data from focus groups conducted as part of this Fellowship and are used to illuminate concepts presented.

1. Orientation/Introduction

Reflective Questions:
Do students get an opportunity to introduce themselves to each other and to you on your module (and you to them)? Do students get the opportunity to interact informally perhaps during orientation at programme level or early in a module?

The first steps in meaningful intercultural dialogue is having the opportunity to tell one’s own story. Students value the opportunity to simply introduce themselves and share their own background story and to hear from their peers. International students valued knowledge of Irish culture, whether this was through formal channels but also knowledge from dialogue and encounters with their peers. Consider ring-fencing time early in the trimester to allow students to introduce themselves to and learn about each other.
“Something like that is nice to help understand, and for students coming in, especially people coming from South Asia, because our culture’s really different. Whatever we do is extremely different from whatever people do here... taking out people for dinner or buying drinks, just the smallest things are very different. With classes like that we understand a lot better about the country that we’re studying in, and then it’s just better overall and to know about other countries also.”

[Participant 16, Student]

“If I have a module, and other people come in for it from somewhere else, if you sprinkle them around and get them to introduce themselves, that then changes the dynamic and improves the whole thing, and even my own students get better.”

[Participant 1, Academic Staff]

“Prepare to know your group... Where are these people coming from? Anticipate how they give into different situations and then also demonstrate your openness... Create and facilitate an environment for other people to share, to come with their own experiences, and to be able to express themselves in the ways that make them feel comfortable.”

[Participant 31, Academic Staff]

2. Group Work

Reflective Questions:
Are there opportunities for students to work in groups on your module/programme? What kind of group work would lend itself to your module and learning outcomes? Are groups diverse in terms of culture, citizenship, gender, age?

Group work is an important vehicle for Intercultural Learning and exchange. Whilst it is important the students are not overburdened with assessment tasks relating to work with different groups, students should be exposed to group work to facilitate development of important intercultural skills. Lecturers/module coordinators should allocate students to groups with attention to mixing gender, cultures, age, citizenship. Group work may involve completion of assessed assignments but may also take other low stakes forms such as: in-class conversations in small groups or pairs, group problem solving or case scenarios, using role play and storytelling. During group work, structure or engineer the exercise to promote intercultural exchange.

“Introduce a lot of group work... Assign certain roles to each member within the group, to ensure that each member is sufficiently contributing to the group’s tasks. Because to a certain extent... one can end up with a black box, where you just see the end product, but you don’t see in terms of the contributions of each member. And, that can have a cultural dimension, in terms of people being left out, or left behind, or not being sufficiently encouraged.”

[Participant 2, Academic Staff]

“The strategy for me is to make this experiential. To make it real so it’s not just an abstract concept but we almost force our students or colleagues to be in the shoes of the other people, to practice empathy. How would it be to be in the shoes of a man, or a woman, a black person, a person with HIV, et cetera? That’s what I do in my classes at the end.”

[Participant 28, Academic Staff]
3. Internationalisation of the Curriculum

Reflective Questions:
Review your supporting material, reading lists, resources - do the writings relate to diverse contexts and cultures? Are the authors from diverse cultural contexts? Are examples that you use set in different cultures and contexts?

It is good, where possible and where relevant, that the curriculum reflects diverse contexts and not confined only to Irish or Western contexts. By doing so students are introduced to different perspectives, systems, and ways of doing. Ensure that reading lists and examples used are rooted in diverse contexts and perspectives.

“How are we looking at our curriculum and actually talking about diversity and inclusion if that’s not really rooted in say, broad subjects... How do you get that different lens in there if everything is stemming from a very Western way of thinking?”
[Participant 8, Student]

“Curriculums all end up looking the same anyway, if you go to do an undergrad, wherever you are, it’s going to be the same faces and writers. ...You know what everyone else knows but we’re just repeating the same type of learning. That’s very un-inclusive.”
[Participant 8, Student]

4. Diversity of Contributors

Reflective Questions:
Is there diversity (gender, ethnicity, race, age, nationality, class) in who contributes to your module or programme? How could you introduce more diversity to the teaching team?

It is common to have multiple internal and external contributors to modules and programmes. Students value different ‘voices’ contributing to a programme to broaden their exposure to different experiences and perspectives. Consider inviting a range of contributors to your module. Contributors may be in a ‘face to face’ context where one is contributing to a session for a specific class or it may take the form of a podcast or e-lecture.

“If you take the travelling community as an example. If there were opportunities to talk to them and understand them... I think people learn better from those kinds of opportunities as opposed to just lectures about it and learning simply what their beliefs are, as opposed to how they feel about it, and how they feel about us and about our beliefs and whatever.”
[Participant 18, Student]

“...the dynamics of the pedagogy could benefit from a more diverse perspective. And that’s perhaps a little hidden within the diversity that we have within the classroom already.”
[Participant 2, Academic Staff]
5. Space For Intercultural Learning

Reflective Question:
Is there [safe] space on your module for conversations, discussions, encounters?

Intercultural Learning takes time and ideally should be threaded through modules and programmes. Conversations, discussions, encounters and storytelling are considered simple but key vehicles for Intercultural Learning. Such interactions may and do occur within and outside the classroom, both as formal and informal learning. Consider creating space within the curriculum for informal interactions such as conversations, discussions, encounters and storytelling. These interactions may be part of the formal curriculum or informal, they may take place in physical or online learning environments.

“More opportunities for conversation in general, because even a conversation like this [Focus Group] we wouldn’t really have an opportunity for through our course. Maybe through other things like VO [UCD Volunteers Overseas], which you learn a lot from. And it’s not like somebody is talking at you as well. You get to figure out yourself how you actually think, because for some people these conversations might be their first experience to talk about different things.”

[Participant 18, Student]

“Giving examples from their own experience, sharing it in a group, and then discussing how people would interpret it. Maybe examples of events or conversations that people thought that they didn’t understand. Like communication was somehow not perfect and they thought that was due to some kind of intercultural misunderstanding. ..That was quite effective and the other people in the group were giving their interpretations, and we discussed case after case.”

[Participant 31, Academic Staff]

6. Using Artefacts To Drive Intercultural Learning

Artefacts are everyday objects and examples may include photographs, items of clothing, social and multimedia imagery, a piece of sculpture or art or any form of writing. Artefacts may be used to help students articulate their experiences and understandings of Intercultural Learning.

Artefacts may be used as an icebreaker to initiate conversation and discussion but also as a powerful tool to give the student control and freedom to speak to issues and experiences relevant to them. Use of artefacts also facilitates movement of power or control of discussion and learning to the student, (rather than the teacher).

“I brought a Nike jacket... A big part of what I would call my cultural identity is rooted in class, and it’s maybe true that different experiences of education I’ve had, it’s not usually encouraged to think of a working class identity as a cultural identity. But I think very much is, and has been suppressed or attempted institutionally to be suppressed at each level. Perhaps not actually in the masters, which was maybe the first time I think that it was actually at the fore of a lot of our learning. But I think going from a primary DEIS school where we had an elocution teacher, and we were told to soften our ‘th’es. And also my parents at home. There was always a huge thing that it would be a shame for people to know first off, that you are working class and for that to be the first thing somebody grasps about you. Similarly when I went to another university. I’d a very small class. It was a new program called visual culture. There was zero contact with class issues whatsoever. I then was so frustrated by this, I wrote my thesis about it, about this tension between feminist art practice and working class identity. I think for me intercultural learning is finding that tension between that identity that maybe is the reason you shouldn’t be in institutional learning or that people have told you that this would be a barrier. Everyone bringing their Nike jackets, whatever they may be, whatever format, they are, that to me is intercultural learning. Everyone can just wear them in, it’d be very recognized, this is who I am, this is part of me. That is intercultural to me.”

[Participant 20, Student]
7. Visibility of Intercultural Learning

Reflective Questions:
Is intercultural learning a goal of your teaching? Is it visible to students, articulated in learning outcomes, assessed?

Students value Intercultural Learning as a mechanism to ensure that as graduates they are equipped for the global workforce. Classroom diversity is not leveraged as much as it could be. There is a need to ensure that the goal of Intercultural Learning is ‘visible’ within the curriculum. The goal of Intercultural Learning should be embedded in programme philosophies and articulated in programme/module learning outcomes. Achievement of intercultural skills can be incorporated into and demonstrated via assessed work, for example reflective essays, log books, engagement with discussion boards.

“What does UCD stand for? What does UCD look at from another viewpoint? You are training the students to be the future workforce of the world. You’re not just an island. Then what are the values that the future workforce should have?”

[Participant 5, Student]

“I don’t think enough of the teaching staff have enough perception of where some people, who are Irish, may be coming from, whether it’s a very rural background or a working-class background. And we just need to be more aware.”

[Participant 30, Academic Staff]

Useful Links


## ARTEFACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTEFACT</th>
<th>Focus Group # (FG)</th>
<th>Participant # (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uzmaa Tree</td>
<td>FG5 P24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image: “a relaxed person”</td>
<td>FG5 P25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>FG5 P22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Grammar Book</td>
<td>FG5 P21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornaments</td>
<td>FG5 P23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA Sock</td>
<td>FG5 P26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissue Paper</td>
<td>FG6 P22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptor</td>
<td>FG6 P29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retable</td>
<td>FG6 P29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infographic</td>
<td>FG6 P27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir</td>
<td>FG6 P30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>FG6 P31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Maker</td>
<td>FG7 P19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Yearbook</td>
<td>FG1 P8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracelet</td>
<td>FG1 P5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souvenir</td>
<td>FG1 P4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saasaa</td>
<td>FG1 P7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Pot</td>
<td>FG2 P1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Clothing</td>
<td>FG2 P3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>FG3 P11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book: Anthony Giddens, Sociology</td>
<td>FG4 P15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugandan Object</td>
<td>FG4 P18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niko Jacket</td>
<td>FG4 P20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>FG4 P19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ZOOM ETIQUETTE GUIDE

Zoom etiquette to be sent to participants with a Zoom link to the Focus Group in advance of the Focus Group session.

- You will receive a link and password to join the Zoom Focus Group session.
- You will first enter a waiting room on Zoom. The host (researcher) will let you in.
- We ask that you have your camera on if possible to engage in face to face dialogue.
- You will be asked to reaffirm your consent in the Zoom space.
- We will encourage one speaker/one voice at a time in Zoom.
- When you are not speaking please use the mute function to prevent sound distortions.

*Breakout rooms will not be used unless in the event of participant distress or anxiety*
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