



McGuire-Snieckus, R. (2015) 'Towards a unified vision and assessment of the multifaceted construct of global citizenship in higher education.' In: Friedman, J., Haverkate, V., Oomen, B., Park, E. and Sklad, M., eds. *Going glocal in higher education: the theory, teaching and measurement of global citizenship*. Middelburg: Drvkkery, pp. 115-124.

Publisher URL: <http://www.de-drvkkery.nl/boeken>

ResearchSPAce

<http://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/>

This version is made available in accordance with publisher policies.
Please cite only the published version using the reference above.

Your access and use of this document is based on your acceptance of the
ResearchSPAce Metadata and Data Policies, as well as applicable law:-

<https://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/policies.html>

Unless you accept the terms of these Policies in full, you do not have permission
to download this document.

This cover sheet may not be removed from the document.

Please scroll down to view the document.

TOWARDS A UNIFIED VISION AND ASSESSMENT OF THE MULTIFACETED CONSTRUCT OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Rebecca McGuire-Snieckus

The term ‘global citizenship’ has gained increasing prominence in higher education discourse over the past decade (Knight, 2013). But what do we mean by ‘global citizens’? What are the core traits that determine global citizenship and how do we determine whether the impact of international initiatives in higher education fosters these identified traits? The aim of this chapter is to explore the multifaceted concept of global citizenship, to provide a critical reflection on the different ways in which global citizenship has been assessed, and to make a call to action for a comprehensive tool that encompasses all relevant global citizen concepts.

During the past thirty years, the international dimension has increasingly become a focus in higher education. Initiatives designed to increase cooperation and exchange in teaching and research during the 1980s helped stimulate an increase in proactive, rather than reactive, approaches to higher education institutional strategies in Europe (de Wit, 2010). While early international initiatives were typically viewed as an ‘add on’ to core strategy in higher education, they are increasingly viewed as central (International Association of Universities, 2003). In 1998, the international dimension was identified as a quality indicator in the World Conference on Higher Education Meeting of Higher Education Partners (WCHE) World Declaration. The declaration emphasized the importance of staff and student mobility and knowledge exchange in teaching and research. Recently, in the United States, 48% of higher educational institutions reported international or global education to be among its top five strategic priorities in 2011, compared to 24% in 2001 (American Council on Education, 2012). A survey of 156 higher education institutions worldwide revealed that 70% of institutions reported an international strategic plan (International Association of Universities, 2003). By 2025 it is expected that the demand for international education will increase to 7.2 million students, from 1.2 million students in 2000 (Knight, 2013).

A new lexicon of terms and associated meanings that describe the international dimension of higher education has emerged, including those that are curriculum focused (intercultural education, global studies, international studies, peace education, multicultural education), mobility focused (academic mobility, education abroad, study abroad), and cross border focused (global education, education across borders, borderless education, transnational education) (de Wit, 2010). Knight (2013) has charted the evolution of international education terminology: from terms used in the last 50 years (international education, international development cooperation, and comparative education); the last 30 years (internationalization, multicultural education and intercultural education); the last 20 years (globalization, borderless education, transnational education); and the last 10 years (glocalisation, knowledge enterprise and global citizenship).

Global citizenship discourse has its roots in ancient Greece, and is underpinned by the central goal of harmony between people in the Polis (de Witt, 2010). It is sometimes linked to the concept of cosmopolitanism, an intellectual and aesthetic position of openness towards people, places and experiences from different countries (Matthews & Sidhu, 2005). However, banal cosmopolitanism—consumption of global travel, food, brands, icons—‘does not necessarily extend to ethical and moral commitments to a global community’ (Matthews &

Sidhu, 2005). Moreover, concerns have been raised about international initiatives in higher education amounting to producing learners as 'intellectual tourists, voyeurs and vagabonds', 'agents of civility and democratic nation builders' or as 'multicultural consumers of ethnic, racial and (inter)national difference' (Roman, 2003; Bannerji, 2000). Thus global citizenship pedagogy tends to center around an understanding of loyalties, memberships, identities, rights, responsibilities, in the context of globalization (Matthews & Sidhu, 2005). The concept of citizenship has circulated in the realm of political science with an emphasis on the political and social ties that bind citizens in pursuit of the collective good (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Rousseau's notion of the social contract is based on the concept of free will, in the context of reciprocal rights and responsibilities (Bertram, 2003). Waltzer (1978) defines citizenship in relation to membership, rights and responsibilities. The UNESCO view of global citizenship education centers on 'the values of tolerance, universality, mutual understanding, respect for cultural diversity and the promotion of a culture of peace ... inspiring action by international organizations, states, civil society and individual citizens' (Pigozzi, 2006).

Nussbaum (2002) notes that the 'liberal arts education' model in colleges and universities should be reformed to equip students with the challenges of global citizenship, including: the Socratic ability to criticize one's own traditions and carry on an argument in terms of mutual respect for reason; the ability to think as a citizen of the world and not just a local region or group; and the 'narrative imagination', or the ability to imagine what it would be like to be in the position of someone very different from oneself. Indeed, liberal arts education can be traced back to ancient Greece as the mark of an educated person and essential to participating in civic life. Here, the role of education was seen to shape good citizens with an understanding of civic duties, rights and responsibilities (Ornstein and Levine, 1985). According to Gacel-Avila (2005), the goal of global citizenship education should be: to foster understanding in students of the interdependence between people and societies; to develop an understanding of their own and other cultures, and respect for pluralism; and to develop global consciousness, including understanding of and receptivity to foreign cultures, and issues of socioeconomic concerns and ecology. Schechter (1993) maintains that global citizenship education should be pragmatic (gaining knowledge and skills for employability in a global context), liberal (intercultural sensibility and capacity for appreciating cultural differences), and civic (with a sense of multidimensional citizenship). McGregor (1999) suggests that global citizenship education should include a civil component (community involvement including learning through participating in the community and community development), a political component (skills in decision making, conflict resolution, public life skills), and a social and moral responsibility component.

While some argue that global citizenship constructs may be too abstract to be meaningfully operationalized (Davies, 2006), there have been several attempts to do so. The assessment tools created reflect different approaches to international initiatives in higher education, whether by 'competencies' (attitudes, skills and knowledge), 'rationale' (defined by intended outcomes), or 'process' (progressive integration of an international perspective) (De Wit, 2002). Roman (2003) suggests that there is a distinction between dominant conceptualizations of global citizenship as being either from 'above' ('national and global competitiveness, efficiency, consumption, and productive citizenship') or 'below' ('values of civic global responsibility, service to community, respect for the environment, and a shared sense of belonging to a common human community across national borders'). It has been suggested that the dominance of 'wanting to travel' and 'wanting to contribute' as main reasons for seeking

cross border student experiences indicates a complex set of motivations that may be interpreted as being both from 'above' (the gaining of cultural capital through the collection of experience abroad) and 'below' (altruism and responsibility to others) (Sin, 2009; Roman, 2003). Many scales focus on constructs relating to global 'competence', 'effectiveness', 'adaptability', 'sensitivity' and 'intelligence'. For instance, Hunter's (2004) model encompasses experiences (effective global participation, collaboration across cultures), skills (identifying difference, ability to assess intercultural performance), knowledge (globalization, world history), and attitudes (non-judgmental, risk taking, openness, and diversity). Der Karabetian (1993) uses Sampson and Smith's (1957) model of 'World Communication Competence' in their assessment. It includes constructs such as general cultural understanding, culture-specific understanding, and positive regard for the other. Arasarthnam's (2009) Intercultural Communication Competence Scale includes cognitive (communication competence complexity), affective (empathy), and behavioral (adapting behaviors or communication, seeking interaction, friendships with people of other cultures) dimensions. Chen and Starosta (2000) focus on the affective aspects of intercultural communication, namely open-mindedness, suspending judgment, self-monitoring, interaction involvement and empathy.

'Multicultural effectiveness' is defined by van der Zee and van Oudenhoven (2000) as: the ability to work well in a new cultural environment; the ability to manage people from other cultures with a sense of wellbeing; and having attitudes such as flexibility, extraversion, open-mindedness, orientation to action, emotional stability, and curiosity or adventurousness. Kelly and Meyers (1992) focus on 'cross cultural adaptability' with dimensions including personal autonomy, emotional resilience, perceptual acuity, and flexibility. The Inter-cultural Adjustment Potential Scale (Matsumoto et al., 2001) assesses psychological skills for intercultural adjustment including empathy, openness, emotion regulation, tolerance for ambiguity, interpersonal security, flexibility, emotional commitment to traditional ways of thinking, and critical thinking.

Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) assess intercultural sensitivity using the ICSI by exploring an individual's ability to modify their behavior in an international context with respect to individualism and collectivism, flexibility in the unfamiliar, and open-mindedness to differences. Preuegger and Rogers (1993) assess cross-cultural sensitivity using the CCSS with constructs including cultural knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and lifestyles. The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) (Hammer et al., 2003) assesses an individual's reactions to cultural difference according to six stages. The first three stages (denial, defense and minimization) are described as 'ethnocentric' (an individual's own culture is experienced as central to reality) whereas the last three stages (acceptance, adaptation and integration) are described as 'ethnorelative' (an individual's culture is experienced in the context of other cultures).

Gudykunst, Wiseman and Hammer (1998) assess cross-cultural attitudes, including dimensions that are affective (ethnocentrism), cognitive (stereotypes) and conative (social distance). Ang et al. (2011) assess cultural intelligence with the use of dimensions that are metacognitive (how cultural knowledge and understanding are acquired), cognitive (general knowledge about culture), motivational (energy applied to learn and function in cross-cultural situations by magnitude), and behavioral (when interacting with people from other cultures, the ability to act appropriately).

Other scales focus on concepts such as 'responsibility' and 'justice' and may or may not include competencies. For instance, the Global Responsibility Scale (Starrett, 1996) includes

dimensions of global social obligation, responsibility for people, and social conservatism. The Global Beliefs in a Just World Scale (Lipkus, 1991) assesses constructs such as interpersonal justice, social political justice and cynicism/fatalism. Shultz et al. (2008) incorporate four domains into their assessment, namely: civic principles, civic participation, civic identities, and civic society and systems. Morais and Ogden (2011) assess global citizenship according to social responsibility (altruism, disparities and global justice, empathy and altruism, personal responsibility and global interconnectedness), global civic engagement (global civic activism, political voice, involvement in civic organizations), and global competence (intercultural communication, self-awareness, global knowledge). The Global Perspective Inventory (Braskamp et al. 2014) assesses interpersonal (social interaction and social knowledge), intrapersonal (affect and identity), and cognitive (knowledge and knowing) dimensions. Across different assessments there is much conceptual overlap and divergence, even among constructs that on the surface appear to overlap. For instance, ‘empathy’ is conceptualized as a ‘social responsibility’ (Morais & Ogden, 2011), an affective dimension of communication competence (Arasaratnam, 2009; Chen & Starosta, 2000), and a psychological skill for intercultural adjustment (Matsumoto et al., 2001).

Suggested and actual uses for assessments designed to measure global citizenship constructs include program development (Morais & Ogden, 2011; Hunter, 2004; Sperandio et al., 2010), program evaluation (Glover et al., 2011; Hett, 1993), assessing impact of abroad experiences (Morais & Ogden, 2011; Tarrant et al., 2013; Matsumoto et al., 2004), measuring international student adjustment (Braskamp et al., 2008; Shultz et al., 2008), comparison of populations (Hett, 1993; Goldstein & Smith, 1999; Bhawuk, 1998), identification of correlates of GC (Lipkus, 1991; Starrett, 1996; Bush et al., 2001; Arasaratnam and Banerjee, 2011; Arasaratnam, 2009; Ang et al., 2007) and as predictive tools (Reysen et al., 2013; Ang et al., 2011; Ward et al., 2011; Reuben, 1976; van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2003; Suanet & van der Vijver, 2009).

Most global citizenship constructs are assessed using self-reporting instruments that maintain some inherent limitations. Social desirability—the tendency to rate oneself according to socially approved behavior—is a longstanding concern with self-assessment tools (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). There is also much evidence to demonstrate discrepancies between self-evaluations and evaluations made by others (Brown & Knight, 2002). Moreover, self-assessments are based on the assumption that responses reveal preexisting states of mind, rather than ones generated by the questions themselves. Might the cognitions actually be created by completing the questionnaire (Ogden, 2012)? When asking an individual to locate themselves on a Likert-type scale for a given concept, one must consider the extent to which such reality is framed. Are assessors constructing an aspect of an individual’s self-concept that may or may not have existed before the assessment? Indeed, some researchers have revealed how the framing of questions can be used to manipulate thoughts and feelings—particularly if the behavior being assessed is unfamiliar—though research suggests that even a focus on familiar behavior can create a shift in cognitive set (Wenzlaff & Wegner, 2000; Ogden, 2012). Moreover, completing a questionnaire can also change a person’s subsequent behavior (Ogden, 2012). Do individuals have insight into constructs that they are being asked to self-evaluate? Are individuals really able to differentiate their thoughts, feelings or behaviors to the level of detail required by numerical scales (on scale from 1-7, for instance) (Ogden, 2012)?

Notwithstanding limitations of the self-assessment methods, they do give individuals the opportunity to report their own experience. As higher education institutions increasingly value

the international dimension as a quality indicator and strategic priority (American Council on Education, 2012; International Association of Universities, 2003) assessments of such initiatives gain importance. At the same time there is the recognition of the limitations of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) of internationalization, such as percentages of incoming or outgoing students for benchmarking purposes, and that sustainable process should take into account qualitative aspects within the context of the institution's own goals and capacities (Gruenewald, 2014). If higher education institutions hope to produce global citizens by encouraging an international dimension, it could be argued that a comprehensive assessment of global citizenship would provide insight into the particular benefits of such initiatives to the students. A comprehensive scale that incorporates all relevant constructs of global citizenship, including those captured by pre-existing assessments, as well as those that have not been operationalized by assessment tool is needed. An all-encompassing assessment of the multifaceted construct of global citizenship could be used for the purpose of program development and evaluation, comparison of populations, and impact assessment of international initiatives.

References

- Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 290-305.
- American Council on Education. (2012). *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses*. Washington: Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Ling Tan, M. (2011). Cultural intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg, S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook on Intelligence* (pp. 582-602). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization review*, 3(3), 335-371.
- Arasaratnam, L. (2009). The development of a new instrument of intercultural communication competence. *Journal of Intercultural Communication* 20, 1-11.
- Arasaratnam, L., & Banerjee, C. (2011). Sensation seeking and intercultural communication competence: A model test. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(2), 226-233.
- Banerji, H. (2000). *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism, and Gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Bennett, J. M. (1993). Cultural marginality: Identity issues in intercultural training. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, (pp. 109-136). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bertram, C. (2003). *Rousseau and the Social Contract*. Routledge.
- Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. W. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 413-436.
- Bhawuk, D. (1998). The Role of Culture Theory in Cross-Cultural Training A Multimethod Study of Culture-Specific, Culture-General, and Culture Theory-Based Assimilators. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29(5), 630-655.

- Braskamp, L., Braskamp, D, Merrill, K., & Engberg, M. (2008). *Global Perspective Inventory (GPI): Its purpose, construction, potential uses, and psychometric characteristics*. Chicago: Global Perspective Institute Inc. Retrieved from <https://gpi.central.edu/supportDocs/manual.pdf>
- Brooks, J., & Normore, A. (2010). Educational leadership and globalization: Literacy for a glocal perspective. *Educational Policy*, 24(1), 52-82.
- Brown, S., & Knight, S. (2002). *Assessing Learners in Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Bush, V. (2001). Managing culturally diverse buyer-seller relationships: the role of intercultural disposition and adaptive selling in developing intercultural communication competence. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29(4), 391-404.
- Carter, C. (2004). Education for Peace in Northern Ireland and the USA. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 32(1), 24-38.
- Chen, G., & Starosta, W. (2000). The development and validation of the intercultural sensitivity scale. *Human Communication*, 3, 1-15.
- Collier, M. (1989). Cultural and intercultural communication competence: Current approaches and directions for future research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13(3), 287-302.
- Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review*, 58(1), 5-25.
- Der-Karabetian, A., Metzger, J. (1993). The cross-cultural world-mindedness scale and political party affiliation, *Psychological Reports*, 72(3), 1069-1070.
- De Wit, H. (2010). *Internationalisation of higher education in Europe and its assessment, trends and issues*. The Hague: Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie (Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders)-NVAO. Retrieved from: http://nvaio.com/page/downloads/Internationalisation_of_Higher_Education_in_Europe_DEF_december_2010.pdf
- De Wit, H. 2002. *Internationalisation of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis*. Greenwood Press.
- Dunlap, R., & Van Liere, K. (1978). The new environmental paradigm. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 9(4), 10-19.
- Gacel-Avila, J. (2005). The internationalisation of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9, 121-136.
- Glover, A., Peters, K., & Haslett, S. (2011). Education for sustainable development and global citizenship: An evaluation of the validity of the STAUNCH auditing tool. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 12(2), 125-144.
- Goldstein, D., & Smith, D. (1999). The analysis of the effects of experiential training on Sojourners cross-cultural adaptability. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(1), 157-173.
- Gruenewald, H. (2014). Education and Internationalisation. *Perspectives of Innovations, Economics and Business*, 14(1), 28-33.
- Hammer, M., Bennett, M., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 421-443.
- Hett, E. (1993). The development of an instrument to measure global-mindedness. Dissertation: University of San Diego.

- Hunter, B., White, G., & Godbey, G. (2006). What does it mean to be globally competent? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 267-285.
- The International Association of Universities. (2003). *Internationalisation of Higher Education: Trends and Developments since 1998*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Meeting of Higher Education Partners, Paris. Accessed from: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001455/145505e.pdf>
- Kelley, C., & Meyers, J. (1993). *The Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory*. Minneapolis: National Computer Systems.
- Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalisation – for better or worse? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 17(3), 84-90.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalisation remodelled: Definitions, rationales and approaches. *Journal for Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Knight J. (1997) Internationalization of Higher Education: A conceptual framework, in Knight J., De Wit H. (Eds) *Internationalization of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries*, pp. 5–19. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Lipkus, I. (1991). The construction and preliminary validation of a global belief in a just world scale and the exploratory analysis of the multidimensional belief in a just world scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12(11), 1171-1178.
- Lyons, K. (2012). Gap year volunteer tourism: myths of global citizenship? *Annals of Tourism Research*. 39(1), 361-378.
- Matsumoto, D. (2001). Development and validation of a measure of intercultural adjustment potential in Japanese sojourners: The Intercultural Adjustment Potential Scale (ICAPS). *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25(5), 483-510.
- Matthews, J., & Sidhu, R. (2005). Desperately seeking the global subject: International education, citizenship and cosmopolitanism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 3(1), 49-66.
- McGregor, S. (1999). Towards a rationale for integrating consumer and citizenship education. *Journal Consumer Studies and Home Economics*, 23(4), 207-11.
- Morais, D., & Ogden, A. (2011). Initial development and validation of the global citizenship scale, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 15(5), 445-466.
- Nunnally, J. & Bernstein, I. (1992). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nussbaum, M. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21, 289-303.
- Ogden, J. (2003). Some problems with social cognition models: a pragmatic and conceptual analysis. *Health Psychology*, 22(4), 424.
- Ogden, J. (2012). *Health Psychology*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Ornstein, A., & Levine, D. (1985). *An Introduction to the Foundations of Education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Peterson, R., & Seligman, M. (2004). *Character Strengths and Virtues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pigozzi, M. (2006). A UNESCO view of global citizenship education. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 1-4.
- Pruegger, V., & Rogers, T. (1993). Development of a scale to measure cross- cultural sensitivity in the Canadian context. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 25(4), 615-621.
- Rapoport, A. (2009). A forgotten concept: Global citizenship education and state social studies standards. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 33(1), 81-112.

- Reysen, S., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2013). A model of global citizenship: Antecedents and outcomes. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(5), 858-870.
- Rizvi, F. (2007). Postcolonialism and globalization in education. *Cultural Studies: Critical Methodologies*, 7(3), 256-263.
- Roman, L. (2003). Education and the Contested Meanings of 'Global Citizenship'. *Journal of Educational Change*, 4(3), 269-293.
- Ruben, B., & Kealey, D. (1979). Behavioral assessment of communication competency and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 3(1), 15-47.
- Rutkowski, D., & Engel, L. (2010). Soft power and hard measures: Large-scale assessment, citizenship and the European Union. *European Educational Research Journal*, 9(3), 381-395.
- Sampson, D., & Smith, H. (1957). A scale to measure world-minded attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 99-106.
- Schechter, M. (1993). Internationalising the university and building bridges across disciplines. In T. Cavusgil (Ed.). *Internationalising Business Education: Meeting the Challenge* (pp. 137). Michigan: Michigan State Press.
- Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Losito, L., & Kerr, D. (2008). *International Civic and Citizenship Education Study: Assessment Framework*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. Accessed from: http://iccs.acer.edu.au/uploads/File/Reports/ICCS_10_Initial_Findings.pdf
- Sin, H. (2009). Volunteer tourism: 'Involve me and I will learn?' *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 480-501.
- Sperandio, J., Grudzinski-Hall, M., & Stewart-Gambino, H. (2010). Developing an Undergraduate Global Citizenship Program: Challenges of Definition and Assessment. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22(1), 12-22.
- Starrett, R. (1996). Assessment of global social responsibility. *Psychological Reports*, 78(2), 535-554.
- Suanet, I., & Van de Vijver, F. (2009). Perceived cultural distance and acculturation among exchange students in Russia. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 19(3), 182-197.
- Tarrant, M., Rubin, D., & Stoner, D. (2014). The Added Value of Study Abroad Fostering a Global Citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18(2): 141-161.
- Teichler, U. (2014). The changing debate on internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*, 48(1), 5-26.
- Van Der Zee, K., & Van Oudenhoven, J. (2000). The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire: A multidimensional instrument of multicultural effectiveness. *European Journal of Personality*, 14(4), 291-309.
- Ward, C., Wilson, J., & Fischer, R. (2011). Assessing the predictive validity of cultural intelligence over time. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(2), 138-142.
- Waltzer, E., & Waltzer, E. (1978). *Equity: Theory and Research*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.