Challenges of Teaching Business and Economics in English: The "Third-Country" Professors Perspective

Chris J. Czerkawski and Vagelis Dedoussis*

(Received on February 27, 2003)

I. Introduction

Tertiary education is increasingly marked by two striking developments. One, the influence and rapid spread of the US model of higher education, exemplified by the establishment of US and US-like colleges and universities in many non-English speaking parts of the world including several European countries traditionally known for a rather frosty attitude towards what is perceived as US "cultural imperialism". The second development is the ascendancy of English to the lingua franca of our times and its rapidly increasing use as the medium of instruction especially at the graduate, but also undergraduate, levels from universities in Western Europe to the former Soviet republics, to the Middle East, South East Asia and Japan. As a result of these two developments many thousands of students are taught in English in countries where English is used as second or even foreign language. These students, as well as their professors, are facing several challenges in the context of the internationalization of the English language and the US model of higher education. One only needs to think of the, not so rare nowadays, case when both professors and students use English as foreign language or when a third-country professor (i.e. neither a US native nor a local) interacts through the medium of English with local students in the country where a US university is established to appreciate the magnitude of the challenges.

For over two decades we have taught business disciplines at five universities in Japan, Australia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, and Lebanon; English, originally acquired as foreign language but increasingly used as our second and even first language, is the medium used to teach. The university in Lebanon is a US university, the one in Saudi Arabia is a US-styled university, while the remaining three universities in Singapore, Australia, and Japan, follow, to a lesser or greater extent, the US model. In all universities English is the official medium of

---

    Assistant Professor
 * Ameican University, Beirut

instruction; the sole exception is Waseda as English is typically restricted to a few classes given by foreign professors. In our career we have taught native English speaking students in Australia, students using English as their first or second language in Singapore and Lebanon, and students for whom English is a foreign language in Japan and Saudi Arabia. Our case is by no means unique, as over the years we have worked with numerous non-native English-speaking colleagues teaching disciplines to native English speakers and/or students using English as their second language or foreign language. In a number of US-chartered universities operating in Eastern Europe and Central Asia most faculty teaching disciplines are non-native English speakers, although many have spent several years in the US.

Our own experiences and observations as well as the input provided by former and present colleagues have persuaded us that non-native English speaking professors teaching disciplines to native English speakers, or students using English as second or foreign language, face more challenges compared with native English speaking colleagues teaching the same audience. Accordingly, the focus of the present paper is on the challenges foreign professors (i.e. non-native English speakers) face while teaching a foreign (i.e. non-native English speaking) student body. The discussion will be informed by reference to organizational culture and sub-cultures, as well as to national culture, and differences in the maturity level of students. The paper suggests that all sections of the university community need to be aware of and appreciate the benefits that diversity of faculty backgrounds can bring to tertiary education. Carrying out their duties foreign professors face several challenges; should universities recognize and deal with such challenges in a proactive and systematic manner, a fuller and more effective utilization of the skills and expertise of foreign faculty with beneficial effects on the wider academic community may be expected. Such an expectation is in line with modern management thinking suggesting that in a knowledge-based environment (and universities provide a prime example of such an environment) diversity of employee capabilities, experience, and perspectives, can be an important organizational asset.

II. The impact of culture on learning and teaching

This part of the paper discusses universal challenges confronting native and non-native English speaking professors alike who teach outside their home country; such challenges may be expected to emerge when diverse cultures interact with one another and have significant implications for the role of professors, student expectations, and learning-teaching effectiveness.

1 *Cultural specificity of learning and teaching*

"Learning" and "learner-focused teaching" have, over recent years, increasingly come to be seen as the ideal to strive for in tertiary education rather than the more traditional "teaching" successive generations of university professors were content to associate their role with (Johnson and Johnson, 1994; Lowman, 1995; Meyers, Chet, and Jones, 1993; Donovan, Bransford, and Pellegrino, 1999). However, "learning" and "teaching focusing on learner's" needs may not be equally appropriate for everyone; this approach is easier accepted by students in some countries than their counterparts elsewhere. Australian students, for example, welcome and often anticipate teaching focusing on their own needs as learners. This may reflect the influence of strong egalitarianism and high individualism, two notable features of Australian society; Australia has been given the second highest ranking internationally for individualistic values (Hofstede, 1991). By contrast, the professor is expected to impart knowledge and "teach" in the traditional sense of the world by students in Japan, Singapore, and Saudi Arabia. The expectations of Japanese and Singaporean students are probably due to the influence that collectivism, and respect for order, authority, knowledge, and age have exercised upon the respective societies; thus, one may suggest that students in Japan and Singapore are socially conditioned to view their professor primarily as "teacher". Regarding Saudi students, respect for, and expectation of, the professor as "teacher" may, at least partly, reflect values endorsing the unequal distribution of power in their own society.

Beneficial as recent literature (Donovan, Bransford, and Pellegrinio, 1999) suggests it is, the move towards learning and learner-focused teaching may, however, require the redefinition of the role of the professor from that of a "teacher" and "authority" to that of a "facilitator" in a group of learners (in our opinion, professors too are learners). The task of redefining the professor's role is not without problems as expectations among students differ. For example, in an Australia university the professor is expected to be friendly and approachable, treat students with respect and as equals, and consider their ideas seriously; further, the professor should demonstrate confidence in student abilities and encourage them to perform at their highest level by setting challenging goals, and emphasize excellence. Looking at the professor as leader in the classroom (Kinicki and Schriesheim, 1978), it may be suggested that Australian students expect a supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership style (Rodrigues, 1990) from their professor. On the other hand, Japanese and Saudi students expect the professor to provide guidance on what should be done and how, maintain standards of performance, and schedule work; in other words, a directive leadership style modified by

elements of supportive and, partly, participative leadership (Hofstede and Bond, 1988) is what Japanese students expect from their professor while their Saudi counterparts expect a predominantly directive and supportive leadership.

With the possible exception of students coming from a limited number of internationally-oriented high schools, Lebanese university students appear to have been conditioned to feel content with the role of the passive listener for themselves while looking to the professor as the fountain of knowledge, part of which (as much as it can help them do well in exams but no more, we may add) they expect to be imparted to them. Thus, students expect the professor to tell them precisely what to do and how, often demanding to know whether parts of a chapter or even of a certain page are included in an exam. Interestingly though, such attitudes were changed when we decided to exercise supportive, achievement-oriented, and participative leadership, the inevitable baggage of influences we had been subjected to while teaching in Australian universities, while cutting down on directive leadership eagerly expected by Lebanese students. We were pleased to note that students, especially in senior and graduate courses, responded positively to this shift in expected leadership styles. Thus, culture, though a crucial influence in learning and teaching activities, may actually prove less of a stumbling block if, aiming at student behavior modification, the professor is prepared to work around it. However, for such an attempt to be successful students' trust must first be gained and they must also see tangible benefits from the alternative style of leadership exercised upon them.

The style of leadership students expect from their professors in the business schools we have taught is summarized in table 1.

Table 1. Expected professor's leadership style in five business schools

Business school in:	Leadership style expected
Japan	Directive, supportive, participative.
Singapore	Directive, supportive.
Australia	Supportive, participative, achievement-oriented.
Saudi Arabia	Directive, supportive.
Lebanon	Directive, supportive. (*)

(*). Students in Lebanon have responded positively and worked well under a mix of participative, achievement-oriented, and supportive leadership styles although socially conditioned to expect a directive and supportive leadership style from professors.

2   *What students expect from professors is shaped by their own maturity*

Our understanding of maturity refers to the combination of:

a.   <u>Intelligence</u> that is, the capacity for constructive thinking, reasoning, and problem solving.   Intelligence includes mental abilities, such as verbal comprehension, word fluency, numerical, spatial, memory, perceptual speed, and inductive reasoning (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2001), and

b.   <u>Emotional intelligence</u>.   A new concept that has created a stir in management and organizational behavior literature, emotional intelligence includes abilities to motivate oneself, persist in the face of frustrations while maintaining hope, regulate one's moods, and keep distress from swamping the ability to think (Goleman, 1995).

In general, freshman and sophomore-level students tend to be less mature compared to their senior-level counterparts as well as to graduate students.   Thus, students in the early part of university life look upon the professor as the ultimate source of discipline-related knowledge and wisdom; not surprisingly, expectation these students have from professors do not, in most cases, go far beyond the transfer of bits of information related to the discipline they study and, occasionally, wisdom.   On the other hand, more mature senior-level and graduate students tend to expect the professor to act as their companion in the learning process and guide in the search for knowledge.   However, this generalized picture of students' expectations is conditioned by the socio-cultural environment of their home country.   We have not administered an IQ (intelligence) or EQ (emotional intelligence) test to students we have taught but, based on our own experience and the opinions of many former and current colleagues, we would judge Australian students to be the most mature, especially with respect to emotional intelligence, while we would nor rank far behind them students in Japan and Singapore.   Lebanese students may not be as mature as their Australian or Japanese counterparts but they are more mature than Saudi students.

Cross-country differences in student maturity as outlined above but also inevitable differences in the maturity level of students in the same country present a dilemma to professors.   That is, in order to be effective in the eyes of students and, importantly, have the (perceived) effectiveness reflected in a favorable student evaluation survey (which, although eventually may carry little weight only in decisions made by the university administration regarding a professor's career, it nevertheless tends to disproportionately worry faculty) a pro-

fessor may, often, be forced to play two, not always compatible, roles that is, that of the provider of discipline-related information and knowledge, but also that of the guide to information and knowledge. While, one could well argue that the latter role is more appropriate and important to university learning and teaching, especially in the case of senior-level and graduate courses, constraints such as the maturity level of students, their expectations regarding the professor's role, and the broader socio-cultural context of a particular country, require some hard, and not always welcome by students, decisions on the part of professors with respect to the role(s) they need to play.

3   Organizational culture impacts upon the learning-teaching process and the role of the professor

The organizational culture of a university, as well as sub-cultures of its various units such as schools or departments, may have an even greater impact upon learning-teaching and the role of the professor than societal culture discussed earlier. Normally, one may expect that the organizational culture of a university reflects, at least partly, the cultural values of the country where the university is established. However, quite often sub-cultures of university units differ from each other as well as from that country's culture; for example the sub-culture of a law school is typically different from the sub-culture of a medical school or a philosophy department while, in turn, one or both sub-cultures may be different from that country's culture. The main values defining the culture profile of the five business schools are presented in table 2. The culture profile of an organization can be defined in terms of over fifty values (O'Reilly III, Chatman, and Caldwell, 1991; Sheridan, 1992); however, in order to facilitate comparisons between the schools, the ten most important values, not ranked in a particular order of importance, defining each school are only presented in the table. Although the culture profiles in table 2 refer to business schools that is, university sub-units, they may or may not define the university as a single organization as well. For example, formality and being rule-oriented, two of the values featuring in the culture profile of the business school in Lebanon are also values defining the profile of the university (AUB) as a single entity. On the other hand, two other values of the business school namely, being innovative and taking initiative, are more specific to the school itself as they are not widely shared by other units or the university as a whole.

A few examples from the five business schools can help illustrate how cultural values reinforce each other and impact upon the learning-teaching process and the role of

Table 2. Culture profile of five business schools

B-school in:	Main values of culture of business faculties/schools
Japan	Formality, stability, predictability, being rule-oriented, security of employment, attention to detail, low level of conflict, team orientation, being supportive, tolerance.
Singapore	Formality, predictability, being aggressive, risk taking, being rule-oriented, taking individual responsibility, low level of conflict, working long hours, being results-oriented, being highly organized.
Australia	Flexibility, informality, being easygoing, being innovative, being aggressive, taking initiative, autonomy, taking individual responsibility, security of employment, high level of conflict.
Saudi Arabia	Informality, stability, predictability, being easygoing, being careful, being rule-oriented, security of employment, low level of conflict, being team-oriented, emphasizing a *single* organizational culture.
Lebanon	Formality, stability, predictability, being innovative, taking initiative, being demanding, being rule-oriented, working long hours, an emphasis on quality, being results-oriented.

Source: Adapted from C. A. O'Reilly III, J. A. Chatman, and D. F. Caldwell. "People and organizational culture: A profile of comparison approach to assessing the person-organization fit". *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 1991, p. 516.

professors.   At the business school in Griffith University in Australia, defined by values of flexibility, autonomy, individual initiative and responsibility, and security of employment as shown in table 2, professors enjoy a great deal of freedom in selecting textbooks and other course material, deciding modes of delivery, type and weight of assessment items for a course, and designing new courses; in short, professors, by virtue of their expert (and rarely challenged) power, play a leading role in the learning-teaching process while the role of the administration is confined to assisting faculty carry out their duties.   The professor's role may, often, be determined primarily by a single value than a combination of several values; this is the case of the business school at Waseda University in Japan where professors' unquestionable freedom reflects the impact of security of employment (in no other country we are familiar with do academics enjoy more secure employment than in Japan).   At the business school in Singapore, predictability, formality, being rule-oriented, and avoidance of conflict, turn professors into followers of rigid rules set by the university administration.   Strict adherence to minute bureaucratic rules severely restricting professors' freedom is also true of the business school at KFUPM in Saudi Arabia; this appears to have been the major reason behind the deci-

sion of several US former colleagues to resign rather than witness what they considered profes-sors' prerogatives being eroded by bureaucratic rules.

The general type of organizational culture, normative beliefs, and the role(s) of professor, shown in table 3, help to construct a more complete profile of the five business schools. The classification of organizational culture into constructive, passive-defensive, and aggressive-defensive is based on Cooke and Szumal (1993). Normative beliefs, defining each type of culture, are an individual's thoughts and beliefs about how members of an organization are expected to approach their work and interact with others (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2001). The example of the business school in Lebanon can help understand table 3. The school, as previ-ously discussed, is defined by values of formality, stability, predictability, and being rule-oriented; thus, the school has a passive-defensive type of culture, that is a culture reinforcing conventional normative beliefs found in bureaucratic, conservative, and traditional institutions (the university as a single entity also appears to be defined by the same values). At the same time, however, the culture profile of the business school is also defined by values of innova-tion, initiative, emphasis on quality and results; thus, the school shares features of a construc-tive culture that reinforces normative beliefs of achievement. In our opinion, the school's

Table 3. Organizational culture, normative beliefs, and professor's role in five business schools

B-school in:	General type of organizational culture	Normative beliefs	Role of professor
Japan	Constructive	Humanistic-encouraging, Affiliative	Helpful and approachable "teacher". "Master" of the course.
Singapore	Passive-Defensive	Approval, Conventional, Dependent	Helpful and approachable "teacher". Follower of administrative rules.
Australia	Constructive	Achievement, Self-actualizing, Humanistic-encouraging	"Facilitator". "Innovator". "Master" of the course.
Saudi Arabia	Passive-Defensive	Approval, Conventional, Dependent	Helpful and approachable "teacher". Follower of administrative rules.
Lebanon	Constructive/Passive-Defensive	Approval, Conventional, Achievement	Follower of administrative rules.

(and university's) passive-defensive culture reflects indigenous, and also French, colonial cultural influences, while its constructive organizational culture mirrors the infusion of US culture.

The remaining business schools fall more neatly into distinct types of organizational culture. The business schools at Griffith university in Australia, and at Waseda university in Japan provide examples of a constructive organizational culture endorsing, to varying degrees, humanistic-encouraging, affiliative, achievement, and self-actualizing normative beliefs. On the other hand, both the Saudi business school at KFUPM and the business school in Singapore fall into the passive-defensive organizational type of culture reinforcing normative beliefs associated with approval, conventional, dependent, and avoidance.

III. Foreign professors: In a predicament

On top of the universal challenges native as well as non-native English speaking professors face when teaching abroad that were discussed above, professors whose mother tongue is not English face several challenges specific to them; such challenges are the focus of this part of the paper.

An audience whose mother tongue is not English tends to associate native English speaking professors with mastery of the medium of instruction. Thus, foreign students, who aim to improve their own comprehension and speaking skills, look forward to a close interaction with native English speaking professors in addition to the parting of knowledge related to the subject taught. On the other hand, to be perceived by students as offering them the same value, with respect to language fluency, as a native English-speaking colleague, a foreign professor would need to demonstrate mother tongue English language proficiency. This is especially true in places where students do not have many opportunities to practice their English skills. For instance, students in the university in Japan where English is often used as the medium of instruction, would prefer to register in the class of a native English professor rather than the same class offered by an equally qualified, knowledgeable, and capable foreign colleague. By hoping to improve language skills in addition to acquiring knowledge, Japanese students' preference for the native speaker aims at the maximization of their own benefit.

Foreign students who nevertheless have a very good command of English may focus more on picking possible language shortcomings of their foreign professor, such as a thick accent or

grammatical errors, rather than the professor's mastery of the discipline and knowledge of the subject. It goes without saying that students whose mother tongue is English would have little difficulty picking up errors committed by foreign professors, for instance incorrect use of words or syntactical errors. Should the distinction between language proficiency on the one hand, and competency in the discipline and knowledge of the subject on the one hand, become unintentionally or otherwise, confused by students, they may start developing a kind of a superiority complex vis-à-vis their foreign professor. In this event, the status of the professor slowly but steadily diminishes in the eyes of students leading, sometimes, to students attempting to gain the upper hand over professors and even to bully them. Easier to become afflicted by this type of situation are younger non-native English speaking professors in the early stages of their career, whose self-confidence regarding their own teaching capabilities is still developing.

In the event that language skills of self-conscious non-native English speaking foreign faculty (even if these skills are marginally only different from the skills of native English speaking colleagues) become the focus of attention and the yardstick upon which their teaching performance is judged by students, foreign faculty may develop feelings of insecurity, become withdrawn and passive, and likely to be easily manipulated by students; this may be the case if the foreign professor teaches a native English speaking student audience. If the foreign professor has received degree(s) outside the US this unfavorable situation may be further aggravated as widely held perceptions about the superiority of the US model of higher education and degrees awarded by US universities, may reinforce students unfavorable perceptions about foreign professors. As a result, foreign professors may experience low self-efficacy leading to low commitment, weak aspirations, and an unwarranted focus on minor language deficiencies.

A peculiar and specific challenge is faced by "third-country" professors, that is professors teaching outside their own home country in a university located in an English speaking country or in a university in a non-English speaking country but where English is the medium of instruction; this may be the case of a Polish professor teaching in Singapore, a Greek teaching in an American university in Lebanon, or an Indian teaching in an Australian university. As in such cases, aspects of the third-country professor's English proficiency such as accent or vocabulary, are likely to differ from those of a US native (naturally, a US accent is considered *the* accent in US universities abroad and in US-styled universities) as well as from those of the third-country professor's local colleagues, they may become the focus of attention of and the subject of negative comments and derision by students. This can be understood considering

that, in the ears of students, the third-country professor's use of the language and accent are, neither the "right" ones, that is the use of English and accent of a US native, nor the "accepted" ones, that is the use of the language and accent of local colleagues. The experience of many colleagues and our own suggests that students show little sympathy and toleration for an accent falling outside the boundaries defined by what they expect and believe is "correct", and what they are familiar and comfortable with. Understandably perhaps we, third-country professors for the most part of our career, have been the subject of student comments and criticism regarding our accent; however, we feel comforted knowing that we are in good company as the accent of Welsh and Irish former colleagues, also third-country professors, was often evaluated by Australian students as anything ranging from "funny" to "strong" to "difficult"!

Professors whose mother tongue is not English but who teach English-speaking students face several challenges specific to them; as a result, these professors are at a disadvantage vis-à-vis their native English-speaking colleagues. Third-country professors, an increasingly common phenomenon in the context of a globalized tertiary education, are in a particularly vulnerable position. This calls for looking into issues of diversity and how universities deal with it.

IV.   From ignoring diversity to accommodating it

Upholding the US model of tertiary education, understanding and, preferably, accepting and espousing American cultural values, are essential requirements facilitating the integration of foreign professors into US universities abroad. Furthermore, foreign professors should be prepared to teach, learn, and view the world through US eyes (textbooks used in US universities abroad are almost invariably written by US scholars with US students in mind). In general, the above are also true in the case of US-styled and English-speaking universities in countries heavily influenced by American culture such as Singapore. Accepting US values and adopting a US-centered perspective for looking at the world may be a very challenging part of their job for those foreign professors who, while employed at US or US-styled universities abroad, have limited or no exposure to American cultural values. Third-country professors face an even greater challenge considering that US universities abroad are not pure transplants of the US model but their establishment and operations are influenced by local conditions, customs, norms and values; thus, these universities tend to acquire a complex and peculiar "localized American" identity, often difficult for third-country professors to understand and even

more difficult to reconcile with their own perceptions of what a US university should look like.

One might have reasonably expected that issues of diversity would have received adequate attention at US universities abroad in the light of the mixed "local-American" identity of these universities. To be fair, US universities abroad appear to have been successful in blending with local values, norms, and customs, thus presenting the image of a local citizen while preserving their original (i.e. US) identity; in short, US universities have ostensibly dealt with diversity as it relates to two identities. On the other hand, however, there is still some way US universities abroad need to go before a claim can be made that issues of diversity have been dealt with in a comprehensive manner. Two examples, one referring to faculty recruitment, and the other to student admission can offer some insights. Rare exceptions notwithstanding, faculty are recruited from among US academics or from local professors who have earned terminal degrees from universities in the US., the latter typically accounting for most positions. The strategy on student admission appears to target local or restricted regional markets. For instance, although AUB's student population is drawn from over sixty countries, the bulk of both undergraduate and graduate students come from Lebanon and a handful of neighboring Arab countries. This may be an understandable behavior aiming at promoting the image of an "American" university, serving local markets, and taking account of the ever-present local sensitivities. However, a narrow perspective in recruiting two crucial components of an academic community, namely faculty and students, is unlikely to support the longer-term development of US universities and quite inadequate to deal with issues of diversity in the modern workplace including that of universities.

Organizational initiatives regarding the management of diversity have been categorized into eight generic action options (Thomas, 1996); the action options range from "denial" (organizations claim that decisions are made irrespective of age, gender, color denying that differences exist) and "exclusion" (the objective is to decrease and even exclude diverse people from the organization) to more enlightened approaches such as "mutual adaptation" (allowing the greatest accommodation of diversity as differences are recognized and accepted). Each business school follows different action options in managing diversity. For example, at the Saudi business school the options of "suppression" and "isolation" are used to discourage or squelch differences among faculty by setting diverse people off the side in an attempt to perpetuate the status quo. A more or less similar situation prevails at the business school in Singapore where the infusion of a small amount of "tolerance" (whereby while differences are acknowledged

they are not accepted or valued) helps to modify, to some extent, suppression and isolation. "Isolation" and "assimilation" (the thrust of the assimilation option is that all diverse people can become like the dominant group) are the two options found at the Japanese business school.

Thomas's (1996) action options of "exclusion" and "assimilation" are pursued at the business school in Lebanon with the apparent objective of creating a homogeneous undergraduate student body; this may be evidenced by university-wide admissions practices biased towards straight from high school entry to university with practically no mature-age undergraduate students present on campus. Further, students are subtly but consistently encouraged, throughout the socialization process, to develop and uphold the AUB "identity" which presumably distinguishes them from their peers in other local universities. With respect to faculty recruitment, targeting natives holding US degrees, the university pursues the "tolerance" option that is, although inclusion of professors with degrees from outside the US is allowed, differences in faculty backgrounds do not always appear to be valued.

Compared to the other business schools, the experience of the business school in Australia stands out. This is because in the latter the management of diversity is based on the options of "mutual adaptation" and on "building relationships" (the basic premise behind the latter option is that quality relationships, underlined by acceptance and understanding, can overcome differences among diverse groups) whereby acceptance, understanding, and accommodation of diverse individuals and groups are emphasized. It may not be, therefore, accidental that the 35 faculty members of the Australian business school represent 17 different nationalities while roughly one third of the student population are non-Australian citizens. Certainly, some credit may be due to Australia's stated policy of fostering multiculturalism; however, it is predomi-

Table 4. Management of diversity in five business schools

B-school in:	Action option	Basic premise
Japan	Isolation, Assimilation	Maintain status quo, diverse people to fit in dominant group
Singapore	Suppression, Isolation, Tolerance	Discourage differences, maintain status quo
Australia	Mutual adaptation, Building relationships	Full accommodation of diversity by fostering quality relationships
Saudi Arabia	Suppression, Isolation	Discourage differences, maintain status quo
Lebanon	Exclusion, Assimilation, Tolerance	Diverse people to fit in dominant group

nantly the business school's (and the university's) policies and practices that have helped achieve and effectively manage such diversity.

The action options used by the business schools in the management of diversity are presented in table 4.

V. Conclusions

Unless unforeseen events of tremendous proportions take place one could reasonably expect the landscape of the international tertiary education to continue, for at least some in the foreseeable future, to be marked by two striking characteristics, that is the dominant position of English as our lingua franca, and the increasing influence and rapid spread of the US model of tertiary education. As the mushrooming of US as well as US-styled universities abroad continues, different cultures, norms, values, and ways of looking at the world come to closer interaction that, in turn, gives rise to issues and problems associated with diversity. Baring the view that, a certain culture is, somehow, superior and can, or should, be imposed upon all other cultures, issues of diversity must be acknowledged, understood, accepted, and, most importantly, dealt with.

Most of the institutions examined handle diversity issues by adopting the action options of suppression, isolation, exclusion, assimilation, and tolerance; however, these are said to be among the least preferred options for managing diversity. As it has been suggested, diversity can be best managed by mutual adaptation, building relationships, and inclusion (Thomas, 1996); yet, it is in one institution only that issues of diversity are managed by adopting desirable and effective options. Obviously, there is still much universities need to do to manage effectively a diverse, in the context of an increasingly globalized tertiary education, faculty and even student body.

As far as specific management practices for successfully dealing with diversity are concerned, they can be classified into three major types that is, accountability, development, and recruitment (Morrison, 1992). In the context of a university, accountability practices refer to the fair treatment of diverse students, faculty, and staff, development practices focus on preparing diverse employees for greater responsibility and advancement, while recruitment practices focus on attracting qualified employees (faculty and staff) prepared to accept challenging work assignments. In the university in Australia, a combination of accountability, development, and recruitment practices are used while predominantly accountability practices are employed

by the university in Lebanon to address diversity issues; examples of accountability practices include policies on equal employment opportunities, against racism and sexism. To a lesser extent, development practices such as internal training and informal mentoring are also used at the university in Lebanon.

Living in an inter-dependent world, (that, almost by definition, needs to value and accommodate diversity), characterized by the internationalization of English language and the US model of higher education, and higher, than in previous times, mobility of faculty and students, challenges associated with cross-cultural interaction and learning-teaching outside one's own home country should no longer be ignored. Special attention needs to be paid to the challenges non-native English speaking faculty interacting with non-native English speaking students face, as well as to the peculiar, although by no mean uncommon nowadays, case of "third-country" faculty teaching abroad but outside their own home country. If diversity is, as often claimed, indeed valued, innovative responses addressing such challenges are called for.

References

Cooke, R. A. and Szumal, J. L. (1993). "Measuring normative beliefs and shared behavioral expectations in organizations: The reliability and validity of the organizational culture inventory", *Psychological Reports*, 72, pp. 1299–1330.

Donovan, M. S., Bransford, J. D., and Pellegrino, J. W. (1999). *How people learn: Bridging research and practice*. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Hofstede, Geert (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. and Bond, M. H. (1988). "The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to Economic growth", *Organizational Dynamics*, Spring, pp. 4–21.

Johnson, D. W. and Johnson, R. (1994). *The nuts and bolts of cooperative learning*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Kinicki, A. J. and Schriesheim, C. A. (1978). "Teachers as leaders: A moderator variable approach", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, pp. 928–935.

Kreitner, R. and Kinicki, A. (2001). *Organizational Behavior*, 5th edition, McGraw-Hill.

Lowman, J. (1995). *Mastering the techniques of teaching*, 2nd edition. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyers, Chet, and Jones, T. (1993). *Promoting active learning: Strategies for the college classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Morrison, A. M. (1992). *The new leaders: Guidelines on leadership diversity in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Reilly III, C. A., Chatman, J. A., and Caldwell, D. F. (1991). "People and organizational culture: A profile of comparison approach to assessing the person-organization fit", *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, pp. 487–516.

Rodrigues, C. A. (1990). "The situation and national culture as contingencies for leadership behavior:

Two conceptual models", in *Advances in International Comparative Management*, vol. 5, Prasad, S. B. (ed.), Greenwich CT: JAI Press.

Sheridan, J. E. (1992). "Organizational culture and employee retention", *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, pp. 1036–1056.

Thomas, R. R. (1996). *Redefining Diversity*, New York: AMACOM.