

Faculty development initiatives critical to navigate multicultural Business Schools

Soumya Sivakumar, Marymount University, USA (ssivakum@marymount.edu)

Carly Speranza, Marymount University, USA

Abstract

Due to the increasing complexity of higher educational institutions and the rising mobility of students from new nations and cultures entering higher education, business school environments and their faculty are experiencing greater challenges in providing an inclusive learning experience across multiple classrooms and instructional formats. Business schools need to rise to the occasion to develop their faculty to meet these new challenges, rather than the onus being on faculty alone. This paper reviews the literature and ends with recommendations for business school administrators and management to help foster a business school culture of diversity, inclusion, and acceptance for faculty, staff and students.

Keywords: Internationalization, ethical responsibility, business school, faculty development, AACSB, inclusive

Introduction

“Internationalization reaches to the heart of the very meaning of ‘university’ and into every facet of its operation, from teaching and education to research and scholarship, to enterprise and innovation and to the culture and ethos of the institution” Foskett (2010, p. 37).

Higher education in the US comprises a complex web of several groups competing for access to educational resources within a constantly evolving social structure. Many writings on multicultural education, while discussing the challenges faced by minority student populations, typically tend to unintentionally highlight the stereotypes that these vulnerable groups desire to distance themselves from. For instance, a discussion of Latino students would invariably include their struggles with English as a second language (ESL) education, thereby reinforcing stereotypes.

It cannot be left to faculty alone to develop in a way that can provide an inclusive and dynamic learning environment for students from diverse backgrounds. As business schools continue to increase their role and engagement in society, they must take up the mantle and as an on-going ethical practice provide the necessary development and resources to ensure their faculty can adequately support their increasingly diverse student body.

In this conceptual article we not only address the increasingly multidimensional, dynamic, and contextual nature of multicultural higher education, but also discuss the literature related to related to faculty identity, empowerment, cultural competence, emotional intelligence, and development. We end by provide details of current best Business school practices, and recommendations for business school administrators and management to ethically create, maintain, and foster a culture of diversity, inclusion, and belongingness for all.

Literature Review

Internationalization and Complexity of Higher Education

In 1990 Fincher published an article that focused on the scope and complexity of higher education within the U.S. At that time, over 13 million students were enrolled in 3,535 U.S. colleges and universities (Fincher, 1990). Fast forward to 2020 and over 3,900 U.S. degree-granting institutions served almost 20 million students (Bryant, 2021). While there was almost a 65% increase in student enrollment, there was less than a 10% increase in serving institutions. Moreover, over the last several decades higher education has only grown more complex and international in nature (Hawawini, 2016). In fact, almost three-million students currently study outside of their home country across the globe and that number is projected to more than double by 2025 (Edwards & Kitamura, 2019).

Within higher education, the term internationalization has significantly morphed over the last several decades due to globalization and the increase in transnational education initiatives (Bovill et al., 2015; Gopal, 2011). We will use the European Parliament's definition of Internationalization as cited by Hawawini (2016) as "the intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions, and delivery of postsecondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society" (p. 15).

Since the late 1990s, internationalization in higher education (IoHE) has been accepted as its own research field and discipline (Bedenlier et al., 2018) to include the formal establishment of journals and multiple other published works focused on the field. In 2018, Bedenlier et al. (2018) published a content analysis on research of internationalization in higher education and found that even in the short span of 25 years, the research has progressed through four developmental waves progressing from delineation of the field to institutionalization and management of internationalization, to consequences of internationalization, to today's focus on transnational higher education. This too provides some evidence into the growing nature of internationalization and its increasingly complex environment.

Just as internationalization has increased so have the manifestations of how this is represented across the globe in higher education settings (Edward & Kitamura, 2019). Today's international student does not have to leave the home country to study abroad due to technological and curriculum advancements. In fact, students can choose a seemingly infinite number of ways to achieve a degree; however, while this aids students in their educational pursuits, it also creates a greater amount of complexity to institutions and often falls primarily on faculty to meet these challenges in multiple classroom formats, especially as new nations and cultures enter the mix of higher education and mobility (Larsen, 2016).

Along with the significant increase of international students, the international education landscape has exploded globally. According to Larsen (2016), while international education used to occur primarily in Western countries, regional education hubs have emerged across the globe to include East Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, New Zealand, and Africa. Subsequently, since university staff and faculty have increasingly flowed between international academic locations the term "transnational teaching" has recently taken hold (Bovill et al., 2019) and only appears to continue to grow in the future. As such, universities need to strategize and create flexible employment and teaching opportunities for faculty to be successful in this increasingly cross-border education environment (Plater, 2016).

Faculty Empowerment and Inclusive Business School Culture

Faculty empowerment has been defined as "the process by which faculty members develop the competence to take charge of their own growth, solve their problems, and meet the needs they require for their workplace" (Short et al., 1994, p. 38). Empowered faculty have the power to make

decisions about the educational setting in which they work (Rodriguez-Bonces & Beltran, 2014), seek opportunity for professional development, have the freedom to flex their identity (Quan et al., 2019), succeed in an environment of risk and change, and foster professional autonomy and accountability (Rodriguez-Bonces & Beltran, 2014). In a post-Covid world, higher business education faculty will be required to harness this empowerment to adequately respond to the needs of students, especially vulnerable groups where the bulk of the diversity in the US student population resides, whose education and personal well-being were most impacted by the pandemic.

Vulnerable student groups constitute the entire gamut of diversity - students coming from international, low-income, ethnic, indigenous, diverse gender identity, sexual orientation, and special needs backgrounds. In fact, business programs host the largest percentage of international students in the U.S. at just over 20% (IIE, 2016). Empowered faculty are in a unique position to make learning accessible to all students by engendering an inclusive learning environment where students can feel connected, be seen and heard, are able to maximize their learning potential, and persist towards course completion (Bloomberg, 2021). Faculty empowerment has been shown to translate into providing a diverse set of students with relatable learning experiences, where students in turn feel empowered to own their own personal and professional growth (Broom, 2015).

An inclusive learning environment supports students academically and creates a sense of belonging for all student and faculty identities (Kaplan & Miller, 2007). Research shows that when faculty and students can integrate their personal identity and experiences with course material, students are more likely to succeed academically (Tanner, 2013). Particularly, inclusive learning cultures demonstrate respectful and equitable participation, encourage cross-cultural communication, acknowledge and celebrate differences, use inclusive language (e.g. avoid masculine pronouns when referring to people), include multicultural examples (e.g. use diverse guest lecturers, and protagonists in case studies), facilitate learner empowerment, and adopt diversity statements in the pedagogy to model inclusivity in the classroom (Nemi-Neto 2018, Tanner, 2013).

The significance of an inclusive pedagogy is that the teaching tools and course materials will acknowledge diverse perspectives and demonstrate real world relevance. In fact, several US business schools have initiatives around diversity, inclusion, and belonging (DIB) to empower

educators to promote a DIB friendly pedagogy. While business schools recognize the importance of a curriculum to educate future business leaders that can manage diverse teams, the need for an inclusive and empowered higher ed faculty capable of appropriately responding to a transnational classroom is not lost on the audience as a diverse, equitable, and inclusive classroom follows a faculty that is similarly endowed. Interestingly, the corporate world mirrors these imperatives by hiring culturally competent employees to work well in diverse work environments. A recent study of more than 1,000 large companies spanning 15 countries, reported that amongst the firms, diversity and inclusion leaders outperformed the followers on all indicators of financial performance including profitability and annual stock returns (Dixon Fyle et al., 2018).

Cultural Competence and Faculty identity

Cultural competence is defined as “a set of congruent thought processes, behaviors, and attitudes” that allows people to interact appropriately and work effectively in multicultural contexts (Betancourt et al., 2002, p. 3). To develop cultural competence requires one to value diversity, adapt in response to the dynamics and demands of cross-cultural interactions, and possess cultural awareness. The census projections for the demographic composition of the U.S. population predict that, by 2050, more than 50% will comprise of racial/ethnic/religious minorities, leading to not only diverse communities, but also multicultural workplaces and a globalized workforce (Passel & Cohn, 2008). It naturally follows that if college students must succeed in multicultural work contexts, higher education campuses need to provide both faculty and students with culturally sensitive and inclusive learning environments in order to develop and enhance their cultural competence (Rateau et al., 2015). While most U.S. colleges and universities have come a long way from their hostile and exclusive history to becoming inclusive *weapons of mass attraction* where diverse groups of learners feel welcome and valued (Glass et al., 2015), the onus of creating such an environment and an inclusive learning experience capable of not only developing student cultural competence, but also reducing the culturally induced disparities in student achievement, typically falls on the faculty.

Recognizing the importance of the role of faculty both in instructing and interacting with diverse learners, faculty development initiatives at several institutions of higher learning have evolved to include modules on creating DIB friendly pedagogy and on training faculty to foster a learning climate that is culturally responsive (Schmid et al., 2016). Underscoring the significance

of faculty promoting a DIB-aware pedagogy in an inclusive learning multicultural environment, is the interplay between faculty development and the formation of various aspects of faculty identity.

Faculty identity is multidimensional, encompassing faculty members' professional, academic, social, and personal identities that influences the teaching, research, and service domains of their professional lives. It is typically described as voluntary, ongoing, and beneficial practices that individual faculty undertake to improve the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral skills that could enhance their performance. Faculty identity is dynamic, varies in importance at different points, and is influenced by how faculty view their relationships with themselves and others (Lankveld et al., 2017). Faculty identity encompasses multiple transformative roles where faculty are mentors, advisors, researchers, scholars, and instructors - all requiring them to interact appropriately with cultural sensitivity, bridge cultural differences, adopt empathy, and adapt their behaviors to address the inclusivity needs of their students (Bezrukova et al., 2012).

Identity is a multifaceted construct that has meant different things based on one's focus. For instance, when studying politics, identity could include race, gender, sexual orientation and several other individual bases for identification. When developing international and cultural relations, identity could involve national, ethnic, cultural, and tribal affiliations. Identity thus not only involves identifying with a set of characteristics, but also includes the distancing oneself from certain "other" characteristics. Identity is both derived by the self and also socially constructed, and is further divided as personal, social, and professional identities (Fearon 1999). Personal identity relates to the unique individuals that people are (e.g., white male), social identity entails their membership in groups (e.g., white married Christian male), and professional identity refers to the role played in society (e.g., professor of business). And while, for the same individual, these sources of identity intersect with each other, they also interact with the corresponding identities of others that they encounter (Burke 2004).

Galkiene (2016) believes that faculty identity cannot exist in isolation from student perceptions of such identities. In fact, Galkiene's (2016) research has shown that faculty identity is revealed by comparing student expectations for faculty traits and attitudes, and faculty knowledge and skills. Such traits and attitudes include the willingness to build relationships with students, to create a professional, joyful microclimate in the classroom, to help students experience personal success, and to make academic demands of students according to their individual potential. Faculty knowledge and skills include the ability to formulate learning activities that are

flexible, interesting, involving, and diverse. Further, a faculty identity that demonstrates inclusivity in the classroom manifests in a pedagogy that uses innovative educational techniques, self-reflective instructional practices, empathetic responses to students and their situations, adaptations to individual learning styles, and instructor's participation in the learning process (Galkiene, 2016). Several higher education institutions have initiated faculty development programs emphasizing the importance of cultural competency in the transformative roles faculty play and such programs are typically aimed at assisting faculty create multicultural educational experiences for their students.

Dimensions of Multicultural Education

Though the US civil rights movement of the 1960s put the need for multicultural education at the forefront, it was not until the late 1990s that both researchers and practitioners charted the critical elements that such a curricular transformation would entail. In his seminal work on re-inventing higher education curriculum, Banks (1995) elaborated on the requirements of education reform which allowed for "all students to have equal opportunities to learn" (p. 391), empowering them in the process by giving them voice. Banks programmatically developed a typology of five dimensions that directed empowered faculty to create and implement a multicultural curriculum integrating faculty and student identities within all fields of education.

The five dimensions include content integration, the knowledge construction process, prejudice reduction, an equity pedagogy; and an empowering school culture (Banks, 1995, p. 391). Each of these dimensions, according to Banks, play a role in creating transformative knowledge, curriculum, scholarship, and classroom experience. In content integration, faculty bring examples from different cultures to elucidate the content and theories around it. Knowledge construction questions the cultural assumptions, paradigms, and frames of reference that influence the way in which knowledge is created and interpreted. For instance, while several scholars might draw conclusions about the generalizability of their research findings, faculty engaged in multicultural education are able to not only critically question the universality of such knowledge but also guide students to examine it through a multicultural lens (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

Research from the 1980s indicates that racial attitudes, biases, and beliefs are formed when young, and that society continually reinforces racial identification and preferences (Spencer, 1982). The dimension of prejudice reduction refers to the strategies that faculty could employ to

encourage students to develop more multicultural and democratic values. In pursuit of an equitable pedagogy, Ladson-Billings (1995) proposed that when faculty incorporated culturally responsive and congruent teaching strategies, it facilitated the academic success of diverse student populations. Specifically, when classroom activities highlighted the cultural strengths of the students, the academic achievement of all students increased (Kleinfeld, 1975). For instance, when the student teams in the opening *vignette* were tasked with designing a marketing plan for a product entry into a country of their choice, each team chose a nation that at least one member of the group was familiar with. The intimate country knowledge that the student was able to bring to the group made the marketing plans rooted in economic reality and culturally viable. Finally, an empowering school culture treats the school as a system that is more than the sum of its parts - pedagogy, classroom activities, faculty, and students.

For multicultural education to take hold in such a system, there can be no band aid solutions, but the whole school culture must be transformed in order to successfully implement a DIB pedagogy. For instance, Black History month is limiting since it is time constrained, instead requiring systematic year-long integration of Black history into mainstream American history (Hodge, 2018). In reality, asking a culturally diverse classroom to compartmentalize their varied cultural identities to only systematically sanctioned times/places/events would be making uncompassionate demands of their collective emotional intelligence.

Emotional Intelligence

In the mid-1990's, Daniel Goleman, put emotional intelligence (EI) on the map with his in-depth research and publication of his highly acclaimed book *Emotional Intelligence: Why it Can Matter More Than IQ*. Since its publication, organizations across the globe have used EI assessments to hire and predict employee success to include CEOs and presidents of large multinational corporations (Goleman, 2006). Over the last 10-15 years, research has begun on EI and faculty performance. As a result, EI has been found to improve faculty and student interaction, to include retention and knowledge retainment (Lillis, 201; Tariq et al., 2020) and to enhance business faculty performance across research, service, and teaching (Jiao, 2021). Unlike IQ, EI can be improved (Goleman, 2006) through professional training development opportunities. In fact, EI training amongst teachers has been found to increase teaching effectiveness and relationships with both peers and students (Dolev & Leshem, 2017).

According to Robbins and Judge (2019), emotional intelligence is an individual's "ability to (1) perceive emotions in the self and others, (2) understand the meaning of these emotions, and (3) regulate his or her emotions accordingly" (p. 119). Over the years the EI model has changed slightly, and today, it is represented by four quadrants. These quadrants, or really dimensions, are Self-Awareness, Self-Management; Social Awareness; and Relationship Management (Goleman et al., 2002). As each of these dimensions are described, consider how integral each of these dimensions are to faculty members, their identity, and their relationships with others to include colleagues, students, and administrators.

The first dimension of EI, self-awareness, refers to the awareness that one has of their own feelings and emotions (Konopaske et al., 2018). For example, a faculty member that has stronger self-awareness may recognize their strengths and weaknesses more readily than a faculty member with weaker self-awareness. This can also affect how faculty members choose courses and delivery methods that best suit their strengths versus struggling through events that do not highlight their best attributes in the face-to-face, hybrid, or on-line classroom. In fact, Pololi and Frankel (2005) found that faculty with increased self-awareness were more likely to positively reach students in the classroom through generalizations and more personalized explanations of course material.

Self-Management is another "self" related EI dimension that focuses on the ability to manage emotions in a way so that they do not negatively affect relationships with others. (Konopaske et al., 2018). As faculty, we often expect our students to regulate their emotions within the classroom and to work through life issues to ensure they meet our expectations and course deadlines; however, who holds the faculty responsible to manage themselves? Faculty who are more able to manage their emotions are less likely to respond with hostility when under pressure and are more likely to motivate and contribute to student learning (Jennings et al., 2013). Moreover, faculty members who can effectively manage their own emotions are more likely to be perceived as trustworthy (Goleman, 2006) by both their students and colleagues.

In the third EI dimension, social awareness, individuals that are strong in this dimension are often able to relate to others more easily and are more skilled at demonstrating empathy (Konopaske et al., 2018). As eloquently expressed by Kim and Sax (2009) "interacting with faculty-whether in the classroom, the laboratory, office hours, or other venue-is one of the key college experiences associated with student development" (p. 437). However, not all faculty-student interactions are created equal, and faculty must recognize which students based on gender,

social-class, culture, and race need differentiated social interactions to excel in a university environment (Kim & Sax, 2009).

The final dimension of EI is relationship management, and it is focused on how well one maintains productive and positive relationships through activities such as listening and collaboration (Konopaske et al., 2018). Aside from relationships with administrators, faculty often engage in relationships as peers, mentors, or mentees and each of these relationships experience different levels of trust and transparency (Lund, 2010). When a faculty member has stronger relationship management skills, they are more likely to ask for help, network, listen and reflect, and respect the advice of others (Opengart & Bierema, 2015). Thus, faculty members strong in this dimension are more likely to create a healthier work environment through trust and collaboration.

Faculty Development

Faculty development is loosely defined as “activities and programs designed to improve instruction” (Amundsen et al., 2005) and while there are competing terms such as academic development and professional development, that describe related roles of a faculty member (e.g., researcher, advisor, colleague, scholar, university citizen), the term faculty development specifically focuses on teaching and instructional development. This is because not every field expert is able to effectively disseminate their knowledge and not every scholar can create an inclusive and conducive learning environment for the students. When faculty rewards including tenure and promotions, and university honors including rankings and accreditation depend on student performance measures and student evaluations, it becomes imperative that both faculty and the university seek ways to improve instructional design. As mentioned earlier, not only is the student demographic profile changing dynamically, but COVID-19 has forced most, if not all, higher ed institutions to embrace alternate/online formats of instruction, thus, forcing individual faculty members to quickly ramp up their instructional skills. Institutions are aiding this through providing campus-wide offerings such as establishing teaching and learning centers, and faculty development programs aimed at improving instructional design and teaching skills.

In an in-depth review, Amundsen et al. (2005) describe four foci of faculty development activities that support faculty instruction and pedagogy - skills, method, process, and discipline. Activities with a skills focus are designed to aid individual faculty members overcome problems

that prevent them from giving detailed feedback to students or presenting material effectively in the classroom. These areas are typically flagged as those of concern by student ratings. A focus on methods gives importance to faculty engaging different types of learning in the classroom as diversity in student populations require different approaches to learning, and such methods might include cooperative learning, problem solving, and group projects. Faculty may have beliefs about student learning and a focus on the process makes faculty question these preconceived notions, reflect on their own teaching practices, and thus make improvements in their pedagogy. Finally, a focus on discipline allows for faculty to stay on top of new knowledge in their own field and use this lens to expand their understanding of other disciplines.

An important outcome of these faculty development focuses is the creation of a new pedagogical approach that treats students as partners (Mercer-Mapstone et al., 2017). In a traditional model of teaching, knowledge is transmitted from the instructor to the student, within a rigid hierarchical structure. However, when faculty and students share in the responsibility for learning, students who become partners, find their voice, and take an active role in their own learning. Students who come from diverse learning backgrounds not only find this model empowering but also become more engaged with learning as they develop a greater sense of responsibility (Werder, 2012). In fact, most successful faculty development programs with such a focus are designed to develop skills and attitudes that are better situated to meet the needs of culturally diverse student partners downstream.

Along these lines, the term “faculty development” suggests that the development of faculty is a passive role for a faculty member, something to be done to a faculty member versus an active engagement (Editor, 2016). Moreover, andragogy holds that self-directed, active learning that takes an adult learner’s previous experience can often be even more effective (Mew, 2020), especially when the learning experience is personalized (Brown, 2016). As such, a faculty development framework should include identity, growth, and empowerment as necessary development outcomes (Editor, 2016). In fact, the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity suggests that faculty support should address four key areas - strategically planning work demands to achieve tenure/promotion, managing research productivity, maintaining healthy professional relationships, and achieving work-life balance (n.d.).

An Ethical Responsibility

Higher education has long had an ethical responsibility to provide society with ethical leaders and responsible citizens. In fact, the college campus, both on-line and in physical form, is often where ethics and morals are first explored through critical thinking and inquiry (Couch & Dodd, 2005). In fact, when an ethical scandal occurs, many look at higher education (and in some cases even secondary education) to understand what is being taught, who is teaching, and how the material is delivered. Subsequently, as society has continuously increased its call for ethical business practices and corporate social responsibility, many have turned to business schools to increase ethical and moral responsibility in the standing curriculum.

To answer that call, several years ago The Association of Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International, commonly referred to as AACSB, stood up an Ethics Education Task Force. Ultimately, the task force formally requested that business school educators and administrators bolster ethics education to include “awareness, reasoning skills, and core principles of ethical behavior” (AACSB, n.d., p. 8). However, to accomplish this, faculty require the guidance and development to create, teach, and mentor their students to recognize and have the moral courage to respond to unethical practices and environments (AACSB, n.d.). Moreover, while the standard curriculum is critical, students also construct their own ethical behaviors based on their observations and engagement with the business school culture and it responds to the needs of an increasingly international society.

B-School Faculty Development “Best Practices”

While AACSB does not accredit every business school and accounting program, it is considered the “gold standard” and longest-standing accreditation for business schools across the globe. As of July 2021, approximately 901 world-wide institutions were AACSB accredited (AACSB, n.d.). To receive the highly sought after AACSB accreditation, business programs must display high-quality programs that include rigorous standards, strong curricula, ethical culture, and extensive faculty qualifications, support, and development.

In 2020, after seven years of unchanged standards, AACSB rewrote their accreditation standards to include a greater emphasis on business schools and their impact on society. Subsequently, AACSB has reaffirmed that business schools, aside from providing

outstanding education, should also maintain a collegial environment, a global mindset, and supportive faculty development (AACSB 2020 Standards, 2020). In fact, to achieve AACSB accreditation, business schools must document and communicate how they will develop and support faculty over the course of their careers to ensure that faculty continue to learn and grow themselves.

While AACSB and other business accreditation bodies want to ensure faculty are well-developed by their employers, they do not have specific requirements to meet this standard. Instead, business schools are expected to align their faculty development programs to best meet the mission and vision of their individual school and academic programs. As a result, it often falls on the business school and its leadership to determine how best to develop its qualified faculty and ensure they maintain relevance in the classroom. While this hands-off approach provides business schools with quite a bit of autonomy, it also creates a difficult task because faculty are often at different levels and points in their career, not to mention a need for differentiated skills and knowledge based on expertise and previous development. As expressed by Legorreta et al., “a one-size fits all faculty development program is not realistic for most [business] schools” (2006, p. 4).

While there is limited research out there on B-School faculty development, there are three practices distinct to business schools that should be considered when developing faculty. First, as per AACSB standards B-Schools should link faculty development with their school mission. In this way, business schools will be more intentional and develop faculty that are attuned to the mission and goals of the school. Legorreta et al., (2006) provided a case example where the College of Business Administration at the California State University in Sacramento (CSUS) linked its faculty development plan to the school mission and then aligned resources against identified goals. Using this approach, CSUS was able to intentionally operationalize and develop their faculty while also advancing its mission (Legorreta et al., 2006).

Second, a faculty development tool that has been around for some time yet may be difficult to resource are short-term study-abroad programs for faculty, especially those that teach international business. These programs allow faculty to immerse themselves for a brief, but integral period of time into another country and culture. As such, these overseas development opportunities allow faculty to build contacts, extend their knowledge of a culture, recharge, and possibly correct possible existing bias and misperceptions (Festervand & Tillery, 2001). The good

news is that there are several organizations, including universities, that operate stand-alone overseas faculty development opportunities that schools can nominate and enroll their faculty.

Finally, business schools should strive to create hubs or opportunities for B-school faculty to assist in the creation of positive societal change in communities local to the university. In fact, over the last several years AACSB has created the Innovations That Inspire initiative and has recognized over 160 business schools for their innovative approaches to positively assist society through challenges (AACSB, n.d.). While most universities have service requirements for tenure and rank, service requirements external to the university should also be valued. Moreover, there should be a liaison in the B-School that can assist the faculty and the community to link up and work together on specific societal issues. These relationships will keep faculty informed on what society needs and will also leave the local community feeling more connected to the university and likely more comfortable recruiting and hiring its graduating students.

Regardless of a business school's established faculty development strategy and programming, they need to ensure that they offer development to both their full and part-time faculty. As schools decrease tenure-track positions and increase the numbers and employment of adjunct faculty (Maxey & Kezar, 2016), schools need to recognize that adjuncts are a critical component to student learning and experience inside and outside of the classroom. Fuller et al. (2017) found that less than 70% of universities offer development opportunities and that public universities were more likely than private universities to offer adjuncts supportive development. Areas that adjuncts may specifically need increased development may include classroom technology, classroom observation, faculty learning communities, and single-session specific teaching and learning topics based on assigned courses (Fuller et al., 2017).

Discussion and Recommendations

Internationalization and the complexity of higher education has created an even greater necessity for a supportive school culture, and innovative and inclusive faculty development programs. However, with many competing demands schools may find it difficult to be proactive versus reactive in the creation of a positive, inclusive, and ethical culture. The following are two primary recommendations for business schools to further expand faculty identities to excel in a multicultural and complex environment.

First, universities must recognize that faculty need just as much support as their students and sometimes more. This support should come from multiple sources to include colleagues, administrators, and mentors. However, this support will only become an embodiment and expectation of business school faculty when the culture has been tended to and cared for by all participants. To achieve this culture a business school should create an environment where risk and change are anticipated and supported, and where faculty get to flex their professional autonomy and are provided opportunities to expand their own professional and personal identities inside and outside of the classroom.

Second, business schools should consider faculty development programs as a cornerstone to both provide excellent student learning experiences and strengthen school culture. Subsequently, every full and part-time faculty member should have ready access to mission-aligned, innovative, and inclusive development opportunities. An effective faculty development program will not only respond to student and faculty needs, but also in the long run foster an equitable and sustainable learning climate and inclusive culture capable of addressing the demands of the various stakeholders to include students, communities, and university administration. The development opportunities must move beyond mere instructional techniques and tools and strengthen faculty emotional intelligence and cross-cultural awareness so that they are better prepared to navigate gender and sexuality needs, reduce implicit bias and microaggressions, and eliminate racism inside and outside of the classroom. Faculty development should be an active-learning environment that encompasses differentiated activities that may include education, cross-cultural immersions, research, administration, reflection, or other areas that lead to a personalized professional trajectory for each faculty member. Along these lines, administrators must remember that faculty are also adult learners and should have an active role in their own development so that they feel empowered and passionate about their own learning and what they can contribute to their students and society as a whole.

Conclusion

Students are demanding, and deserve, affordable and equitable access to all university resources; employers are seeking a well-rounded diverse workforce. Moreover, post Covid-19, universities are increasingly concerned with the inclusion and retention of vulnerable populations. Faculty are on the frontlines with students every day and should be empowered to provide input and co-create

inclusive educational environments where especially vulnerable populations hold equal sway and have ready access to desired educational experience and outcomes. Ultimately, the goal of the business school is to enhance and advance society. Yet, only through an ethical inclusive learning environment and empowered, developed faculty is this achievable.

As discussed, internationalization and complexity in higher education are likely to continue to grow over the next decade due to an increase in online education and technology. To best prepare faculty to meet these exciting, yet sometimes daunting adaptations necessary to meet these challenges, faculty must have a strong identity and a robust skill set to effectively build relationships with students and other university stakeholders across cultures and technology. This is even more prevalent in business schools across the globe as business programs enroll more international students than other disciplines, and society is increasingly looking toward businesses to act ethically and responsibly. In conclusion, if business schools empower and actively support and develop their faculty, they will be poised to flourish in this increasingly multicultural higher education environment.

References

- AACSB. (n.d.) Business schools creating positive societal impact. <https://www.aacsb.edu/media-center/news/2021/03/aacsb-highlights-24-business-schools-creating-positive-societal-impact>
- Amunden, C., Abrami, P., McAlpine, L., Weston, C., Krbavac, M., Mundy, A., & Wilson, M. (2005). Presented at *American Educational Research Association*. <http://www.sfu.ca/rethinkingteaching/publications/CAmundsen.etal.pdf>
- Arenas, J., Gray, H., & Hamner, P. (2009). Empowering faculty to facilitate distance education. *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal*, 7(1), Article 18. <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/alj/vol7/iss1/18>
- Bedenlier, S., Kondakci, Y., & Zawacki-Richter, O. (2018). Two decades of research into the internationalization of higher education: Major themes in the Journal of Studies in International Education (1997-2016). *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22(2), 108-135.
- Betancourt, J., Green, A. & Carrillo, E. (2002). *Cultural competence in health care: Emerging*

frameworks and practical approaches. The Commonwealth Fund.
[https://www.commonwealthfund.org/sites/default/files/documents/ media files public
ations fund report 2002 oct cultural competence in health care emerging framewo
rks and practical approaches betancourt culturalcompetence 576 pdf.pdf](https://www.commonwealthfund.org/sites/default/files/documents/media_files_publications_fund_report_2002_oct_cultural_competence_in_health_care_emerging_frameworks_and_practical_approaches_betancourt_culturalcompetence_576.pdf.pdf)

Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K. A., & Spell, C. S. (2012). Reviewing diversity training: Where we have been and where we should go. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11, 207–227. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.0090>

Bovill, C., Jordan, L., & Watter, N. (2015). Transnational approaches to teaching and learning in higher education: Challenges and possible guiding principles. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(1), 12-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2014.945162>

Broom, C. (2015). Empowering students: Pedagogy that benefits educators and learners. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 14(2), 79-86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2047173415597142>

Brown, M. (2016). Faculty as learners. In Maxey, D. & Kezar, A. J. *Envisioning the faculty for the twenty-first century: Moving to a mission-oriented and learner-centered model* (pp. 117- 129). Rutgers University Press.

Bryant, J. (2021). How many colleges are in the U.S.?
<https://www.bestcolleges.com/blog/how-many-colleges-in-us/>

Burke, P. (2004). Identities and social structure: The Cooley-Mead award address. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 67, 5-15.

Couch, S. & Dodd, S. (2005). Doing the right thing: Ethical issues in higher education. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences* 97(3), 20-26.

Dixon-Fyle, S., Hunt, V., Dolan, K., & Prince, S. (2019). *Diversity wins: How inclusion matters*
[https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/diversity-and-inclusion/diversity-wins-how-
inclusion-matters](https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/diversity-and-inclusion/diversity-wins-how-inclusion-matters)

Dolev, N. & Leshem, S. (2017). Developing emotional intelligence competence among teachers. *Teacher Development*, 21(1), 21-39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2016.1207093>

Editor. (2016). Moving from faculty development to faculty identity, growth, and empowerment. *Academic Medicine*, 91(12), 1585-1587. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000001447

- Edwards, S. & Kitamura, Y. (2019). Knowledge diplomacy and worldview diversity education: Applications for an internationalized higher education sector. In Neubauer et al. (Eds.), *Contesting globalization and internationalization of higher education* (pp. 143-161). International Development Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26230-3_11
- Fearon, J. D. (1999). *What is identity (As we now use the word)?* Stanford University. <https://web.stanford.edu/group/fearon-research/cgi-bin/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/What-is-Identity-as-we-now-use-the-word-.pdf>
- Festervand, T. A. & Tillery, K. R. (2001). Short-term study-abroad programs - A professional development tool for international business faculty. *Journal of Education for Business*, November/December, 106-111.
- Fincher, C. (1990). AIR between forums: The scope and complexity of higher education. *Research in Higher Education*, 31(6), 605-611.
- Foskett, N. H. (2010). Global markets, national challenges, local responses: The strategic challenge of internationalization. In F. Maringe & N. Foskett (Eds.), *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic and management perspectives* (pp. 35-50). Continuum.
- Fuller, R., Brown, M. K., & Smith, K. (2017). *Adjunct faculty voices: Cultivating professional development and community at the front lines of higher education*. Stylus.
- Glass, C. R., Kociolek, E., Wongtrirat, R., Lynch, R. J., & Cong, S. (2015). Uneven experiences: The impact of student-faculty interactions on international students' sense of belonging. *Journal of International Students*, 5, 353-367.
- Goleman, D. (2006). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantem Dell.
- Gopal, A. (2011). Internationalization of higher education: Preparing faculty to teach cross-culturally. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(3), 373-381.
- Hawawini, G. (2016). *The internationalization of higher education and business schools*. Springer.
- Hodge, J. (February 19, 2018). Black history is necessary, but shouldn't be time constrained, *The*

Rocky Mountain Collegian.

<https://collegian.com/2018/02/hodge-black-history-is-necessary-but-shouldnt-be-time-constrained/>

Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches. *AMS Review*, 10, 10-26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0>

Jennings, P. A. Frank, J. L., Snowber, K. E., Coccia, M.A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2013). Improving classroom learning environments by cultivating awareness and resilience in education (CARE): Results of a randomized controlled trial. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 28(4), 374-390.

Jiao, L., Harrison, G., Chen, J., & Butcher, K. (2021). Does emotional intelligence matter to academic work performance? Evidence from business faculties in Australia. *Accounting and Finance*, 61, 1181-1204.

Kaplan, M., & Miller, A. T. (Eds.). (2007). *Scholarship of multicultural teaching and learning: New directions for teaching and learning*. Jossey-Bass.

Kim, Y. K. & Sax, L. J. (2009). Student-faculty interaction in research universities: Differences by student gender, race, social class, and first-generation status. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(5), 437-459. DOI 10.1007/s11162-009-9127-x

Larsen, M. A. (2016). *Internationalization of higher education: An analysis through spatial, network, and mobilities theories*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Legorreta, L., Kelley, C. A., & Sablynski, C. J. (2006). Linking faculty development to the business school's mission. *Journal of Education for Business*, Sept/Oct, 3-10.

Lillis, M. P. (2011). Faculty emotional intelligence and student-faculty interactions: Implication for student retention. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 13(2), 155-178. doi: 10.2190/CS.13.2.b

Lund, J. W. (2010). Successful faculty peer relationships at evangelical Christian colleges. *Christian Higher Education*, 9, 207-225. DOI: 10.1080/15363750903182086

Maxey, D. & Kezar, A. J. (2016). *Envisioning the faculty for the twenty-first century: Moving to a mission-oriented and learner-centered model*. Rutgers University Press.

Mercer-Mapstone, L., Drovakova, S. L., Matthews, K. E., Abbot, S., Cheng, B., Felten, P.,

- Knorr, K., Marquis, E., Shammass, R. & Swaim, K. (2017). A systematic literature review of students as partners in higher education. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(1), 1–23. DOI: [10.15173/ijasp.v1i1.3119](https://doi.org/10.15173/ijasp.v1i1.3119)
- Nemi-Neto, J. (2018). Queer pedagogy: Approaches to inclusive teaching. *Policy Futures in Education*, 16(5), 589–604. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210317751273>
- Opengart, R. & Bierema, L. (2015). Emotionally intelligent mentoring: Reconceptualizing effective mentoring relationships. *Human Resource Development Review*, 14(3), 234-258.
- Plater, W. (2016). Internationalization and faculty work. In Maxey, D. & Kezar, A. J. *Envisioning the faculty for the twenty-first century: Moving to a mission-oriented and learner-centered model* (pp. 157- 172). Rutgers University Press.
- Pololi, L. H. & Frankel, R. M. (2005). Humanising medical education through faculty development: Linking self-awareness and teaching skills. *Medical Education*, 39, 154-162.
- Quan, T., Bracho, C. A., Wilkerson, M., & Clark, M. (2019). Empowerment and transformation: Integrating teacher identity, activism, and criticality across three teacher education programs, *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 41(4-5), 218-251. DOI: [10.1080/10714413.2019.1684162](https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2019.1684162)
- Rateau, R. J., Kaufman, E. K., & Cletzer, D. A. (2015). Innovative classroom strategies that prepare college graduates for workplace success. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 56, 52–68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5032/jae.2015.03052>
- Robbins, S. P. & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (18th Ed.). Pearson.
- Rodriguez-Boncos, M. & Beltran, C. G. (2014). Creating a culture of faculty empowerment through professional development, *Mextesol Journal*, 38(1), 2395-9908. https://www.mextesol.net/journal/index.php?page=journal&id_article=501
- Schmid, M.E., Gillian-Daniel, D.L., Kraemer, S., & Kueppers, M. (2016). Promoting student academic achievement through faculty development about inclusive teaching, change: *The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 48(5), 16-25, DOI: [10.1080/00091383.2016.1227672](https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2016.1227672)
- Short, P.M., Greer, J.T., & Melvin, W.M. (1994). Creating empowered schools: Lessons in change. *Journal of Educational Research*, 32(4), 38-52.

- Tanner, K. D. (2013). Structure matters: Twenty-One teaching strategies to promote student engagement and cultivate classroom equity. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 12, 322-331.
- Tariq, S., Tariq, S., Atta, K., Rahman, R., & Ali, Z. (2020). Emotional intelligence: A predictor of undergraduate student's academic achievement in alter living conditions. *Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association*, 70(12-B), 2398-2402. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47391/JPMA.429>
- Toward a more inclusive Business School*. (2020, July 31). Harvard Business Publications. <https://hbsp.harvard.edu/inspiring-minds/what-administrators-and-educators-can-do-now-to-drive-progress-on-diversity>
- van Lankveld, T., Schoonenboom, J., Volman, M., Croiset, G., & Beishuizen, J. (2017). Developing a teacher identity in the university context: A systematic review of the literature. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(2), 325–342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1208154>
- Werder, C., Thibou, S., & Kaufer, B. (2012). Students as co-inquirers: A requisite threshold concept in educational development. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 26(3), 34–38.