DAVID STARR-GLASS

10. ON THE LEADING EDGE

International Programs and Mentoring in Transnational Settings

At first sight it might seem strange that the State University of New York's Empire State College (ESC) has an international presence and academic programs in countries such as the Czech Republic and Greece. It could certainly be reasoned that, as a state university, its efforts should be exclusively directed toward the local community and state residents. Of course, in an era of increased globalization and boundaryless online education, it might be expected that some ESC learners would be located throughout the world, but why should the College maintain a separate and active presence abroad?

The origins of ESC's International Programs lie in two fundamental institutional concepts. The first is that the College's mission is to provide innovative non-traditional educational opportunities for *all* learners and to explore visionary ways of engaging with these learners. This vision is a vital part of the College's *raison d'etre* and, like all powerful visions, it is constrained neither by difference, culture, nor physical location. Since its inception in 1971, the College has maintained an active international presence as part of its ongoing effort to encounter cultural diversity, to explore educational difference, and to better appreciate the needs of all learners irrespective of their physical location (Bonnabeau, 1996).

The second institutional concept at work is that of *community*. ESC understands itself to be a community of learning, a community of practice, and a community of scholars. A fundamental strength of communities is that they learn from their constituent members, reflect collectively on individual experiences, and integrate these into a richer and more robust communal understanding. Two factors are crucial for this community endeavor: (a) the richness and extent of variation available; and (b) an effective means through which difference encountered can be shared, compared, and reflected upon. Those who work with ESC's International Programs are involved with educational challenges, learning possibilities, and mentoring relationships that are significantly different from their state-side colleagues. By actively sharing these experiences, internationally located faculty can provide new perspectives and possibilities for the whole learning community. Rather than viewing ESC's International Programs as an exotic peripheral engagement, it is more accurate to see it as part of the community that is working on the leading edge of discovery and channeling its experiences back to the domestic College.

K. Jelly & A. Mandell (Eds.), Principles, Practices, and Creative Tensions in Progressive Higher Education, 201–213.

So what are these leading edge experiences?

At the outset it will be helpful to briefly set the scene. The ESC International Program in Prague is actually a *transnational* program – that is, one in which the College works with a foreign partner (a private Czech university) to provide educational opportunities for students abroad (Knight, 2010; van der Wende, 2003). Curriculum design, academic quality assurance, and the degree awarding process are all strictly controlled and monitored by ESC. To reduce institutional costs, the program uses a blended instructional model in which mentors meet their mentees in Prague at the beginning of each semester and then work with them at a distance for the remainder of the semester. The physical encounter with mentees is a critical advantage in the mentoring relationship, providing unique learning opportunities that cannot be replicated in purely online distance learning work. My mentoring involves working with mentees in the design, necessary research, and the production of their undergraduate capstone experience. The capstone experience takes the form of a dissertation that is planned and written during the student's final two semesters (Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, 1998, 2001).

This chapter considers international engagement as a significant way through which ESC fulfills its mission of building bridges and of cultivating humanity. The first section identifies the challenge of distance in the mentoring relationship. This is followed by three strategies for reducing relational distance and creating more effective mentoring relationships: liminality, strangerhood, and *bricolage*. These are approaches that I find important in my transnational mentoring; hopefully, they may have resonance with other mentors, instructors, and learners. It is important to note that this chapter reflects a personal approach to mentoring; it seeks neither to impose solutions nor to project an institutional response.

FOUR DEGREES OF SEPARATION BETWEEN MENTEE AND MENTOR

As might be imagined, in Prague most of our students come from the Czech Republic and neighboring Slovakia. However, as the reputation of the program has grown, students increasingly migrate from further afield. To provide a snapshot of this increasing diversity, a recent cohort of mentees that I worked with came from Russia (12), Czech Republic (6), Kazakhstan (5), Slovakia (4), Korea (2), and single representatives from Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, Poland, Serbia, and Vietnam.

My understanding of the transnational mentoring process has been acquired over the years by directly exploring the attitudes, feelings, and constructs of my mentees. Although all mentors develop their unique understandings of the mentoring process, it may be helpful to begin with a formal definition. The definition that resonates most strongly with what I do – and aspire to do – was proposed by Powell (1997), who understood mentoring as a one-on-one relationship between an experienced and less experienced person (the mentee, or protégé):

> to improve [the mentee's] chances for achieving his or her goals by linking them to resources and support not otherwise available. The role of the mentor is to pass on knowledge, experience and judgment, and/or to provide guidance and support… [to offer] psychosocial support for changes in behavior, attitudes and ambitions… with the goals of reassuring innate worth, instilling values, guiding curiosity, and encouraging a positive youthful life. Distinguished from child rearing and friendship, the mentoring relationship is intended to be temporary, with the objective of helping the protégé reach independence and autonomy. (p. 4)

My mentees bring with them different national identities, cultural behaviors, and educational expectations even although they are temporarily situated within the social and cultural norms of an American institution in Central Europe. Part of their educational experience involves recognizing and adjusting, socially and culturally, to these new norms. The collaborative exploration of adjustments adds to the richness of cultural exchange for students, local and visiting faculty, partner institution, and ultimately for the whole ESC community. The rich national-culture mix provides significant opportunities, but it also presents challenges. In the mentoring process, my mentees and I are initially distanced in four senses.

- *Distanced from the learning institution.* Transnational mentees are culturally distanced from the values and perspectives of the American-based educational system within which they are enrolled. Many have completed their final high school year in America in anticipation of an international career. They have some understanding of American educational perspectives, but remain culturally and intellectually separated from the assumptions of American higher education and the core values articulated by ESC, which place value on a liberal arts perspective. ESC emphasizes breadth in learning, critical thinking, student self-direction, and interdisciplinary constructions of knowledge. This can be challenging for students familiar with narrower definitions of education, surface learning styles, and disciplinary isolation. This is particularly a problem with my mentees, who are Business Administration majors, and who generally favor a narrower, more pragmatic, and essentially utilitarian approach to knowledge acquisition.
- *Unfamiliar with the mentoring concept.* Mentoring is unfamiliar to my mentees and any notions that they might have about the mentor-mentee relationship have been shaped by prior educational experiences (real or vicarious) in their home countries. Mentoring is personal and reciprocal, guiding rather than instructing, and requires an appropriate match between mentor and mentee. As a process, it must negotiate individual difference, assumptions of social status, traditions of authority, and perceived differences in cultural group affiliation (Starr-Glass, 2014a, 2014b). Mentees in Prague take great pride in being assigned a mentor and look forward to the relationship. However, although enthusiastic, they have yet to appreciate the structure and process of the relationship. The mentor's task is to demonstrate how mentoring allows mentees to achieve their goals.

Mentoring across ethnic and national-culture difference requires trust, respectful inclusion, anticipatory awareness, and authentic empathy. Although mentoring is often represented from the mentor's perspective, the voice of the mentee is equally critical in creating and maintaining a productive mentoring relationship. Indeed, part of the successful mentoring process is to "unpack the ways in which mentoring is personally experienced and constructed by students… including students with different perspectives and backgrounds" (Crisp & Cruz, 2009, p. 540).

- *Skeptical about distance learning.* Creating a productive mentoring relationship – just like producing a productive online learning environment – is complicated by physical, social, cognitive, and relational distances (Olesova, Yang, & Richardson, 2011; Yang, Olesova, & Richardson, 2010). Extensive and timely communication, high social presence, and mentor displays of commitment all reduce these distances and contribute to more effective mentor-mentee engagements. I meet with mentees at the beginning of the relationship, but for most of the time our mentoring is done at a distance. This is usually the mentees' first encounter with distant learning and, given their traditional educational attitudes, they are anxious about its utility and skeptical about its value. Distanced mentoring always challenges the mentor to relate with mentee concerns, to reduce social and cognitive distance, and to establish empathetic connections (Starr-Glass, 2005).
- *Distanced by national culture.* Blake-Beard (2009) notes that "mentoring is always fraught with the concern of how to cross boundaries, how to bridge cultural differences to show yourself, and to accompany another on their journey" (p. 15). In America, the impact of gender and ethnicity on mentoring has received attention (Barker, 2007; Blake-Beard, Bayne, Crosby, & Muller, 2011). In transnational mentoring, however, the central issue is national culture. Hofstede (1980) identified dimensions in national cultures: power-distance, individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity, uncertainty avoidance, and short-term versus long-term orientation. These dimensions – and the positioning of a national culture along them – are best considered statistically: clusters of probabilities and anticipated tendencies. They *do* significantly impact the process of communication and sense-making, but they should never be used to label or to stereotype (Osland & Bird, 2000). For example, mentees coming from high power-distance cultures (which most of my students do) often find it difficult to understand the low power-distance and reduced attention to status in mentoring relationships (Pawson, 2004). The mentor has to appreciate and respect these cultural assumptions and attempt to negotiate them in ways that demonstrate awareness, sensitivity, and understanding.

These four boundaries of separation challenge effective relational mentoring. Of course, these degrees of separation are not unique to transnational mentoring. To some extent they are relevant to all mentoring work, but their magnitude and ramifications

are seen more clearly from the vantage point of transnational work. Those involved in our mentoring process have little appreciation of American-centered educational values. They also come from traditional educational cultures where distance learning is considered, at best, as poor substitute for in-person instruction. Likewise, they have no experience of – and faith in – a relational mentoring process because their national cultures privilege and accentuate power-distance.

Because of these complexities of distance and separation, mentors in Prague are on the leading edge of mentoring and their shared experiences may provide new perspectives for American-based mentors confronted with the challenges of dealing with an increasingly diverse student population. In the following sections, I consider three theoretical approaches for mentoring across these boundaries of separation. These approaches emerge from theoretical considerations, but they provide practical ways of improving the learning experience and enriching the mentoring relationship.

LIMINAL PRACTICE: MOVING ONTO THE BRIDGE

Liminality is a transient stage in a transformational journey that allows us to pause and recognize the transformation. It is the threshold (Latin: *limen*) between one state of being and another, a state of temporary suspension that van Gennep (1960) saw as "betwixt and between" and which Turner (1969) described as "a moment in and out of time … [in which] a generalized social bond that has ceased to be and has simultaneously yet to be fragmented into a multiplicity of structural ties" (p. 96).

Mentoring partnerships have three phases: (a) an initial phase, in which it is recognized that previous cultural and social structures are about to change; (b) a liminal phase that is "a cultural realm that has few or none of the attributes of the past or coming state" (Turner, 1969, p. 94); and (c) a transformed phase, in which there is a mutual recognition of a mentoring relationship that has re-formulated rules, behavior, and responsibilities. These three phases are separate and sequential, but it is always unclear how long each will last. The critical phase is the liminal phase, which acts as a bridge between the initial encounter and the negotiated mentoring relationship. In the liminal phase the rules and assumptions of power, authority, and status are deliberately suspended, allowing both mentor and the mentee to consider constructing a new and unique relational bridge: "not simply reproduce traditional power dynamics, social practices, modes of participation, and fixed senses of self, but rather create spaces within which to question these" (Cook-Sather, 2006, p. 122).

I purposefully extend the liminal phase when mentoring transnational students, signaling that prior cultural and social assumptions are about to change, but without imposing a new and non-negotiated relationship. This allows mentees to consider the ways in which they want to create the mentoring relationship. My aim is to preserve liminality, defer premature imposition of structure, and to sustain ambiguity. This can be achieved in a number of ways:

- *Reorienting the directionality of teaching and learning.* I study and discuss the student's national history and cultural norms. When mentees realize that the mentor has taken the time, interest, and effort to study their national histories they have more confidence in building their own bridges. Learning at least some of the student's language – I have learned Czech and Croatian – demonstrates interest, recognition, and respect. These acts acknowledge that mentees are rooted in different national cultures, historical experiences, and linguistic traditions: they recognize the uniqueness of mentees. They also place the mentor in a situation of *being a learner* – purposefully vulnerable in speaking a new language, willing to learn, and welcoming new perspectives. Power structures and assumptions of authority are inverted: the assumed directionality of learning is changed.
- *Deferring product and recognizing process.* Mentees are usually too focused on the pragmatic concerns of completing their capstone dissertation. They are caught up with the *product* considerations, rather than with the *process* through which their dissertations will evolve. Mentees do not need to be slowed down or diverted from starting their dissertations, but they do need to explore process considerations in the liminal space that exists before they begin their work. In time, they will discover that they are completing two related journeys: one in the mentoring relationship, the other in completing the capstone dissertation. Mentees need reminding that these journeys are parallel and connected; academic success rest on effective mentoring relationships. Reciprocity is a hallmark of the mentoring relationship; mentors can suggest a fragmentary sense of purpose, but mentees themselves must identify their own aspirations and begin to think about the process that will realize these goals (Starr-Glass, 2010).
- *Accentuating the liquidity of the task.* Mentees engage with me in a guided voyage of discovery, in terms of exploring the mentoring relationship and of writing their capstone dissertations. I deliberately focus on process considerations – not product ones – and use learning modules to explore issues such as the nature of research, the attributes of scholarly writing, and the mentee assessment of the work of previous students. The "betwixt and between" state provides a place for innovative thought, creative considerations, and fluid imagination about the future project. Sustained liminality "offers less predictability, and appears to be a more 'liquid' space, simultaneously transforming and being transformed by the learner as he or she moves through it" (Meyer & Land, 2005, pp. 379–380).

This is my *threshold work* (Starr-Glass, 2013a). Recognizing, encouraging, and sustaining liminality at the outset of the mentoring relationship permit both mentor and mentee to articulate dialogues that might otherwise have been suppressed or avoided. Encouraging liminality in the early stages of the mentor-mentee relationship moves prior experience and individual personality from the center to the periphery. Once that has been done, there is space for novelty, creativity, and innovation. Sustaining liminality makes space for inclusion, suspends prior discourses, and appreciates diversity. Many of my students would agree with me that in moving

through liminality we enter a different world – one that was not previously imagined or accessible (Conroy & de Ruyter, 2009).

STRANGERS AND OTHERS: ENCOUNTERS ON THE BRIDGE

Discussions of mentoring usually accentuate the closeness of those in the mentoring dyad. Strangerhood, then, may seem an alien concept, but it is not. In considering the sociology of space, Georg Simmel (1950) noted that "to be a stranger is naturally a very positive relation; it is a specific form of interaction" (p. 402). Simmelian strangers are simultaneously near and remote, and that duality creates a freedom which is unconstrained by the familiarity of previous interactions, or by speculations about future relationships.

Simmelian strangers are in the process of perpetual transition; neither permanently located in their origins, nor seeking incorporation in the places through which they pass. They accept social and cultural dislocation. They allow *the other* the opportunity to come to deeper understandings his or her fixity and preoccupation with integration. Škorić, Kišjuhas, and Škorić (2013), commenting on Simmel, argue that social life is never static "because spatial and temporal gaps indicate that man [sic] is always in the state of 'being in between.' Distance is always a double structure (di-stance) between two positions … social action is always 'between' and never 'within'" (p. 592).

That double structure defines the stranger; it also defines the *mentor* and the *mentee* – two distinct positions in a social dyad. In my mentoring practice, I recognize that *we* are each Simmelian strangers. I enter a mentoring relationship not to define the other, any more than I use it to define myself. I recognize that "the relationship with the 'other' is not an external relationship, but structures one's identity from within. I am who I am only in relation to the Other, and this sense of difference prevents me from claiming that my existence is whole or complete" (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007, p. 7). I also appreciate that this existential reality must always recognize and respect the mentee's distance, apartness, and strangerhood.

My mentees are usually expected to embrace the set of educational goals, aspirations, and values of the educational system in which they have enrolled. Sometimes they do, more often they do not. Some compare American educational values favorably with those of their home countries, appreciating the breadth and scope of the learning opportunities. However, a deeper questioning indicates that many reject a *distinctive American* approach to education. They are more likely to recognize pragmatic, rather than philosophical differences, based on the anticipated value of an American degree in the globalized marketplace. Their educational journeys are often complex and serendipitous. They have come from different countries to study in Prague, but they almost always insist that it is a temporary sojourn: they will return to their native countries, or seek postgraduate opportunities in more distanced ones. In their writings and reflective journals most of my mentees

concede that strangerhood is ever-present, but they rarely communicate a sense of isolation or alienation (Starr-Glass, 2014c).

- *Recognizing the legitimacy of strangerhood.* Strangers meet as people, with origins and legitimacies not marginalized by place or past. Transnational mentees have opted for a degree of strangerhood when they engage with a different educational culture. When they migrated from their native country to Prague they have also assumed another dimension of strangerhood. Within the mentor-mentee engagement, and as members of a transitory educational community, mentees have ethical claims to be accepted as unique persons, neither as the *exotic other* nor as the incidental flotsam on the currents of globalized education (Kim, 2009).
- *Allowing mentees to value their strangerhood.* Simmelian strangers have real and intrinsic value. It is important for mentees to appreciate that value and it is important for the mentor to assist, rather than impede, that appreciation. The mentor must remain sensitive to transience, tolerant of ambiguity, and accepting of otherness. The mentor, as a helping guide, should also encourage the cultivation of that sensitivity, tolerance, and acceptance in mentees. Mentoring is a transient relationship and it ends when the mentee has been sufficiently empowered to no longer need the guidance that the mentor provides.
- *Avoiding "pedagogies of narcissism."* When one is working with mentees across national-culture borders, absolutist values need to be suspended; difference needs to be dignified. Recognizing or promoting a single agenda – whether in knowledge production, ethnicity, or cultural values – only results in narcissism. The locus of narcissism can be varied – centered on the personality of the mentor, on the nature of the College, or on a restrictive "American" view of education – but its result always compromises the mentoring alliance. In Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the failing of Narcissus and Echo was not an exclusive concern for self, but rather their inability to recognize the "other." That is what Carol Hess (2003) alludes to in her discussion of the pedagogy of narcissism, where she contrasts it with the "pedagogy of conversation" and recognizes that in the closeness of the mentoring relationship "the ultimate role of the mentor is to help students articulate their particular voices. When the mentor is also able to receive from the voice she [sic] nurtures, conversational education takes place" (p. 136).

This is what I call my *bridge work* – recognizing the transitions that both mentor and mentee must make in their relationship. This requires that the bridges constructed during the liminal phase are subsequently used with confidence by both mentor and mentee to move to other places. Acknowledging strangerhood provides the opportunity for mentor and mentee to meet as fellow travelers, recognizing that their journeys – whether expressed in social, cultural, or educational terms – are valuable and empowering. For my mentees, strangerhood is an invitation to understand that knowledge is not *situated* in one a place, but remains with them on their journey.

Through the self-construction and internalization of knowledge, mentees come to realize that they can *detach* knowledge from the structures that shape it and possess it fully in their futures. They can more easily appreciate the value, possibility, and need for on-going life-long learning – and they can move forward, recognizing the natural and positive nature of the sojourner, to new destinations and to new bridges.

BRICOLEURS AND BOUNDARY-WORKERS: TRAFFIC ACROSS THE BRIDGE

The mentor needs to have broad disciplinary knowledge, the agility to recognize novel research directions, and a sense of enjoyment in undertaking creative challenges. Specifically, the concept of "subject matter expertise" needs reconsideration. In Prague, I am not so much a subject matter expert as a simple *bricoleur*.

The *bricoleur* is an eclectic collector and discerning improviser (Levi-Strauss, 1966). *Bricoleurs* are travelers and in their experiential journeys they acquire fragments of insight, possibilities, and connections. These are stored away because *bricoleurs* know that they will be useful at some future time. *Bricoleurs* are the hunter-gatherers in the academic landscapes of epistemology and ontology. Subject matter experts, by contrast, are the settled agrarians who cultivate their disciplinary plots and protecting them with disciplinary fences. *Bricoleurs* tend to be boundary workers: exploring the disciplinary boundaries, the interstices between disciplines, and the liminal spaces that have yet to be colonized. This was captured well by the late Joe Kincheloe (2005) when he wrote that "bricoleurs, acting on the complexity principle, understand that the identification of social structures is always problematic, always open to questions of contextual contingency" (p. 330).

My task in working with mentees who are writing their capstone dissertations is to help them recall prior knowledge and experience that can be used to select their dissertation topic. My task is to share with them the fragments and perspectives that I too have collected, and which might be useful in their novel constructions. In guiding them, I see myself not as a subject matter expert ground in a particular disciple – even although they may see me as such. They are Business Administration majors and will write on business or economic topics, but my task is to encourage them to explore inside and outside their chosen discipline, to seek out new areas of interest, and to sort through what they – as unwitting and unknowing *bricoleurs* – have collected throughout their undergraduate studies.

In writing this chapter, a central goal has been to demonstrate that ESC International Programs is on the leading edge of incursions into different learning systems and cultural contexts. This experience, however, remains with the individual mentor unless an effort is made to share it with others. It is this aspect of my *bricolage* work that I want to mention here.

- *Contributing to the disciplinary community.* The transnational mentor is in the best position to see different aspects of a discipline, or fragments that are often unrecognized. Certainly, engagement with hundreds of mentees in their

exploration of business and economic topics encourages the mentor to adopt a *bricoleur's* perspective. These alternative aspects can be collected, brought across the bridge (as it were), and shared with disciplinary peers who have not had my opportunities. Whether that is in different ways to see Human Resource Management in small and medium-sized businesses in different countries (Starr-Glass, 2013b), the cultivation of cultural sensitivity in teaching Cross-cultural Management (Starr-Glass, 2014c), the marketing and non-profit ventures in the Czech Republic (Bulla & Starr-Glass, 2006), or enhancing business internship experience in Southeastern Europe (Starr-Glass, 2006), these *bricolage* works could not have come about without my international engagement and exposure to other-country experiences.

- *Contributing to the teaching-learning community.* Experience in multiple national culture environments, if shared, allows others to reconsider knowledge production and relevancy. It provides a better understanding of the transfer and the co-creation of knowledge across cultures, permitting a deeper appreciation of diversity and of our learners as they engage in lifelong knowledge growth. This can be shared with others engaged in teaching international business (Starr-Glass, 2009, 2011). Because my mentoring practice is carried out mostly at a distance, experienced gained and shared can also add to the knowledge base of instructional communities involved in online distance learning in multi-cultural settings (Starr-Glass, 2014d). Sometimes, sharing experiences of different national education structures and systems can help to clarify what our learners face (Starr-Glass & Ali, 2012).
- *Contributing to the collegiate community.* Working directly in locations where cultural issues are significant in the mentoring process provides knowledge that is unavailable in the domestic community of learning at ESC. The importation of that knowledge, shared and made public, can stimulate the College community to consider issues that they may otherwise only encounter in attenuated ways. For example, the growing diversity in the domestic-based ESC community presents mentoring challenges that are qualitatively similar to those encountered in ESC International Programs. Reports from the front line, as it were, can provide College-wide benefit. As a member of the extended ESC collegiate community, I contribute extensively to the College's publication, such as *All About Mentoring*. I also contribute to the publications of our private university partner in Prague, aiming to create and support collegiate bridges that provide mutual benefits to both communities of scholars and of practice.

Bricolage is an essential quality in confronting the different topics that my mentees will explore in writing their undergraduate dissertations. This is what I call my *bricolage work* – collecting fragments, bringing them across the bridge, sifting through them, assembling them in novel combinations, and then sharing the new assemblies with others. *Bricolage* provides benefits for those in the mentoring relationship, but it also provides benefit for others outside this relationship.

CONCLUSION

Transnational mentoring provides an opportunity for self-discovery, reconsideration, and humility. The mentor-mentee encounter is neither on an American campus nor on a foreign one, but on a bridge of greater understanding and of constructive engagement. The meeting place is on a cusp of difference, where new cultures and experiences collide. It may also be thought of as a boundary zone, with the familiar behind and the yet-to-be-experienced beyond. Boundaries can be places of demarcation, division, and separation – but they are also starting points for exploration, discovery, and transformative contact.

The International Programs of ESC provides the opportunity to refine our understanding of the diversity of learners and of different approaches for effective learning and mentoring in an increasingly inclusive and globalized educational environment. Those involved in such enterprises have the opportunity to share their experiences with others. However, I suggest that we not only have to ability to share, but that we have the *obligation* to share – particularly our ESC collegiate community.

In this chapter, I have set out some of the approaches that I use in working with my mentees. Liminality, strangerhood, and *bricolage* can be looked upon as pedagogic strategies, but they are also ways of making sense of transnational mentoring and of researching (literally "re-searching") our experience. With this in mind, it seems fitting to end with Joe Kincheloe's (2005) conclusion to his essay on *bricolage*. Although he was writing about research and methodology, it has always seemed to me that his words are particularly helpful in a more general sense, especially when thinking about what we do in ESC International Programs and about what I do in transnational mentoring. Much is possible.

> Understanding that research that fails to address the ontology of the human existential situation, with all of its pain, suffering, joy, and desire, is limited in its worth, bricoleurs search for better ways to connect with and illuminate this domain. In this context, much is possible. (p. 348)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In writing this chapter, I would like to acknowledge the generous support, collegiate encouragement, and constructive feedback received from the editors Alan Mandell and Katherine Jelly. Their collective insights and thoughtfulness have been exceptionally valuable and any remaining deficiencies in this work are my own.

REFERENCES

Barker, M. J. (2007). Cross-cultural mentoring in institutional contexts. *The Negro Educational Review, 58*(1–2), 85–103.

Blake-Beard, S. (2009). Mentoring as a bridge to understanding cultural difference. *Adult Learning, 20*(1/2), 14–18.

Blake-Beard, S., Bayne, M. L., Crosby, F. J., & Muller, C. B. (2011). Matching by race and gender in mentoring relationships: Keeping our eyes on the prize. *Journal of Social Issues, 67*(3), 622–643.

Bonnabeau, R. F. (1996). *The promise continues: Empire State College – The first twenty-five years.* Virginia Beach, VA: The Donning Company Publishers.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. (1998). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities*. Stony Brook, NY: State University of New York.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. (2001). *Reinventing undergraduate education: Three years after the Boyer Report*. Stony Brook, NY: State University of New York.

Bulla, M., & Starr-Glass, D. (2006). Marketing and non-profit organizations in the Czech Republic. *European Journal of Marketing, 40*(1/2), 130–144.

Conroy, J. C., & de Ruyter, D. J. (2009). Contest, contradiction, and security: The moral possibilities of liminal education. *Journal of Educational Change, 10*(1), 1–12. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10833-008-9072-z

Cook-Sather, A. (2006). Newly betwixt and between: Revising liminality in the context of a teacher preparation program. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 37*(2), 110–127.

Crisp, G., & Cruz, I. (2009). Mentoring college students: A critical review of literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(6), 525–545.

Hess, C. L. (2003, July). Echo's lament: Teaching, mentoring, and the danger of narcissistic pedagogy. *Teaching Theology & Religion, 6*(3), 127–137.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequence: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kim, T. (2009). Transnational academic mobility, internationalization, and interculturality in higher education. *Intercultural Education, 20*(5), 395–405.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2005, June). On to the next level: Continuing the conceptualization of bricolage. *Qualitative Inquiry, 11*(3), 323–350.

Knight, J. (2010). Higher education crossing borders: Programs and providers on the move. In D. B. Johnstone, M. B. D'Ambrosio, & P. J. Yakoboski (Eds.), *Higher education in a global society* (pp. 42–69). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Kostogriz, A., & Doecke, B. (2007). Encounters with 'strangers': Towards dialogical ethics in English language education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 4*(1), 1–24.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Meyer, J. H. F., & Land, R. (2005). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (2): Epistemological considerations and a conceptual framework for teaching and learning. *Higher Education, 49*(3), 373–388.

Olesova, L., Yang, D., & Richardson, J. C. (2011). Cross-cultural differences in undergraduate students' perceptions of online barriers. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 15*(3), 68–80. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ935586.pdf

Osland, J. S., & Bird, A. (2000). Beyond sophisticated stereotyping: Cultural sensemaking in context. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 14*(1), 65–77.

Pawson, R. (2004, October). *Mentoring relationships: An explanatory review.* (Working Paper No. 21). London, UK: ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice. Retrieved from http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/departments/politicaleconomy/research/cep/pubs/papers/assets/wp21.pdf

Powell, M. A. (1997, October). *Academic tutoring and mentoring: A literature review*. Sacramento, CA: California Research Bureau, California State Library. Retrieved from http://www.library.ca.gov/crb/97/11/97011.pdf

Simmel, G. (1950). The stranger. In K. H. Wolff (Ed., & Trans.), *The sociology of Georg Simmel* (pp. 402–408). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press. (Original work published 1908)

Škorić, M., Kišjuhas, A., & Škorić, J. (2013). "Excursus on the Stranger" in the context of Simmel's sociology of space. *Sociológia, 45*(6), 589–502. Retrieved from http://www.sav.sk/journals/uploads/01091217Skoric%20OK.pdf

Starr-Glass, D. (2005). Tutorials at a distance: Reflection on the process. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development, 19*(3), 12–20. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/nha3.10221

Starr-Glass, D. (2006). Enhancing the transformative potential of business internships. *Managing Global Transitions International Research Journal, 4*(4), 285–297. Retrieved from http://www.fm-kp.si/zalozba/ISSN/1581-6311/4_285-297.pdf

Starr-Glass, D. (2009). Teaching international business abroad: Paradigms suggested by metaphor theory. *Journal of Teaching International Business, 20*(3), 230–243.

Starr-Glass, D. (2010). Reconsidering the international business capstone: Capping, bridging, or both? *Journal of Teaching International Business, 21*(4), 329–345.

Starr-Glass, D. (2011). Between stereotype and authenticity: Using action research in a cross-cultural management course. *Journal of International Education in Business, 4*(2), 112–124.

Starr-Glass, D. (2013a). Threshold work: Sustaining liminality in mentoring international students. *International Journal for Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 2*(2), 109–121.

Starr-Glass, D. (2013b). The synergistic potential of human resource management in small and medium enterprises. In C. Machado & P. Melo (Eds.), *Effective human resources management in small and medium enterprises: Global perspectives* (pp. 74–95). Hershey, PA: IGI-Global.

Starr-Glass, D. (2014a). Three degrees of separation: Strategies for mentoring distanced transnational learners. In F. J. García-Peñalvo & A. M. Seoane-Pardo (Eds.), O*nline tutor 2.0: Methodologies and case studies for successful learning* (pp. 176–200). Hershey, PA: IGI-Global.

Starr-Glass, D. (2014b). Servant mentors and transnational mentees. In R. Selladurai & S. Carraher (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Research and practice* (pp. 92–113). Hershey, PA: IGI-Global.

Starr-Glass, D. (2014c). Internalizing cross-cultural sensitivity: Reflective journals of migrant students. *Journal of International Education in Business, 7*(1), 31–46.

Starr-Glass, D. (2014d). Blending was not an option: Variation theory and reluctant international distance learners. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 27*(6), 1464–1478.

Starr-Glass, D., & Ali, T. (2012). Double standards: When an undergraduate dissertation becomes the object of two different assessment approaches. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 37*(2), 179–192.

Turner, V. W. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

van der Wende, M. C. (2003, June). Globalisation and access to higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *7*(2), 193–206.

van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage* (M. B. Vizedom & G. L. Caffee, Trans.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1909)

Yang, D., Olesova, L., & Richardson, J. C. (2010, September). Impact of cultural differences on students' participation, communication, and learning in an online environment. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 43*(2), 165–182.