

## A Cross-Cultural Collaboration Between U.S. and Kazakhstani Students

**Sarah Summers**

Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology

**Brett Craig**

St. Louis College of Pharmacy

### Introduction

Engineering is an increasingly global field, with one in six professionals working with individuals in another country in any given week (Falkenheim & Kannankutty, 2012). Several engineering education organizations have developed objectives to prepare students to work productively with international collaborators. The Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET, 2015) listed among its student outcomes the ability to “understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental, and societal context” (p. 3). In part because of the demands of globalization, the National Academy of Engineering (2004) acknowledged that engineers must be strong communicators, particularly as “modern advances in technology will necessitate the effective use of virtual communication tools” (p. 55). The need for strong virtual communication skills across cultures is especially salient in light of a survey reporting that 56% of respondents identified “miscommunication resulting from differences in culture and language” as the biggest challenge facing virtual teams (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2009, p. 3). Engineering educators, then, must consider how to best prepare students to meet this global challenge of communicating effectively not only across cultures but through different communication technologies.

Because engineering educators cannot prepare students for all communication contexts, particularly in light of a rapidly changing global and technological landscape, we must instead equip them with a broader set of skills that allow them to adapt to unfamiliar—and even uncomfortable—contexts. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (2010) defined critical thinking in their VALUE rubric as “a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion” (n.p.). Their definition is particularly salient for intercultural communication because it asks that students resist easy answers or quick categorizations, like those that often rely on unexamined stereotypes and cultural biases. To think critically in an intercultural context, then, means to suspend judgement in favor of first exploring and understanding. Thus, critical thinking is chief among the skills that allow students to identify their own cultural values and those of others and apply that knowledge in a variety of contexts in order to build trust within multicultural group settings. However, pedagogies that address critical thinking and globalization must not be merely theoretical. As Emerson (2014) argued, “for students in [STEM] disciplines to be better prepared as thinkers and writers, there needs to be a pedagogy which addresses not only the genres but also the actual working strategies and practices of STEM” (p. 1). We argue that these “actual working strategies” become especially important when teaching global communication

skills. This perspective aligns with the widely accepted use of “problem-based learning and other writing-intensive assignments to foster critical thinking” (Erwin & Zappile, 2013, p. 1). In order to think critically about the ways cultural values and global perspectives influence communication practices, students must participate in real-world, problem-based learning. These experiences require them to develop communication strategies that grow out of the ability to think critically about the implications of working in a global team, like negotiating different value systems, addressing misunderstanding, and appreciating the role of their own biases in their collaborative preferences.

This report describes one such collaboration, in which students in the United States and Kazakhstan were given the opportunity to hone writing and critical thinking skills in a cross-cultural partnership. This collaboration (led by Summers teaching in the United States and Craig in Kazakhstan) provided a particular challenge because critical thinking has not been valued in the educational model of Kazakhstan. Instead, teachers in Kazakhstan generally have been trained to focus more on memorization and lecture. Some report this system created an institutional culture based on competitiveness and intolerance of difference, which are not conducive to an open environment of inquiry and debate (Burkhalter & Shegebayev, 2012). So while critical thinking may be a universal ability, it is not a universally valued skill. However, the Kazakhstani students described in this report are attending a new institution that seeks to make critical thinking an integral part of its educational approach. Therefore, these students are being exposed to critical thinking processes, albeit late in their educational development. Framing the project directly in terms of critical thinking, then, limits its ability to translate across cultures. With this context in mind, we first describe our institutional contexts and the design of our courses. Then, we detail the collaborative assignment we created and the justifications for the pedagogical decisions we made. Finally, we use students’ written reflections to assess student outcomes in terms of both globalization and critical thinking and consider future implications for cross-cultural collaborations.

### **Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology and “Global Writing and Intercultural Communication”**

Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology is a small, private science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) college in west-central Indiana. Rose-Hulman’s mission is to provide its 2200 students with the “world’s best engineering, science, and mathematics education in an environment of individual attention and support.” Students take the majority of their courses in STEM fields and an additional nine courses—mostly electives—in the Humanities and Social Sciences Department, which includes English, philosophy, political science, anthropology, languages, and many other disciplines.

Despite its position as a leader in undergraduate STEM education—or perhaps because of it, given the demographics of STEM professionals in the United States—the student body is fairly homogenous. Over 75% of the students are male and almost 70% of the students identify as Caucasian. As a result, Rose-Hulman is trying to increase the diversity on campus and the diversity of experiences its students have access to. The most recent strategic plan states that “Rose-Hulman will be a diverse, globally-connected, sought-after community,” which includes providing “more opportunities for community members to experience the world and its diversity.”

My (Summers's) course "Global Writing and Intercultural Communication" was a new elective in the Humanities and Social Sciences Department, developed in part to meet this strategic objective. I designed the course with three objectives in mind: (a) to help students identify their own cultural values and the cultural values of others; (b) to provide opportunities for students to apply their understanding of cultural values in a collaborative, global context; and (c) to encourage students to pursue international experiences (study abroad, international employment, etc.). While readings, assignments, and in-class simulations could help students meet objectives (a) and (c), I felt that only real-world experience could satisfy (b). While I was planning the course, our Vice President for Academic Affairs visited Nazarbayev University and emailed our faculty to see if anyone would be interested in research or classroom collaborations with Nazarbayev University faculty. Because I knew I wanted an authentic global experience for my students, I responded right away, and this project began.

### **Nazarbayev University and "Intercultural Communication"**

Nazarbayev University opened its doors in 2010 in the capital city of Astana as an English-medium institution with an international faculty and staff. Proposed to become a research institution while also seeking international accreditation, Nazarbayev University sought to attract the best students from around the country. With autonomy granted by the government in order for faculty to be able to design a new curriculum, a unique exemption for an institution of higher education in Kazakhstan, Nazarbayev University further sought to create a new educational model by instead focusing on Western educational values, such as critical thinking, innovation, and problem solving.

Students attending Nazarbayev University come from around the country to study at what is positioned to be its flagship university. After passing a series of exams, including English proficiency, admitted students begin with their first year as a preparatory year offered by the University College London. After successful completion of this year, students are admitted to the undergraduate program.

Students in the School of Science and Technology pursue bachelor's degrees in physics, biology, chemistry, robotics, computer science, or mathematics. Most secondary schools in Kazakhstan still largely resemble the educational model used during Soviet times. As such, these students often exhibit very high levels of scientific and mathematical abilities while not performing well in critical thinking. However, being modeled after a Western-style education, the curriculum at Nazarbayev University attempts to increase the exposure to critical thinking, not only in the core courses for each major but in the humanities and social science electives.

The School of Science and Technology is among three schools at the undergraduate level, and it is in this school that the communication program was placed in order to work with Kazakhstan's future scientists on how to better communicate among themselves and with the public. The communication minor, created in 2012, gives these students additional options for electives, including Intercultural Communication, one of the courses involved in the international collaboration of this article.

This course aims to challenge students in examining the barriers impeding successful communication between peoples with different cultural backgrounds, exploring the relationship between culture and communication in various professional and personal contexts, and developing the necessary skills for enhancing self-reflection, flexibility, and

sensitivity in intercultural encounters. At the conclusion of this course, students were expected to be able to identify the influence of culture on communication processes and in particular contexts, practice greater self-reflection in understanding their own culture when communicating with others, and improve their own communication with people of other cultures by employing intercultural competence practices of flexibility and sensitivity through written analyses of intercultural interactions.

The relevance of this course to Nazarbayev University students, including those studying in the sciences, is found in the transitioning society of Kazakhstan. Attracting foreign investment and attempting to build new international collaborations has made at least Astana an increasingly international city. Though Kazakhstan does boast a diverse population historically, the communities around the country from which the students participating in this project came are usually not very diverse. Especially in the rural areas, stereotypical views of other cultures and nations come about due to a lack of interaction with people of those cultures, as is common in similar areas around the world. These views are part of the clash between traditional and modern that these students are experiencing firsthand.

### **Collaborative Multimedia Assignment**

After sharing our course objectives and tentative syllabi by email, we began collaborating on specific assignments (see Brewer [2015] for templates of emails to initiate collaborative projects with international colleagues). We agreed that the assignment should meet three objectives: (a) to introduce students to their international teammates and their cultures, (b) to immerse students in a collaborative experience with a deliverable that could be presented to all the students, and (c) to provide students with the opportunity to reflect on the experience. These objectives also encourage the exploration and understanding—of both self and other—that is highlighted in the definition of critical thinking that we adopted. We designed deliverables to meet each objective. The complete assignment sheet is available in the Appendix.

**Photo Story.** To fulfill the first objective and allow students to get to know their partners and their partners' cultural backgrounds, we began the collaboration with photo stories that students created in Prezi and shared via email. These stories included five to seven photos that the students best felt represented them and their values. While we considered written or video introductions, we agreed that photos with short descriptions would force students to be selective when creating their stories and to focus on meaning (as opposed to language difference) when viewing their partners' stories. We selected Prezi not only because it is easily shared and has a highly visual interface but also to prepare students to work in Prezi for the collaborative portion of the assignment.

**Media Analysis.** The bulk of the assignment asked students to work together to select a recent international event and compare the media coverage in their respective countries to explore how culture influences perceptions of events and how the framing of such events varies in the media. Craig had already included a media unit in his course during the time we selected for our collaboration, so we used that as the foundation for determining the scope of the assignments. Having to reconcile expected differences in the framing of these events provided an opportunity for students to think critically about culture, information, and perceptions of different audiences. Students were then required to participate in group video chats, which allowed them to experience the challenges of collaborating across time zones,

to determine their topics. The projects ranged from analyses of a Russian hacking scandal to the Crimean referendum. The topics students chose, like the hacking scandal, often related to their disciplinary interests and allowed them to further practice writing about the concerns within their academic disciplines in an international context.

After meeting again to describe their media sources to one another and conduct analyses, the groups produced Prezi presentations that followed the outline stipulated on the assignment sheet. Because our courses met at such different times, the students then presented the Prezis to their own classmates at the end of the project.

**Reflection.** After completing the collaborative project, students were assigned to write individual reflections on their experiences. The assignment asked students to identify their expectations prior to the collaboration; to evaluate their collaboration, their role in the group and their own learning; to synthesize the experience with theories from the course; and to analyze how the experience might influence future international collaborations. Not only did these reflections give students an opportunity to make meaning from their experience and consider how to transfer their learning to new contexts, but it also gave us, as instructors, a way to assess student learning—an assessment that we provide in the following section.

### **Challenges of Globalizing a Course**

As instructors, we identified three primary challenges with this assignment. First, there were several logistical challenges to planning it. For example, Nazarbayev University operates on a traditional semester schedule while Rose-Hulman operates on the quarter system. So, the Rose-Hulman students were only midway through the course—and through the supporting theoretical material—when they began the assignment. In contrast, the Nazarbayev University students had nearly completed the course but were also preparing to take finals and experiencing the stress that comes at the end of a semester. We also faced logistical challenges related to class size; the Rose-Hulman course had 18 students while the Nazarbayev University course had over forty, which resulted in uneven group sizes.

Second, the question of how to assess student work presented a challenge. The students were working together in groups, but we determined it was not feasible—in part because of our different timelines and course backgrounds—to assess the group work together and assign a single grade. Thus, we each graded our own students' work. While this approach made it easier for us as instructors (and probably reassured our students to some extent because an unknown instructor would not be assessing them), it was also somewhat antithetical to a true collaboration among the students as it removed some of the ability to identify a shared goal.

Finally, time was a major challenge. We ended up completing the assignment in approximately three weeks. While students certainly benefitted from the project, we can also identify several ways that a longer project would have enhanced their collaboration. From the perspective of the Rose-Hulman students, they would have benefitted from more time learning about Kazakhstan. While the Nazarbayev University students had been exposed to American popular culture, media, and had several American professors from whom they had taken classes at their university, most of the Rose-Hulman students could not identify Kazakhstan on a map. Part way through the project, it became evident the Rose-Hulman students also had very little knowledge about Soviet times, the Cold War, and post-Soviet politics, all of which might have enhanced their understanding of the project. Additionally, if

we had more time to complete the project, the students could have gotten to know—and to work with—both instructors, which would have furthered their opportunities for guidance and collaboration during the project and might have opened up alternative assessment strategies. As it was, we were able to assess students' work and learning outcomes only after the conclusion of the course.

### **Student Outcomes**

The project succeeded in exposing students to and requiring collaboration with members of a significantly different culture than their own. While each of us had been teaching fairly homogenous groups of students at our respective institutions, even students from more diverse programs may take their interactions for granted because they happen within a single institution. Here, the cross-institutional, international experience directs students' attention to potential similarities and differences that they might otherwise ignore in a day-to-day setting. These interactions between students brought out a variety of learning opportunities and reflections that are worth noting. Using the student reflections as our source for assessing the outcomes of this project, we found key themes surrounding their critical thinking and perceptions of globalization.

**Globalization.** With regards to globalization, the strongest themes that appeared in student reports were the assumptions students in each culture made about the others, how stereotypes were both challenged and reinforced, and how cultural group boundaries remained salient throughout the entire project.

Many of the assumptions made by Nazarbayev University students regarding their Rose-Hulman partners prior to the start of collaborations centered around the cultural notion they learned of individualism and collectivism (Gudykunst et al., 1996). Nazarbayev University students self-identified as collectivists and had learned in this course as well as through media portrayals that the United States is a highly individualist culture. What individualism meant, however, varied among these Nazarbayev University students, and their assumptions revealed their misunderstandings.

Individualism was assumed by many of the Nazarbayev University students to mean that their American counterparts would be selfish, not care about family (or anyone else for that matter), and be difficult to work with in groups since as individualists they would presumably want to do everything on their own. The salience of individualism was in part reinforced by the Rose-Hulman students' photo stories. The Nazarbayev University students reported in general that they felt the Rose-Hulman students' stories were more about them as individuals rather than about American culture whereas the Nazarbayev University students felt a responsibility to represent their culture more than themselves as individuals to an outside group that was unfamiliar with their region of the world.

Assumptions and stereotypes were both challenged and reinforced by the experiences of students from both institutions throughout the process of this project. The misconceptions of individualism that Nazarbayev University students held were pleasantly changed as most reported positive experiences working in groups with Rose-Hulman students. Many Nazarbayev University students were surprised to see photos of family members in the Rose-Hulman students' photo stories, challenging the assumption that Americans would not care about or be as close to their families as Kazakhs are. Some Nazarbayev University students even changed their impressions of their own culture, finding that their culture was more diverse than they had supposed and that some of their own

classmates were quite hardworking and responsible, which was a contradiction to the common characterization of Kazakhs as being lazy.

Not all assumptions were challenged, however, as many Rose-Hulman students reported gender inequality in their Kazakh group members' interactions, as they had expected to see due to assigned readings about Kazakh culture and the students' photo stories. Furthermore, the Rose-Hulman students reported more on the aspects of a collectivist culture they observed in the communication of their Nazarbayev University group members, such as conflict avoidance and being more relationally-oriented rather than task-oriented. Sometimes these differences were not necessarily labeled as cultural differences but were still reported as obstacles, if not annoyances. The expression of frustration that every email need not begin with asking the group member if he or she is doing well before getting to the task at hand was a common example.

Even when assumptions and stereotypes were challenged, the salience of cultural differences between the students remained high, even in the more cohesive collaborations. Because they come from a collectivist culture, it is not a surprise that the Nazarbayev University students were more concerned with face saving than were their Rose-Hulman group members (Ting-Toomey, 2005). They were conscious of the fact that they were representing their lesser-known culture to outsiders, and some reported even fearing the negative stereotypes they assumed Americans would hold of them for being from a post-Soviet country. This consciousness of a collective identity at times impeded group cohesion, as some Rose-Hulman students reported the feeling of a strong division within the group along cultural and linguistic lines. It seemed to them that the Nazarbayev University group members were conversing outside of the group's scheduled meetings, thus making it seem like an "us vs. them" type of situation. However, in groups where Nazarbayev University students conversed in their native languages in front of their Rose-Hulman group members, in order to ensure understanding amongst themselves, the Rose-Hulman students were satisfied and saw this as an effective means of communication rather than as suspicious and divisive.

**Critical Thinking.** Collaborating with members of another culture also gave these students opportunities to think critically by addressing a global topic from different perspectives but also by exploring and attempting to understand one another's culture and even their own. Many of the groups chose topics in the media that included differing cultural histories and perspectives, such as the Boston Marathon bombing or the conflict in Crimea between Russia and Ukraine. While this may have led to the high level of salience of cultural group membership throughout the project, it also forced these students to directly confront their cultural differences, in addition to the differences in media portrayals of global events.

Both Nazarbayev University and Rose-Hulman students reported being surprised by how different media sources in their respective countries framed these events, which provided the opportunity to not only see from different perspectives but to make sense of such differences through cultural and historical lenses. These students could not, therefore, take the information sources provided about their event at face value, and neither could they simply choose a side. These students were exposed to how information is framed with particular foci, assumptions, and even political agendas. As a result, they reported they will now be more critical in their consumption of media, particularly when it involves multiple cultural or political parties.

Additionally, these students were faced with logistical challenges and had to find ways to overcome them as they collaborated with their international counterparts. Students reported using a variety of mediums, including video chatting via Skype, texting via WhatsApp, email, and social media. The 11-hour time difference was a challenge when synchronous communication was required, but most groups managed to find times to meet. However, there were technological problems that provided ample frustration for some groups, especially the students from Nazarbayev University who experienced intermittent connections with Prezi.

Overall, students from both institutions seemed to be proud of the work they accomplished, given the unique challenges of this project. Not only did they overcome cultural barriers but they did it with the additional challenges of collaboration in virtual space. Many stereotypes were contested and even eliminated due to the positive interactions that took place among members of different cultural groups. However, other stereotypes and misunderstandings did prevail. It was still easy to generalize observations made of others in this project to all members of that cultural group, and sometimes old stereotypes were simply replaced with new ones. When cultural group salience is high, it is often difficult for participants to separate out the cultural influences from what is due to personality differences. They know that their cultures are significantly different, so culture becomes all they see in determining and explaining differences.

### **Implications and Conclusions**

As their reflections demonstrate, students both became more aware of the ways that cultural differences influence collaboration and were forced to think critically about stereotypes they held and the ways to move a project forward despite the challenges presented by a global context. However, one way this project could be improved would be to share with each group the themes of the other's reflections in order to help them see a different cultural perspective regarding their interactions. This addition could enhance the learning of other cultural values and how they influence not only behaviors but reflections on interactions. This may provide the opportunity to address stereotyping and generalizations still being made, and it would also allow students to peer even more into how interpretations and meanings made by others in the same situation can nevertheless vary from their own.

The project also revealed that critical thinking does not occur in a vacuum. Even the best designed projects are subject to variables that limit students' engagement. When conditions were favorable and group cohesion was present, it seems that students were more open to thinking critically by seeing things from a new perspective. However, when frustrations and distrust tainted group work and interactions, students from both Nazarbayev University and from Rose-Hulman seemed less inclined to entertain different perspectives and simply wanted to finish the project as quickly and as painlessly as possible.

It has already been clearly documented that trust influences the success of both virtual and multicultural teams (Brewer, 2015; Sarker, 2005; Suchan & Hayzak, 2001). Our findings suggest that trust is also an integral component for learning to occur in these teams. Thinking critically about cultural difference requires engaging with those differences, expressing one's own values, and showing a willingness to develop strategies to overcome global and technological challenges. In other words, students must make themselves vulnerable and be willing to take risks—behaviors that require trust. Spending more time

building trust across cultural groups at the beginning of the project should be seen as an investment in opportunities for critical thinking at later stages of the project—thinking that will prepare students to be flexible practitioners capable of adapting to changing global and technological landscapes.

## References

- ABET (2015). Criteria for accrediting engineering programs: Effective for reviews during the 2016–2017 accreditation cycle. Retrieved from <http://www.abet.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/E001-16-17-EAC-Criteria-10-20-15.pdf>
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (2010). Critical thinking VALUE rubric. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/critical-thinking>
- Brewer, P. E. (2015). *International virtual teams: Engineering global success*. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE Press.
- Burkhalter, N., & Shegebayev, M. R. (2012). Critical thinking as culture: Teaching post-Soviet teachers in Kazakhstan. *International Review of Education*, 58(1), 55–72.
- The Economist Intelligence Unit (2009). Managing virtual teams: Taking a more strategic approach. Retrieved from [http://graphics.eiu.com/upload/eb/NEC\\_Managing\\_virtual\\_teams WEB.pdf](http://graphics.eiu.com/upload/eb/NEC_Managing_virtual_teams_WEB.pdf)
- Emerson, L. (2014). Enculturation in STEM. *Double Helix*, 2, 1–4.
- Erwin, C. O., & Zappile, T. M. (2013). Organizational response to a university writing initiative: Writing in the disciplines (WID) in an interdisciplinary department. *Double Helix*, 1, 1–19.
- Falkenheim, J., & Kannankutty, N. (2012). International collaborations of scientists and engineers in the United States. *Info Brief: National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics*, 12, 1–7. Retrieved from <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/infbrief/nsf12323/nsf12323.pdf>
- Gudykunst, W. B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., Kim, K., & Heyman, S. (1996). The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human Communication Research*, 22(4), 510–543.
- National Academy of Engineering (2004). *The engineer of 2020: Visions of engineering in the new century*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.
- Sarker, S. (2005). Knowledge transfer and collaboration in distributed U.S.-Thai teams. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10(4), n.p.
- Suchan, J., & Hayzak, G. (2001). The communication characteristics of virtual teams: A case study. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 44(4), 174–186.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). An updated face-negotiation theory. In W. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 71–92). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

## Appendix

### Collaborative Multimedia Assignment Sheet

#### Overview

You've been studying theories of intercultural communication, and now it's time to put them into practice. In small teams of students from both [U.S. Institution] (USA) and Nazarbayev University (Kazakhstan), you will research, create, and reflect on a multimedia assignment that analyzes popular media in both the US and Kazakhstan.

#### Objectives

At the end of this project, students should be able to

- collaborate effectively with students from a different cultural and linguistic background
- identify the challenges of and specific strategies for intercultural collaboration
- explain the way that cultural values influence intercultural communication
- articulate differences in media representations in the US and Kazakhstan
- create multimedia projects that appeal to audiences in both the US and Kazakhstan

#### Requirements

This assignment has three components: an individual photo story and reflective memo; a group Prezi; and an individual reflection on the project.

#### Photo Story and Reflection

Using Prezi, you will create a photo story to introduce yourself to your teammates. Select five to seven photos that reflect your culture, values, and background. The most successful photo stories will draw on class discussions of cultural identity and values. After sending your photo story and viewing the photo stories of your teammates, you will write a 1 page, single-spaced memo to your instructor that answers the following questions

- What did you try to convey about yourself in your photo story? Why did you choose those aspects?
- How did you try to convey those things?
- What did you learn from your teammates' photo stories?
- What were your preconceptions going into this project? How have those been reinforced or changed by this assignment?

The strongest reflections will draw on specific examples from the writer's and the writer's teammates' photo stories as well as use appropriate terms and theories from class.

#### Media Analysis Prezi

In your intercultural groups you will perform a media analysis of a current event in order to explore how culture influences perceptions of events and how the framing of such events varies in the media. You are required to video chat as an entire group at two separate stages of this project.

#### *Stage 1: Brainstorming video chat*

As a group, meet through a video chat to brainstorm and choose a recent (within the last 6 months) international event involving at least two different cultural groups. The event

must have received (or is currently receiving) media coverage from both U.S. and Kazakhstan based media organizations.

Post your topic to the Google Doc as soon as your group has chosen an event since no two groups may choose the same event. This analysis will be presented visually as a Prezi presentation. As such you should choose an event that permits an analysis inclusive of imagery.

Next, research the event itself, the cultural groups involved, and the major issues surrounding the event. Find sources from both the U.S. and Kazakhstan that cover the event. Group members from [US Institution] should find sources from the U.S. and Nazarbayev University group members should find sources from Kazakhstan media (sources from Kazakhstan can be in Russian or Kazakh as well, but you will need to explain them to your American group members). Be sure to choose credible sources that reach a significant portion of the population of the respective country.

*Stage 2: Sharing and Comparison video chat*

Meet as a group again through video chat to share the sources and discuss the ways in which each source frames the international event. Your group should use in total at least five sources from the U.S. and five from Kazakhstan. Identify differences in emphasis, focus, explanation, and cause and effect relationships among the different sources. Compare those of the U.S. and Kazakhstan, and choose 2 to 3 main ways in which the sources appear to be different. Discuss the implications or possible outcomes of such differences in the media's coverage of such an event. Decide how the presentation will be done and what each group member's responsibilities are.

The presentation should include the following sections:

*Introduction:* Briefly introduce the event you have chosen, the main focus of your analysis, and give a preview of the rest of your presentation. You may want to introduce your group members as well.

*The event:* Describe the event from *as objective of a perspective as you can*. This section sets the stage for your analysis and implications sections. Be sure to give your audience the information it needs to understand your analysis.

*Analysis:* Identify differences in the sources from each country. What is the main focus of each media source? What are the predominate messages in the framing of the event? How are the different cultural groups described? How are they compared to each other? What are the cultural and/or historical influences contributing to these differences?

*Implications:* After identifying these differences, discuss in your groups the implications of these differences. What do these differences *do*? What impressions might they have on their respective audiences? Are stereotypes being maintained, promoted, or challenged? Will American and Kazakhstani audiences be influenced by the media's framing of the event in their perceptions of the cultural groups involved?

*Conclusion:* Briefly summarize your presentation. Include take-away points you want your audience to remember.

*Sources:* Be sure to cite your sources throughout your presentation. Use hyperlinks for online sources where appropriate.

### Project Reflection

At the conclusion of the project, you will write an individual reflection on your collaboration. This three-page essay should address some of the following questions:

- What ideas did you have about intercultural collaboration before you began this project? How were they reinforced or changed throughout the project?
- What strategies did you use to collaborate and to manage logistical challenges? What were the differences between types of collaboration (i.e., collaborating via email vs. via video?)
- How would you describe your role in the group? To what extent does your role align with your own understanding of your cultural identity and cultural values?
- What did you observe from others in the group? How do those observations align with your understanding of your teammates' cultural identities or values?
- When, during the project, do you feel like concepts from the course were verified or reinforced? When did your group disrupt or behave counter to the theories we've read?
- What were the biggest challenges with your group? How did you handle them?
- What about your group are you most satisfied with or proud of? Why?
- What parts of this experience would you try to recreate in future intercultural collaborations? What would you try to do differently?

The strongest reflections will describe and analyze specific examples from the project experience and use course terms and theories consistently and accurately.

### **Assessment and Timeline**

Your projects will be assessed by your individual instructor using the attached rubrics.

Thursday, April 16: Photo Essay Due **by 8 a.m.**

Monday, April 20: Photo Essay Reflection Due

Friday, April 24: Group Project Planning Worksheet Due

Thursday, April 30: Group Media Analysis Prezi Due

Friday, May 1: Project Reflection Draft Due (Peer Review)

Monday, May 4: Final Project Reflection Due