

7-2010

Wild Pansies, Trojan Horses, and Others: International Teaching and Learning as Bricolage

David B. Starr-Glass

Empire State College, SUNY, david.starr-glass@esc.edu

Recommended Citation

Starr-Glass, David B. (2010) "Wild Pansies, Trojan Horses, and Others: International Teaching and Learning as Bricolage," *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*: Vol. 4: No. 2, Article 24.
Available at: <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2010.040224>

Wild Pansies, Trojan Horses, and Others: International Teaching and Learning as Bricolage

Abstract

Educational change, predictable or unanticipated, occurs when student populations are altered. When an American college started an international program in Prague, it was anticipated that educational practice would change. To understand the implications for teaching, learning, and practice mentors explored the new educational landscape. The concept of bricolage informed much of that exploration and this paper considers bricolage, summarizes research outcomes, and reflects on the opportunity and ethics of engagement with Other.

Keywords

International, Education, Bricolage, Change, Others

Creative Commons License

Creative

Commons

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0](#)

Attribution-

Noncommercial-

No

Derivative

Works

4.0

License

Wild Pansies, Trojan Horses, and Others: International Teaching and Learning as *Bricolage*

David Starr-Glass

Center for International Programs
Empire State College State
University of New York
David.Starr-Glass@esc.edu

Abstract

Educational change, predictable or unanticipated, occurs when student populations are altered. When an American college started an international program in Prague, it was anticipated that educational practice would change. To understand the implications for teaching, learning, and practice mentors explored the new educational landscape. The concept of *bricolage* informed much of that exploration and this paper considers *bricolage*, summarizes research outcomes, and reflects on the opportunity and ethics of engagement with Other.

Keywords: International, Education, Bricolage, Change, Others

Introduction

This paper considers personal experience and exploration associated with a new venture in higher education. The venue is Prague, Czech Republic, and the institutional players are a local private university and the International Program of an accredited American college. Some American faculty and administrators regarded this international venture as simply a spatial displacement: a change of location, not a change of approaches towards learning or teaching. Other, however, realized that any significant change in student populations inevitably triggers a reappraisal of teaching methodology and learning approaches: what has been done, what has been accepted, and what might be done to produce more effective learning environments might all change.

Confronted with an international setting and international students, an attempt was made to better understand learning experiences and educational encounters. This attempt at 'sensemaking' (Weicke, 1995) is ongoing and evolving, and is best understood in terms of journey, exploration, and discovery. The first section of this paper discusses the inevitability of changed perspective and practice when educational systems accommodate increased social representation and diversity. For some, this might seem self-evident; however, the point is stressed because explorations are not initiated until there is a realization that there has been a change in the educational landscape. The second section sketches the new teaching and learning context. This is followed by an introduction to the concept of *bricolage* and explains why it can serve as a means of exploring new learning and mentoring landscapes. The fourth section briefly reviews some of the outcomes, in terms of contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning, which resulted from these explorations. The concluding section reflects on the experience of using *bricolage* and

discussed this approach in terms of boundary-work, encounter with students, and the recognition of the Other in teaching practice.

Change in Educational Practice and Trojan Horses

Change in educational systems can produce unanticipated consequences. Often the repercussions simply go unheeded or are considered inconsequential. In many cases, however, structural change results in altered perspectives, implies different ways of regarding prior instructional methods, or suggests new educational practice. To illustrate the consequences of change we briefly consider experiences gained when a conscious attempt was made to enhance social equity and increase social inclusion in higher educational institutions in South Africa. In this case, a changed practice resulted in a changed student population that, in turn, led to unanticipated institutional tensions and subsequent adjustments. The changed practice was the adoption of RPL (recognition of prior learning), which allowed prior experiential and informal learning to satisfy formal requirements of vocational colleges and institutions of higher education. Consideration and inclusion of prior experiential learning is now widely practiced in higher education. While underpinning philosophy and methodology are similar, terminology varies nationally: APEL (assessment of prior experiential learning, in the U.K.); PLA (prior learning assessment, in the U.S.); and PLAR (prior learning and assessment and recognition, in Canada).

RPL philosophy and practice reveals and legitimizes ways of knowing obtained in other than formal settings. It provides entry into the worlds of academic learning and vocational training for those who would previously not have been able to gain entry. Considering its position in South African vocational and higher educational programs, Judy Harris (1999) wrote what is now accepted as an exceptionally perceptive and influential paper. There, she 'position[s] RPL within the changing socio-economic and cultural conditions of late-, or post-modernity and see it as a social practice rather than a set of seemingly innocent and benevolent procedures (p. 124).'

Harris (1999) considers RPL primarily as social practice, not an educational one, designed and implemented to increase social diversity within higher education. RPL recognized the legitimacy of prior experiential learning and extended inclusion to those who had previously been outside formal institutions of learning. Increased inclusion brought greater diversity within the student population in social and racial terms, and also in terms of different understandings of knowledge acquisition. Visibility and awareness of those previously excluded result in a reconsideration and change in discourse and practice. Harris considers that the extent to which reappraisal is likely to occur depends on a number of variables and offers a typology of anticipated impact. Critical factors for change include the nature and traditions of the academic discipline involved and the degree to which the institution possesses a history of curriculum change (Harris, 1999).

It was suggested that RPL would have least impact in scenarios where the power and privilege of incumbent academic communities mute, filter, or re-script incoming experiences and dialogues. Here, status quo perspectives results in a 'reinscription of dominant discourses', in which difference and diversity are considered and reconciled with existing practice (Andersson & Fejes, 2005; Andersson, Fejes & Ahn, 2004), or are reinterpreted according to a persistent and dominant discourse (Peters, 2005). In other scenarios, however, exposure to an altered student population leads to a considerable and

fundamental 'challenge of dominant discourse'. Harris (1999) terms this a 'Radical' outcome.

In yet another scenario, educational institutions may demonstrate more 'engagement with mainstream curriculum design and pedagogy' and are capable of appreciating 'diversity and divergence of knowledge recognized and power relations' (Harris, 1999, Figure 1). In this scenario, conditions present in the educational institution lead to a 'critique of dominant discourses', in which the impact of change results in the reconsideration of previously dominant discourses and practices (Harris, 2000a; 2000b; Volbrecht, 2009). In her typography, Judy Harris calls this outcome the 'Trojan Horse'.

The Trojan Horse arrives as the unanticipated gift when there is a significant change in student population and dynamics. Administrators and faculty think they were dealing with a simple structure designed to serve a given purpose; however, the structure has a hidden interiority that is neither recognized nor obvious. In time, the 'trapdoor' opens and content is released. Change results in a catenation of consequences that have a significant impact on the educational system and the way that it functions. Unlike Homeric or viral versions, the Trojan Horse associated with changes in educational contexts often serves to challenge, invigorate, and stimulate reconsideration and innovation within the academy and its community of learning.

Shifting to an International Context

Several years ago an American college formed an educational alliance with private college in Prague. Through an articulation agreement, local students graduate with an American baccalaureate degree after completing four years of study. Education is provided *in situ* by the Czech partner with curriculum control and instructional oversight maintained by the American college. The language of instruction is English. Twenty-five percent of credits required to graduate are taught directly by the American college, using locally hired adjuncts and visiting faculty from America. Visiting faculty, who function as mentors, work with senior students to design and complete an undergraduate dissertation, which is regarded as the capstone experience of a degree program. The majority of students are Czech, although there is a significant Slovak minority. Increasingly, as the value and quality of the program spreads, students are drawn from Central, Eastern, and Southeastern Europe, from Russia, and from former USSR satellite countries of Central Asia (particularly Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan).

Visiting mentors posed two questions. The first: Was a shift to an international context was simply an extension of the America college into new territory? For those who considered such transitions as being more culturally complex, the other question was: Would the venture increase diversity to the extent that a critique of dominant discourse of educational practice was called for? In other words, was international faculty dealing with a simple structural change or a Trojan Horse?

There are different thresholds of change perception. Some international faculty saw teaching and learning in Prague as essentially the same as it was in America. The language in the classroom (if not the language in the corridors) was the same; the curriculum was the same; students certainly looked more or less the same. The scenery was altered but, they argued, the change of venue did not infer a change in approach: the status quo prevailed.

But things had indeed changed, and not just the scenery. Education and learning is embedded in a socio-cultural matrix. Students were 'strangers', not in the sense of being unfamiliar to us but in representing an 'otherness' of which we were unaware. The changed nature of our interactions with students was accentuated because the epistemological model employed was constructivism and the college mode of engagement was mentoring: both require attention to the student as an authentic, thinking person.

As a process, mentoring has a great deal of variability; as a strategy it a range of differing outcomes (Pawson, 2004). The mentoring approach used within the college focused on an active, dialogic relationship, and the co-creation of meaning (Herman & Mandell, 2004). In mentoring relationship relational distance, communication clarity, and cultural difference all have to be carefully negotiated. Mentoring is located within an awareness of political, social, and cultural processes. Appropriate mentoring changes as more is understood and shared about the dynamics of learning. It also changes when social and cultural boundaries shift. It seemed clear to most: mentoring in an international context would bring about changes.

Bricolage: Wild Pansies, Savage Minds, and Discovery

Levi-Strauss (1974) considers there are two ways of conceptualizing and engaging in the world. The first might be loosely termed 'engineering'. When an engineer wishes to create something, she begins by reviewing purpose, component parts, properties of materials, technology requirements and limitations, etc. She envisages the problems, conducts research, and produces a plan that incorporates expressions of both conceptual and physical design. She selects suitable material, applies appropriate technologies, and completes the prototype. She deals with a world of abstraction in order to categorize properties, relationships, and ideas. She manipulates abstractions to inform design and production objectives.

An alternative approach considers objects as concrete and uniquely distinct: they have a history, a place, and a constructed reality. Properties of objects and their relationships are not abstracted; they are implied by similarity, analogy, homologies, association, dialectic contrasts, and contradictions. This is the approach of the *bricoleur*, who is in some ways a craftsman, artisan, and a fixer. He creates by reviewing what is available and seeing how this could be rigged together to provide more or less what he intends. Available and familiar materials are used because other options are presently unknown. *Bricolage* provides solutions and explanations from experiential knowledge. The *bricoleur* assembles material, making do with what is available and with what has been discovered. He following a course of action dictated by accumulated experience and active intuition. The *bricoleur* collects things that might be useful and seeks 'to make do with whatever is at hand' (Levi-Strauss, 1974, p.17). He recognizes that the same thing can be used in different ways to solve different problems. He is skillful and ingenious but constrained by experience, necessity, and availability: 'The *bricoleur's* creativity is limited creativity' (Hatton, 1988, P. 339)

The engineer and *bricoleur* approach the world in different ways with different understandings of innovation. The *bricoleur* may have limited originality but possess a rich inventory of associations, skills, knowledge, and experience. While not governed by an abstract theory-of-knowledge, the *bricoleur* does have an insightful theory-of-action. The distinction between engineer and *bricoleur* is not one of sophistication or intelligence; rather, it is one of world understanding and reliance on abstraction. The engineer is within a body of knowledge and also bounded by that body. She employs a way of thinking and discovering that is privileged in Western cultures. The *bricoleur* lives on the edges and in the

spaces between these abstract bodies of knowledge, often suspicious of them and their gap from the world he sees as a world of action. *Bricolage* as a mode knowledge-in-action has found expression, and provided value, in many areas of practice where a simple theory could not solve complex problems. Inevitably these areas involve the engagement of people in social systems: theological and monastic engagement (Herron, 2006), teaching and teacher training (Hatton, 1988; Reilly, 2009), and changing institutional contexts in and business education (Rynes & Trank, 1999).

Somewhat disingenuously, the title of Levi-Strauss' book (*La Pensée Sauvage*, 1974) was translated as *The Savage Mind*. This might suggest a crudeness of disposition; it also fails to capture the intended pun. Levi-Strauss, himself, is said to have favored *Pansies for Thought*, referring to Ophelia' ('And there is pansies, that for thoughts', Hamlet IV, v). Another translation might be *The Wild Pansy*. *Bricolage* accentuates experience, intuition, and pragmatism in complex situations. It privileges a heuristic rather than rationalist logic; adventurous synthesis rather than detailed analysis; and a deep range of experiential learning rather than cognition.

Trapdoors, Changed Perspectives, and New Opportunities

Barnes (1992) reviewed the gap between intended and enacted in a curriculum in English language education. He argued that a disjunction between what was intended and what was enacted does not necessarily result from communication problems or misunderstandings. Instead, he claimed, there is a real difference between a curriculum designed to produce Standard English speakers and practice that recognizes richness and appreciates diversity of student language (Kostogriz & Doeke, 2008). Disjunction between an imposed theory and the instructor's practice is not necessarily dysfunctional or inappropriate. It can, instead, serve as the starting point for creating new approaches for students and opening up 'opportunities for engaging students in far richer experiences than those mapped out by any formal curriculum' (Kostogriz & Doeke, 2008, p. 260).

The mentor, as *bricoleur*, generates a theory-of-action by using prior skill and artfulness to engage in mentoring relationships. In Prague, this meant working with students to select a viable research question and initiating, supporting, and sustaining the writing of the student's undergraduate dissertation. A mentor engaging in this process often notices a mismatch in what was intended (based on prior experience) and what is enacted (based on present understanding). Initially, the mentor may have an explicit theory of mentoring (an 'engineering plan', as it was); however, discrepancies and gaps may be noticed between that mentoring theory and mentoring-in-action. The mentor, as *bricoleur*, rearranges pieces and parts to make the mentoring engagement successful and effective: a pragmatic effort. Later the mentor, as a scholar of teaching and learning, might reflect on the *bricolage* that was done not only to develop a richer inventory of experience but to reconsider underlying theory and knowledge: a learning effort.

The move to an international setting in Prague provided exciting opportunities to compare prior practice with the required adjustments in practice in order to realign the mentoring process. The disjunction between intended and enacted practice revealed opportunities to engage more richly and authentically with students in learning experiences and in the co-creation of knowledge. Differences sometimes centered on the uniqueness of the international students as learners shaped and primed by their prior social and cultural experiences. Sometimes, they revolved around communication issues; on student perceptions of what educational and teaching should be about; on assumed relationships

and voices that student and mentor should adopt; on division of work, responsibilities, and obligations; and on assumptions that both students and mentors each brought to the learning experience.

In reflecting on difference, the mentor was sometimes able to reconcile new experience with old ones, often by enlarging or reconsidering theory. Frequently these explorations produced, through reflection and consideration, academic work that might be added to the growing body of teaching and learning scholarship. In these cases, the mentor as *bricoleur* was mindful that a comprehensive theory of knowledge situated within this international context was neither available nor possible. The motivating factor was to clarify issues, yet the most valuable aspect was buttressing the mentor's experiential learning and in informing subsequent practice. Some of the issues explored are listed below.

- ***Mentoring at a distance.*** The traditional model within the American college was face-to-face mentoring. Logistical and budgetary constraints made this impossible in the international setting. There was reliance on a hybrid approach in which mentors made several visits to Prague to initiate, and conclude, work and remaining in a mentoring relationship with students between visits through online technology. Spatial displacement, asynchronous communication, and the difference between this and previous mentoring practice stimulated thought on the dynamics, assumption, and effectiveness of mentoring-at-a-distance (Starr-Glass, 2005).
- ***Curriculum paradigms.*** The mentoring engagement discussed in this paper relates work in management, marketing, and human resource management. The intended curriculum was devised and approved by the American college. Exposure to the economic and business characteristics of Central Europe, however, suggested that value could be added to learning experiences by considering local business, organizational, and economic perspectives. These inclusions did not supplant the intended and authorized curriculum. Instead, they provided a richness of insight and experiences that resonated with students. The enacted curriculum emphasized, to students and faculty alike, the value of using different academic approaches, socio-economic histories, and disciplinary traditions to address common underlying problems. A critique of dominant assumptions and discourses in management education was suggested by encountering the difference of European models (Starr-Glass, 2009a).
- ***The experience of work.*** In a business degree an appreciation of experience of work, and organizational involvement, is critical. Of equal importance were the ways that our international student used their business training and competencies to tackle real-world organizational problems. A valuable vehicle for exploring these issues was the supervised internship, in which students completed their capstone experience by working for a semester in a local business organization. As part of the experience students maintained a reflective journal, identifying new situations and considering new experiences encountered in the workplace. An analysis of these experiences provided much insight into the assumptions, considerations, and relationships that student considered valuable. This provided an understanding of the communities of practice in which students worked or to which they aspired. Supervised internships and reflective writings provided a window into student thoughts and understanding of work and career (Starr-Glass, 2006a).
- ***Other educational traditions.*** Students by enrolling in the program had opted for an 'American approach' to education, yet their understandings and positions about

the educational process were shaped by local considerations and traditions. These often figured as a subtle background but often had a marked influence on the learning process. One striking example was when, in addition to obtaining their American degree, students had the option of obtaining a second Czech degree. As part of the process for obtaining this second degree, students submitted their undergraduate dissertation for a separate evaluation by the appropriate Czech educational authorities. This posed multiple questions of assessment approaches, educational goals, and underlying learning paradigms. The mentor, as *bricoleur*, provided components and structures that allow this second degree to be earned. As reflective *bricoleur*, the mentor also examined this process to produce a clearer, more informed theory-in-action for future mentoring and external assessment success (Starr-Glass & Ali, in press).

These outcomes represent adventures in the *bricolage* and scholarship of teaching and learning. They tried to discover a richer, more nuanced, way of engaging in effective mentoring and productive learning experiences. These adventures centered on our community of mentors, on our students, and on practice. They contributed to the micro-, or task, environment of engagement. A second set of explorations targeted the institution and the larger non-international community of learning: the macro-environment in which we were situated.

Organizationally, the international program was a separate division of the college. This organizational structure served as a barrier to the communication of lessons learned and discoveries made in our international practice. Given our expanded opportunities for reflection and reconsideration, it seemed likely that the larger college-wide community could also benefit, albeit vicariously, from our experiences.

The second set of outcomes involved communicating with our larger college-wide community, sharing discoveries and explorations, and making these available for comment and reflection. This resulted in publications in the college's mentoring journal. The objective was to challenge and stimulate re-appraisal of practice and to explore whether international lessons learned could be applied in an (American) environment that has a strong tradition of internationalization resulting from the inclusion of foreign students on domestic campuses. These papers included:

- Experience and perspectives in working with distanced students through creating and sustaining social networks (Starr-Glass, 2006b)
- A consideration of the dynamics of mentoring dialogues with 'others' using a Bakhtinian analysis (Starr-Glass, 2008a)
- Educational opportunities and learning possibilities in international contexts (Starr-Glass, 2008b)
- International communication and sensemaking considerations in transnational educational ventures (Starr-Glass, 2009b).
- Using the concept of 'strangerhood' in engagement with international students (Starr-Glass, in press)

Discussion: What was learned?

The scholarship of teaching and learning has come to mean different things to different people. An all-encompassing definition has still to evolve, as are the practices that shape the discipline (Witman & Richlin, 2007). A critical aspect of this scholarship is the deeper consideration of underlying theories that underpin learning experiences, educational encounters, and instructional practice. Sometimes, it is unclear which theories are to be invoked or relied upon. In other situations there might be no compelling and convincing theory; or existing theories might be considered inapplicable; or the practitioner cannot construct a theory congruent with the presenting situation. In these cases, scholarship is better described as an informed exploration rather than a display of erudition.

There are many ways in which educators approach the exploration of their disciplines and practice, including reflective practice, action research, and phenomenological research (Finlay, 2008). *Bricolage* is suggested here as one possible way of understanding the position of the investigator and the nature of the exploration. The *bricoleur* is not simply a 'fixer' who uses available bits and pieces in a crude or mindless way. Rather, the *bricoleur* explores through approximations, expediencies, and a reflection on results.

Approximations and expediencies ensure that a satisfactory learning environment is maintained for those engaged in the process. Adjustments and modifications are suggested by the *bricoleur's* experience and past practice. Reflection on adjustment does not necessarily lead to a comprehensive overarching theory; however, it does allow the *bricoleur* both the space and the opportunity to refine practice and consider why prior experience does not work in the present situation. An appreciation of the gaps and disjunctions encourages mapping of relationships, similarities, and contradictions. The 'engineer' might embrace theory and disciplinary orthodoxy; the *bricoleur* is neither unduly burdened nor constrained by them. The *bricoleur* 'understands that the frontiers of knowledge-work rest in the liminal zones where disciplines collide...in the deep interdisciplinarity of the bricolage, researchers learn to engage in a form of boundary work' (Kincheloe, 2001: 689). Referring back to the intended subtlety of Levi-Strauss' (1974) title, the *bricoleur* moves beyond the boundary of the garden, beyond the limits of the horticulturalist's domain, and gathers wild pansies – pansies for consideration, pansies for thought.

A central feature of explorations undertaken in our international context was the encounter and dialogue with those recognized, but not dismissively labeled, as Other. Students are central to the learning experience; co-participants are needed for a successful mentoring engagement. Opening the trapdoor of the Trojan Horse to find out what was hidden within can only come about by recognizing, empowering, and listening to the voice of the Other. The trapdoor opened onto the experiences and perspectives of students who came from unknown backgrounds and cultural landscapes. Recognizing Other and entering into dialogue with them 'is to be immersed in the discursive space where the self becomes responsive and answerable when face to face with alterity' (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007: 13).

The interaction between mentor and other participants in the mentoring process, and especially with those recognized and empowered as Other, has suggested the need for an ethical framework for discourses. In considering dialogical ethics, Kostogriz and Doecke (2007) recognize that the professional obligation of the educator 'consists in responding to the call of the Other and it exceeds the teacher's pretension to mastery' (p. 16). They also suggest that 'it is this sense of obligation to the future, as distinct from simply doing

something in the present, that finds its clearest enactment in the dialogic ethic of teaching to difference' (p. 15).

The teacher, as *bricoleur*, must become the perpetual learner, appreciating that educational encounters and learning experiences evolve and change. Change is always present but can increase, or become turbulent, when educational systems altered in ways that impact the core dynamics of the process. Recognition of Other, even if presently invisible within a structure that resembles a Trojan Horse, inevitably changes the learning landscape. Responding to Other, calls for a reconsideration of what has previously been assumed mastery and effective practice. The practice of teacher or mentor, as *bricoleur*, calls for not a simple fixing of the present but for a deeper mindful obligation to the future.

Scholarship of teaching and learning has blossomed from a newer, deeper understanding of the ways in which our subject matter discipline impacts learners and the world in which they live: 'teaching for enhanced learning' is a core value (Biggs, 1999). This necessitates an exploration of the world in which the learner resides and suggests research that goes beyond bounds of our individual disciplines. Where to start and where to go in multidisciplinary research?

Joe Kincheloe (2005) suggests an alternative to explorations that mimic those of the scientific paradigm, one in which 'bricoleurs move beyond the blinds of particular disciplines and peer through a conceptual window to a new world of research and knowledge production' (p. 323). Scholarship in teaching and learning, approached as *bricolage*, moves us into the margins, nooks, and crannies of what is known and what is understood and invites us to make sense of our own teaching. *Bricoleurs* do not tinker in the domain of the engineer: they see alternatives, limitations, different ways of making sense, and pragmatic solutions that are not degraded by their pragmatism. They borrow, experiment, and share, and 'understand a basic flaw within the nature and production of monological knowledge: Unilateral perspectives on the world fail to account for the complex relationship between material reality and human perception' (p. 326). In approaching their teaching and learning, *bricoleurs* realize that 'bricolage exists out of respect for the complexity of the lived world. Indeed, it is grounded on an epistemology of complexity (p. 324).

Kincheloe (2005), a social scientist, had his unique appreciation of the power of *bricolage*; however, that appreciation has relevance and significance in a scholarship of teaching and learning. He notes 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). Much indeed is possible.

References

- Andersson, P. & Fejes, A. (2005). Recognition of prior learning as a technique for fabricating the adult learner: a genealogical analysis on Swedish adult education policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(5), 595-613.
- Andersson, P., Fejes, A., & Ahn, S. (2004). Recognition of prior vocational learning in Sweden. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 36(1), 57-71.

Barnes, D. (1992). *From communication to curriculum*. (2nd edition). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Biggs, J. (1999). What the student does: Teaching for enhanced learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 18(1), 55-76.

Finlay, L. (2008). Introducing phenomenological research. Retrieved June 24, 2010
<http://www.lindafinlay.co.uk/An%20introduction%20to%20phenomenology%202008.doc>

Harris, J. (1999). Ways of seeing the recognition of prior learning (RPL). What contribution can such practices make to social inclusion? *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 31(2), 124-139.

Harris, J. (2000a). *Prior learning: Theories of learning and the recognition of prior learning implications for South African education and training*. Pretoria: National Centre for Curriculum Research and Development.

Harris, J. (2000b). *RPL: Power, pedagogy and possibility. Conceptual and implementation guides*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Hatton, E.J. (1988). Teachers' work as bricolage: Implications for teacher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 9(3), 337-357.

Herman, L. & Mandell, A. (2004). *From teaching to mentoring: Principle and practice, dialogue and life in adult education*. New York: Routledge.

Herron, F.W. (2006). A bricoleur in the monastery: Merton's tactics in a nothing place. *Merton Annual*, 19, 114-127,

Kincheloe, J.L. (2001). *Describing the bricolage: Conceptualizing a new rigor in qualitative research*. The 2001 Egon Guba lecture delivered at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (April).

Kincheloe, J.L. (2005). On to the next level: Continuing the conceptualization of the bricolage. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(3), 323-350. Retrieved June 24, 2010
http://www.slis.indiana.edu/faculty/hrosenba/www/Research/methods/kinchloe_bricolage2.pdf

Kostogriz, A. & Doecke, B. (2007). Encounters with 'Strangers': Towards dialogical ethics in English language education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 4(10), 1-24.

Kostogriz, A. & Doecke, B. (2008). English and its Other: Towards an ethic of transculturation. *Changing English*, 15(3), 259-274.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1974). *The Savage Mind*. (Second ed.). London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Pawson, R. (2004). *Mentoring relationships: An explanatory review*. ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice: Working Paper 21. Retrieved June 24, 2010
<http://kcl.ac.uk/content/1/c6/03/46/19/wp21.pdf>

- Peters, H. (2005). Contested discourses: assessing the outcomes of learning from experience for the award of credit in higher education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(3), 273-285.
- Reilly, M.A. (2009). Opening Spaces of Possibility: The teacher as bricoleur. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(5), 376-384.
- Rynes, S.L. & Trank, C.Q. (1999). Behavior science in the business school curriculum: Teaching in a changing institutional environment. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 808-824.
- Starr-Glass, D. (2005). Tutorials at a distance: Reflection on the process. *New Horizons in Adult Learning*, 19(3), 12-20. Retrieved June 24, 2010
<http://education.fiu.edu/newhorizons/journals/volume19no3summer2005.pdf>
- Starr-Glass, D. (2006a). Enhancing the transformative potential of business internships. *Managing Global Transitions* 4(4), 285-297. Retrieved on June 24, 2010 <http://www.fm-kp.si/zalozba/ISSN/1581-6311/4-4.pdf>
- Starr-Glass, D. (2006b). Beyond the coast of Bohemia: Distanced students, cultural contexts, and social networks. *All About Mentoring*, 31, 66-71. (Mentoring Institute, Empire State College, State University of New York)
- Starr-Glass, D. (2008a). On learning to play the cello at sixty: A study in polyphony. *All About Mentoring*, 34, 54-59. (Mentoring Institute, Empire State College, State University of New York)
- Starr-Glass, D. (2008b). Bridges in Croatia: Challenges, possibilities, and opportunities in international education. *All About Mentoring*, 33, 33-38. (Mentoring Institute, Empire State College, State University of New York)
- Starr-Glass, D. (2009a). Teaching international business abroad: Paradigms suggested by metaphor theory. *Journal of Teaching International Business*, 20(3), 230-243. DOI: 10.1080/08975930903099226.
- Starr-Glass, D. (2009b). Beyond the sardine hedge: A metaphoric reconsideration of international education. *All About Mentoring*, 36, 24-29. (Mentoring Institute, Empire State College, State University of New York)
- Starr-Glass, D. (in press). The orphans' motto: Strangerhood in international education and mentoring. *All About Mentoring*. (Mentoring Institute, Empire State College, State University of New York)
- Starr-Glass, D. & Ali, T. (in press). Double standards: When an undergraduate work product is assessed under two differing paradigms. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*.
- Volbrecht, T. (2009). New courses for Trojan horses: rethinking RPL in a South African teacher education curriculum. *Studies in Continuing Education* 31(1), 13-27.
- Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Witman, P.D. & Richlin, L. (2007). The status of the scholarship of teaching and learning in the disciplines. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(1). Retrieved June 24, 2010
http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/v1n1/essays/witman/IJ_witman.pdf