Toward More Impactful International Business Education: A Teaching Innovation Typology

Author(s): Dieleman, Marleen; Šilenskytė, Aušrinė; Lynden, Karen; Fletcher, Margaret; Panina, Daria

Title: Toward More Impactful International Business Education: A Teaching Innovation Typology

Year: 2022

Version: Accepted manuscript

Please cite the original version:

Dieleman, M., Šilenskytė, A., Lynden, K., Fletcher, M. & Panina, D. (2022). Toward More Impactful International Business Education: A Teaching Innovation Typology. *Journal of Teaching in International Business* 33(4), 181-202. https://doi.org/10.1080/08975930.2022.2137279

TOWARDS MORE IMPACTFUL INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS EDUCATION:

A TEACHING INNOVATION TYPOLOGY

ABSTRACT

Teaching innovations in the field of higher education (HE) have the potential to lead to better learning outcomes and higher faculty motivation. While the pedagogy literature has explored different types of teaching innovations, International Business (IB) scholars have paid relatively little attention to how these innovations are disseminated and generate impact across the IB field. This paper addresses this gap. Drawing on the innovation literature in management and the pedagogy literature on teaching innovations, we provide a typology of teaching innovations and their impact in the context of IB education. This framework illustrates the spread of teaching innovations by considering the intersection of types of pedagogy innovations, and the stakeholders impacted by them. By introducing this framework and illustrating select IB teaching innovations, we contribute to the pedagogy literature in the IB field. The framework also offers practical guidance for innovative educators and HE institutions.

INTRODUCTION

"*Who dares to teach must never cease to learn*." - John Cotton Dana

Innovation – defined in broad terms as doing something new - is widely acknowledged as an engine of growth and a catalyst for societal change (Garud, Tuertscher, & Van de Ven, 2013). The impact of innovation is also evident in the field of higher education (HE) because teaching innovations improve student learning outcomes, motivate stakeholders involved in the education process, and help HE institutions achieve their goals (Walder, 2017).

The HE field has seen various innovations, such as the rise of experiential learning (e.g., Anwar, & Abdullah, 2021; Kolb, 1984), the emergence of new educational players such as large multinational corporations (MNCs), EduTech start-ups, and the arrival of more sophisticated methods to measure teaching innovations (OECD, 2014). All these have set the scene for broadening the scope of teaching and learning practices beyond traditional university teaching methods. While the delivery of education has been continuously evolving (Behara & Davis, 2015; Tierney & Lanford, 2016), the global COVID pandemic has significantly accelerated innovation in this area (Barbosa & Ferreira-Lopes, 2021; García-Morales, Garrido-Moreno, & Martín-Rojas, 2021; Oyedotun, 2020). Against this background, a wide variety of new teaching and learning practices, often digital, were introduced in a relatively short time, which may have produced systemic changes in the structure, format, and methods of teaching and learning (Serdyukov, 2017).

Teaching innovations have been at the center of discussions in the general pedagogy literature for quite some time (e.g., Huberman, 1973; Hannan & Silver, 2000; Looney, 2009; Walder, 2014a), with most of the attention dedicated to novel teaching methods. Scholars have raised concerns that "in a university context, pedagogical innovations are often described as everything which is not lecturing, the method still used by the overwhelming majority of

professors" (Béchard & Pelletier, 2001, p. 133). Therefore, Walder (2014a, 2017) suggested that the nature and impact of classroom teaching innovations needed to be understood better.

Within the international business (IB) academic community, attention has similarly focused on novel pedagogies that go beyond lecturing. A literature review suggests that IB pedagogy innovations are associated with active learning approaches (Akdeniz, Zhang, & Cavusgil, 2019), new teaching technologies (Hernandez-Pozas & Carreon-Flores, 2019; Viswanathan, 2012), and experiential learning (Akdeniz el. al., 2019; Panina, 2021; Panina & Lane, 2018). However, scant attention has been paid to how educators, through their teaching innovations, can *impact* various stakeholders, such as students, institutions of HE worldwide, and international business communities.

We suggest that IB educators have the potential to create profound impact through their pedagogy innovations, and that stakeholder impact has not received sufficient attention. The field of teaching and learning engages with external and internal stakeholders and provides tangible outputs for practitioners and students (Van de Ven, 2007). The IB scholarly community seems particularly well suited to grasp the importance of the global spread of impactful innovations. Cantwell (2017) observed that the field of IB is uniquely positioned to be at the forefront of innovation, since IB is directly concerned with the transfer of novelties across national boundaries while studying knowledge exchange networks that foster technology transfer, learning, and societal change. Thus, IB educators may be in an excellent position to drive changes resulting from the global dissemination of impactful pedagogy innovations (Akdeniz et al., 2019).

In this paper, we combine the innovation process literature, which elaborates on impact through the dissemination of novelties among stakeholders (Garud et al., 2013) with insights from the pedagogy literature on innovations (Walder, 2014a, 2017) to provide a comprehensive framework that classifies different types of teaching innovations and the scope of their impact.

We suggest that teaching innovations in IB are not limited to an instructor's own students, but can potentially reach a wider group of stakeholders. We discuss salient examples of the different types of innovations and, in doing so, we advance a new research agenda on pedagogy innovations in the IB field that focuses on impact. Moreover, we argue that this framework can assist IB educators in adopting and developing impactful teaching innovations, thus providing a roadmap for educational leadership. As universities worldwide are increasingly assessing their educators on their contributions inside as well as outside of the classroom, this framework is a welcome tool for individual IB scholars to design and assess their educator impact journey.

The paper is organized as follows. We first briefly review the literature on pedagogy innovations, with specific attention to IB. We then review the management literature on innovation and suggest that, for innovations to be a catalyst for change, they must involve a variety of stakeholders. We apply this to the context of IB pedagogy and outline how pedagogy innovations impact different types of stakeholders. Based on this we introduce our framework that distinguishes between types of teaching innovations (novel pedagogy methods, new technologies, and new topics), and the stakeholders impacted by them (students, institutions of HE worldwide, and international business communities). We discuss examples of various innovation types within a matrix, and conclude with the discussion of implications for the IB pedagogy literature and practice.

PEDAGOGY INNOVATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Innovation in higher education: Setting the scene

Schumpeter (1934) defined innovation as new combinations of products, production methods, supply, new organizations or new markets, with the key feature being their novelty. Building on this tradition, the vast management literature on innovation often conceptualizes the term broadly as an outcome (see Kahn, 2018): a type of novelty that is closely related with creativity, knowledge, and change (Crossan & Appaydin, 2010). Similarly, in the field of education,

innovation is seen as the emergence of novel outcomes in terms of individual practices, curricula, or organizations (Dill & Friedman, 1979).

While the term education is usually also associated with outcomes, pedagogy is a slightly different construct that encompasses the practice of teaching and learning (Hinchliffe, 2000). To better achieve its social impact, the practice of teaching and learning should evolve and innovate, for instance by obtaining new forms and elements. But what precisely are innovative pedagogies is somewhat complex. Walder (2014a) defined pedagogy innovations by distinguishing between social innovations (changes in teaching practices) and technical innovations (new educational tools), which we address in a section to follow. Pedagogy innovations are also context specific, usually developing in tandem with broader social and technical trends in society that permeate teaching and learning practices and alter their content.

Thus, to understand the nature of teaching innovations that IB scholars can develop to impact society, it is useful to first briefly review recent trends in HE. Social media and the rise of smartphones have fundamentally changed the manner in which people interact with information. Within HE institutions too, ongoing digitalization trends (e.g., Alon, 2003; Zwerg-Villegas & Martinez-Diaz, 2016) significantly changed teaching practices. The way the learners consume information has changed, marking a shift from text-based to visual information transmission, and from longer texts and lectures to shorter content bursts. EduTech newcomers to the field also played a role. EduTech disruptors using digital models such as *Coursera*, *Masterclass, Khan Academy,* and *LinkedIn learning* have changed the way knowledge is being disseminated to learners. By opening this new channel for education, these newcomers changed the way knowledge is consumed (Govindarajan, Srivastava & Enache, 2021). Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) introduced an online learning model that covered new ground and introduced the mass standardization of online learning at low prices. Among other outcomes, MOOCs provided a pathway for education to a segment of learners

who may have resource constraints. While such changes made HE more inclusive, it also led to the concentration on certain teaching and assessment methods (e.g., standardized tests) that suit scale, yet narrow the range of pedagogies utilized (Stracke & Trisolini, 2021).

New technologies such as Virtual Reality, Artificial Intelligence, Distributed-Ledger Technology (blockchain), and others are increasingly adopted in the industry. These technologies changed the way business is conducted globally, with students flocking to the courses that feature new technologies and emerging business fields. Consequently, these innovations are also adopted in pedagogy by, for example, the use of 360 virtual reality content to provide students with virtual immersion for study of subsistence marketplaces (Viswanathan et al., 2004). Technological innovations also set the scene for a dynamic phase of change in the field of IB curriculum, which had traditionally focused on patents, knowledge sharing, and similar topics, rather than direct discussion on technology adoption in IB management.

Despite the promise of digitalization in learning, the adoption of such new practices did not always deliver expected outcomes in a HE setting. One rationale is that effective utilization of technology must be accompanied by its integration in all aspects of education (Fishman, et al., 2004). While these digitalization trends were already ongoing for decades, the Covid-19 pandemic created an urgent impetus to experiment with technology, while also helping to overcome resistance to change and enabling innovative educators and EduTech newcomers alike.

Another trend in HE that led to teaching innovations was caused by a gap between the needs of employers and the abilities of universities to develop graduates' knowledge, skills, and abilities needed in the contemporary workplace (e.g., Behara & Davis, 2015; Foster & Yaoyuneyong, 2016; Mintzberg, 2004; McCarthy & McCarthy, 2006; Paul & Mukhopadhyay, 2004). For example, IB programs have placed significant focus on developing cross-cultural skills needed when working in MNCs. In addition to cross-cultural teams, cross-functional

teams are frequently utilized in business to solve problems or develop strategies. Business students have little experience with working in such teams (Foster & Yaoyuneyong, 2016), thus making these teaching methods valuable to the development of student knowledge acquisition and practice.

Gaps like these were observed in many fields, leading to the development of new pedagogy practices, or the modification of the old ones, such as experiential learning (Kolb, 1984). In addition, employers charged universities to teach new skills and topics, such as data analytics and social media marketing strategies, which in turn lead to curriculum changes. In the field of management, global accreditation bodies (e.g., Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), European Foundation for Management Development) increasingly encourage bridging the gap between industry needs and learning outcomes. Significant new pressures on HE have occurred, pushing academic institutions towards change and teaching innovations. The IB field is a part of this larger movement in HE as well. These trends have led to different types of IB teaching innovations, which we will discuss in the next section.

Types of Innovations in IB Pedagogy

The IB field follows general pedagogy innovations in terms of *new teaching practices*, or what Walder (2014a) described as social teaching innovations, while adapting these to a global context. The field of IB is particularly well positioned to pioneer a range of unique teaching innovations due to its emphasis on cross-boundary knowledge dissemination. The MNCs that students are studying in the IB discipline "provide a context characterized by substantial heterogeneity and complexity, which can be contextual, intraorganizational, or occurring at the individual-level" (Roth & Kostova, 2003, p. 888). This implies that students need to be simultaneously exposed to different institutional environments, complex organizational structures, and a diversity of cultures and individual working styles. To convey contextual

heterogeneity, IB educators have recognized the importance of new practices such as flipped classrooms (Koponen, 2019), blended learning (Anthony, et al., 2020; Garrison & Kanuka, 2004; Smith & Hill, 2018), global virtual exchange (Guidry, Leibowitz, & Adeyemi-Bello, 2020; O'Dowd, 2021) and the use of gamification as a learning strategy for open collaborative innovation (Bogers & Sproedt, 2012; Chang & Wei, 2016; Deterding, et al., 2011; Holmes & Gee, 2016; Subhash & Cudney, 2018), just to offer a few examples.

The distinctive IB context and general HE trends, described in the previous section, gave rise to unique and innovative *teaching practices* in IB, such as: collaborative online international learning (COIL) courses, short-term study abroad courses, service learning, virtual experiential learning, and video cases. We conducted a broad literature review of pedagogy journals and books relevant to IB, using innovation, international, teaching and learning key words to guide the search. Table 1 provides an overview of teaching practice innovations found along with relevant citations.

Table 1: A selection of novel teaching practices used in the IB field

Innovative practice	Illustrative sources
Blended Learning	Anthony, et al., 2020; Garrison & Kanuka, 2004; Smith & Hill, 2018
Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL)	Asojo, et al., 2019; Zhang & Pearlman, 2018; Rubin, 2017; SUNY, 2013; SUNY, 2019
Flipped Classrooms	Koponen, 2019
Gamification	Bogers & Sproedt, 2012; Chang & Wei, 2016; Deterding, et al., 2011; Holmes & Gee, 2016; Subhash & Cudney, 2018
Global Virtual Exchange	Guidry, Leibowitz, & Adeyemi-Bello, 2020; O'Dowd, 2021
Project Based Learning	Chen & Yang, 2019; Guo, et al, 2020; Leal-Rodriguez & Albort-Morant, 2019
Service Learning	Anderson, et al, 2019; Blewitt, Parsons, & Shane, 2018; Eizaguirre, Alcaniz, & García-Feijoo, 2020; Huda, et al., 2018; Panina & Lane, 2018; Salam, et al., 2019; Wilson, Crozier, & Hadidon, 2020
Short Term Travel Abroad	Bain & Yaklin, 2019; Harrison & Palmer, 2019; Panina, 2019; Sachau, Brasher, & Fee, 2010; Whatley, et al., 2021
Simulation Tools	Ben-Zvi & Carton, 2007

Video Case Studies	AIB Teaching and Education SIG, 2021; De Beule et al., 2019; MNCwhispering (Erasmus+), 2021
Virtual Environments and Virtual Teams	Jimenez et al., 2017; Šilenskytė, 2022; Taras et al., 2013; Viswanathan et al., 2004
Virtual Experiential and Collaborative Learning	Ferreira-Lopes, Elexpuru, & Bezanilla, 2020; Šilenskytė, 2022; Taras et al., 2013; Bleicher, et al., 2019

Another type of teaching innovation is the use of *new technologies* to improve teaching; what Walder (2014a) described as technical teaching innovations. Higher education is well positioned to make use of new technologies such as artificial intelligence or virtual reality (Chen, Chen, & Lin, 2020). With the rapid digitalization of society, the new technologies (e.g., software, apps) available to educators at a low cost have triggered a range of new innovations, many of which allow for boundary-spanning knowledge exchange through digital means (Wood & Shirazi, 2020). While digital interaction in its early days (e.g., telex, fax) provided little context, more recent technology innovations allow for greater immersion in real life contexts - the understanding of which is so vital for the field of IB. Virtual environments can be used in intercultural (Kirste & Holtbrügge, 2019) and diversity (Šilenskytė, 2022) training, video case studies provide engaging learning opportunities for students (De Beule, et al., 2019), and the application of virtual reality in the classroom (Hernandez-Pozas & Carreon-Flores, 2019) can immerse someone in a new environment without having to travel. Table 2 provides examples of modern technologies used in IB teaching with relevant sources.

Table 2: A selection of novel teaching technologies used in the IB field

Innovative technology	Illustrative sources
Artificial Intelligence in Education	Chen, Chen, & Lin, 2020
Audience Response Systems	Wood & Shirazi, 2020
MOOC	Stracke & Trisolini, 2021
Video Cases	De Beule et al., 2019
Virtual Environments	Kirste & Holtbrügge, 2019; Šilenskytė, 2022
Virtual Reality	Hernandez-Pozas & Carreon-Flores, 2019; Viswanathan et al., 2004

A third type of innovation is the development and dispersion of entirely *new topics*. Much of this is driven by the reality of the outside world (Walder, 2015), aligning with general trend to close the gap between student skills and employer needs. With a significant power base, MNCs can make a substantial impact in addressing Sustainability Development Goals (SDGs) (Hansen, Stiling, & Uy, 2021; Liou & Rao-Nicholson, 2021; Van Zanten & Van Tulder, 2018) and simultaneously contribute to severe global problems (e.g., Cuervo-Cazurra, et al., 2021; Stringer & Michailova, 2018). IB educators can innovate by creating new IB courses in areas such as sustainability and SDG, thereby introducing new ideas and topics to students, and, indirectly, to other stakeholders as well.

Innovation processes: The importance of stakeholder impact

Thus far, we have discussed pedagogy innovations as an outcome, noticing different types of innovations: new practices, technologies, and topics. The literature on pedagogy innovations in IB tends to focus on such innovations in the context of an individual educator or in the context of the structure of an IB curriculum (Sureka, Donthu, & Kumar, 2020). Management scholars concerned with innovation, on the other hand, also emphasize the process of creating change and the impact this change has on society. How innovative change processes unfold has been the topic of a seminal paper by Garud, Tuertscher & Van De Ven (2013). Specifically, they suggested that innovation processes occur at different levels, corresponding with the different stakeholders involved in the change process. Further, these authors also suggested that such innovation processes are best conceptualized as entangled, since change processes at one level often involved effects on stakeholders at another level (Garud et al., 2013). This aligns with the literature on the diffusion of innovations, which similarly suggests that this process is complex and may result in heterogeneous effects on stakeholders (e.g., Naumovska, Gaba & Greve, 2021). Drawing on the innovation process literature, we believe it is useful to consider to what extent pedagogy innovations become diffused across different stakeholder

groups, thereby having a significant impact on society. This diffusion process perspective is still relatively underexplored territory in the IB pedagogy literature. We make a first attempt to outline the different relevant stakeholder groups that might be impacted by pedagogy innovations, namely (1) students in an IB educator's course, (2) academic peers in institutions of higher learning, and (3) the broader global community.

Pedagogy innovations adopted by individual educators primarily impact their *students*. There are numerous examples of IB educators pioneering new learning experiences within a classroom setting, for instance by providing opportunities to learn not just knowledge, but also cross-cultural (e.g., Bleicher, et al., 2019) or other skills. Although the educator's role in classroom innovations is central (Fishman et al., 2004), a single-classroom innovation achieves less impact as compared to a situation where the innovation is institutionalized, documented for further use, and/or *adopted within or across academic institutions*.

Pedagogy scholars view the spread of teaching innovations as influenced by institutional and disciplinary culture (Walder, 2015). This dissemination across HE institutions can be through institutional changes or though systematic sharing of scholarly knowledge on pedagogy. Business schools typically strive to have an institutional culture where best practices are proactively disseminated through mentoring programs or sharing sessions. Global accreditation bodies, such as AACSB, promote institutionalizing teaching innovations as a sign of high-quality institutions through recognitions such as highlighting "Innovations That Inspire." Therefore, teaching innovations that are adopted by peers inside the institution can have an impact on a broader group of scholars, students, and academic administrators.

Scope of impact is not necessarily limited to an educator's home institution. Through informal professional networks or formal networks (e.g., Academy of International Business) or through scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), educators can showcase their innovations and encourage a broader group of global peers to adopt them, thereby

disseminating the innovation and affecting disciplinary practices. Widening the level of impact from students to peers globally provides significant value as these collaborations can have an impact on a far broader range of educators as well as their respective institutions and students.

The broadest impact is achieved when innovation reverberates *outside the walls of HE academic institutions*. For instance, the popular theory of disruptive innovation, pioneered by Christensen (1997) has influenced changes in education (e.g., Christensen & Eyring, 2011), and become a platform for consultants, trainers, and academics. These adopters view global business transformations through a new lens and promote learning new practices in global business, such as in the form of workshops for companies (Christensen, Raynor, & McDonald, 2013). While few teaching innovations produce such outcomes, those that do tend to have impact on students, peers, as well as on managers within global organizations. Development of high-quality global talent is one of the core concerns of the MNCs (e.g., Collings, Mellahi, & Cascio, 2019), with many of them having their own corporate universities. Thus, IB educators could pioneer teaching innovations that can be further adopted by global companies in their training practices. Thus, educators may influence their students, as well as businesses, regulators, policymakers, and society at large, both directly and indirectly (Besley & Nesbit, 2013).

A FRAMEWORK FOR PEDAGOGY INNOVATIONS IN IB

Combining the types of pedagogy innovations (new teaching practice, new technology, new topics) and the variety of stakeholders (students, peers, and the global community), we construct a typology of dissemination of pedagogy innovations in the IB field. Our typology recognizes multiple components that should be considered when analyzing the diffusion of pedagogy innovations. This expands the current focus on pedagogy innovation as an outcome and allows comprehending the complete value of pedagogy innovations and their impact on

society. Altogether, the framework (see Table 3) produces a classification of nine (9) pedagogy innovations, which we elaborate on below.

Table 3: Typology of IB Pedagogy Innovations

Types of stakeholders impacted *Types of teaching innovations*	**Students in IB courses**	**IB educators globally**	**Global communities**
Novel teaching methods or philosophies to address IB challenges (e.g., experiential learning)	**Innovative classroom teaching** Changes in teaching approaches	**Leading pedagogy innovations** Developing field-wide novel teaching practices	**Revolutionizing educational programs globally** New teaching and learning practices that are adopted outside HE by IB practitioners
Adoption of new technologies in IB education (e.g., virtual reality)	**Innovative integration of technology** Incorporating new technologies, classroom setting	**EduTech innovations** Incorporating new technologies for use in HE settings	**Technology platform developments** Revolutionizing learning beyond HE institutions through new technologies
Inclusion of contemporary topics in IB classrooms (e.g., global sustainability)	**Future-ready teaching** Incorporating new topics in courses	**Teaching materials for IB frontrunners** Incorporating new topics in materials for IB education used across HE institutions	**Shaping International Business thinking** Becoming a global innovator of a new topic, promoting learning on the new topic beyond HE

Stakeholders: Students in IB courses

The first cluster of pedagogy dissemination patterns concerns the spread of innovations within IB courses. These innovations primarily impact students participating in them.

Innovative classroom teaching is typically an invented, developed, or adopted novel pedagogy by an educator in their classroom. Innovative teaching can be found in every academic institution. It is sometimes well grounded in pedagogy research, sometimes created by the educator through a systematic process of experimentation and reflection (Cowan, 2006), and occasionally emerges as a coincidence. In the field of IB, the innovative teaching aims to

bring multinational environments into the classroom to develop knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to work in complex and uncertain IB environment. Thus, methods and styles that help learners experience complexity of MNC structures, and diversity of institutions, cultures, and individuals in IB classroom would classify in this teaching innovation category.

Innovative integration of technology is the other IB classroom level innovation that is essential, particularly in the times of, and after the global pandemic. From early cross-border simulation tools such as Intopia (Ben-Zvi & Carton, 2007) to today's virtual reality pioneers in IB (e.g., Hernandez-Pozas & Carreon-Flores, 2019), tech-savvy innovators transform IB education with exciting new learning experiences for students. Technology in IB classroom permits replicating realities of global virtual work and to certain extent overcoming geographic distances largely present in IB. Facilitated by various technologies and IT tools, IB students can practice how to handle culture, language, and other kinds of diversity that is present in their (future) international workplace.

Future-ready teaching is an innovative pedagogy that addresses emerging realities globally. Educators who create teaching innovations in this category are the first to offer novel courses on the contemporary and emerging topics in the IB field or integrate these topics within the classical themes of classic IB curriculum. These topics currently relate to, for instance, diversity and inclusion, sustainability, or geopolitical trends. Given the novelty of the topics integrated in the IB classroom discussions, both the educators' ability to bring newly emerging research to the classroom and the ability to produce high quality observations, cases, teaching materials about the changing environment are highly valued.

Stakeholders: IB educators globally

Once the classroom innovations are documented, analyzed, spread, or institutionalized, they are capable of making further impact across institutions. Thus, we identify three (3) categories of teaching innovations in IB that bring novelty and changes across educational institutions and

across geographies. When disseminated, these pedagogical innovations primarily impact educational practitioners and institutions.

Leading pedagogy innovations refers to both inventing teaching innovations in the classroom and their active dissemination in the form of publications, trainings, tutorials, or sharing with colleagues in one's own and in other institutions. The dissemination of the ideas could be facilitated by the active participation in academic communities, such as the *Academy of International Business* or via publications such as the *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, or other pedagogy-focused publications. For instance, projects such as X-Culture (Taras et al., 2013) have built upon trends in blended learning and developed program with global academic partnerships. This initiative employs global virtual student teams as a methodology to enhance cross-cultural skills through new technology platforms, while rolling out collaborative projects worldwide, thereby widely disseminating the teaching innovation across universities and across geographies. When disseminating pedagogical innovations, educators are capable of recognizing the similarities and differences of the teaching innovation adoption in different institutional and cultural contexts present across the countries and regions. Leading pedagogy innovations also imply the ability to alter innovative teaching practices where needed (local environment) and create transferable platform of basic principles (for global dissemination).

Leading EduTech innovations focus on innovative application or pedagogical use of technology. Moreover, innovators under this category use technology to facilitate the dissemination of pedagogical innovations across institutions of HE globally. This can range from simulations using novel technology used in multiple institutions to more disruptive technology offerings that change the nature of learning. For instance, educational technology platforms that host content from multiple institutions, such as Coursera, pioneered an online learning formula backed by technology that has created a new market for HE courses by

allowing a new segment of learners to consume knowledge in an "a la carte" manner with low barriers to entry. Learners pay relatively low fees per course and the platform enables them to select offerings from multiple universities, rather than signing up for a higher-cost full degree program at one single academic institution. Meanwhile, the innovative technology platform also allows IB educators to leverage their content and capture a broader audience.

Teaching materials for IB frontrunners is an innovation when emerging IB topics are prepared as materials for teaching and published for use in other IB departments and institutions internationally. Often, these new topics and materials are embedded in or derived from academic research. Innovative educators make an impact in their field by combining a unique new field of knowledge with a teaching practice that becomes widely adopted in other institutions. Creating knowledge dissemination programs and supporting learning materials, such as new textbooks and cases that can be adopted across institutions is a good example. It is essential that materials produced recognize a diversity of perspectives and support critical thinking of IB students. Innovative materials that can be considered to an IB frontrunner should go beyond the traditional coverage of cases and examples within the Western countries.

Stakeholders: Global communities

Some pedagogical innovations have the potential to be impactful beyond the world of education through connections with global communities relevant to IB. We identify three (3) innovation dissemination types in this category.

Revolutionizing education programmes globally are those pedagogy initiatives by leaders or organizations that transcend their own academic field and make an impact on a broader set of stakeholders, including global businesses. In the context of IB, *The World Economic Forum*, for instance, created an educational program based on a novel philosophy of system-wide leadership skills that combined education, work and global network exposure in

a new manner, with the aim to channel the alumni into influential positions globally to enact change (Khurana & Baldwin, 2013).

Technology platform innovations are educational developments that not just build on new technologies, but also scale far beyond individual classrooms and HE institutions (e.g., Barco, Briolink, Kognity). A number of EduTech start-ups and corporate academies (e.g., IBM Skills Academy) have emerged aiming to engage in such innovations and to disrupt the classic model of business education. Scholars have observed that these EduTech disrupters are increasingly well funded and that universities may need to unbundle their educational offerings to compete with them (Govindarajan, Srivastava & Enache, 2021). They also suggest that such innovations can blur the boundaries between HE and other types of learning (e.g., corporate learning such as mass online corporate MBA programs) and that they can take place through a collaboration of specialists, including technology specialists such as augmented reality companies.

Finally, *Shaping International Business thinking* is a dissemination of a novel set of ideas throughout global communities. This may also include building new communities of learners and adopters that go beyond academic institutions. For example, Viswanathan has innovated through a novel immersion-based program on subsistence marketplaces (Viswanathan, 2012). This program involved students not just in his institution, but also learners globally through collaboration and through MOOCs. As a part of this program, materials such as images, 3D videos and textbooks were developed, along with a journal and a website that brings together resources around this topic. This course stimulates students to provide solutions for problems in unfamiliar settings characterized by resource constraints, with students proactively collaborating with companies, social enterprises, and communities in different parts of the world. Over the years, this has become the go-to place for acquiring the latest knowledge on subsistence marketplaces for various stakeholders.

DISCUSSION: TOWARDS IMPACTFUL TEACHING INNOVATIONS IN IB

Innovations are necessary to improve any product or service, including those in the context of HE. The HE field, in general and the field of IB, in particular, have seen a proliferation of innovations (Bogers & Sproedt, 2012; De Beule et al., 2019; Harrison & Palmer, 2019; Hernandez-Pozas & Carreon-Flores, 2019; Kirste & Holtbrügge, 2019; Koponen, 2019; Smith & Hill, 2018). So far, the focus of the teaching innovation literature in IB emphasized innovations as an outcome. We extend this by presenting a theoretical framework which permits reflection on the scope of pedagogical innovations' impact.

The developed framework unpacks the varied nature of the diffusion of pedagogical innovations in the IB field. This is achieved by considering the intersection of types of pedagogical innovations and the stakeholders that they impact, drawing inspiration from seminal work on innovation processes (Garud et al., 2013). We outlined nine (9) distinct pedagogy innovations in the IB context, classified according to their nature and their stakeholder impact. While we have described examples of each type of innovation, the most impactful pedagogical innovations of our time typically spread in multiple ways simultaneously. Indeed, many innovative pedagogies transcend boundaries and may be creatively interconnected, such as gamification within MOOCs (Chang, & Wei, 2016). Innovations may start from impacting students through utilization of new content and new technologies, but subsequently move beyond this by impacting peers and communities as the educator institutionalizes and promotes them. Obviously, the broader acceptance of any innovation takes time. Thus, it is important to recognize new teaching approaches before they receive the approval of the wider IB community. The role of professional teaching associations, journals, and institutions is to channel these innovations towards impacting a wider audience.

We suggest that this novel framework makes two contributions, one theoretical and one practical. Theoretically, the framework provides a meaningful classification of teaching

innovations that goes beyond commonly mentioned types in the literature by incorporating impact. Moreover, the framework uncovers different pathways for disseminating pedagogical innovations, thus illustrating how pedagogy innovations in IB can become widely accepted. The framework offers scholars an opportunity to deepen future pedagogy research on the *impact* of different types of teaching innovations and we hope future research can take this further, for instance by developing an impact assessment framework. When investigating pedagogical innovations adopted by an educator, it is essential to contextualize their nature and impact within a specific discipline. While some disciplines may extensively practice more passive teaching methods (e.g., lecturing), other disciplines such as IB may commonly adopt interactive teaching methods. Consequently, impact on graduates through any specific teaching innovation will differ as a result of the nature of the disciplinary culture (Walder, 2014b).

We encourage the empirical investigation of what types of innovations are more common in the IB context; what are the antecedents of the different types of innovations; or whether certain types of innovations have more profound impact than others. Eventually, teaching innovations springing from the IB context may find their way into other disciplines through cross-disciplinary dissemination and adaptation.

Second, our framework offers clear pathways towards greater impact for individual educators, allowing them to map out a career journey that encompasses expanding circles of impact through the dissemination of their knowledge and teaching skills. We suggest various levels of impact can be part of an educator's repertoire, including knowledge transfer through publications, presentations, and awards from academic community, which may allow others to not just replicate the innovation but also build upon it, generating a virtuous cycle of teaching innovations. Educators may also design their innovations to integrate various aspects (e.g., new technology and new topic, as addressed by Liu, Geertshuis, & Grainger, 2020) to impact broader stakeholder groups, including the IB community. Here, we hope to inspire educators

to adopt a more ambitious agenda for the IB discipline whereby integrative, context-specific pedagogy innovations can impact our field, HE in general, as well as the global business community that is the focus of our discipline.

CONCLUSION

The review of the existing research on teaching innovations in IB presents a wide variety of examples of new methods, approaches, technologies, and contemporary IB topics being incorporated into pedagogy. Drawing from the innovation process literature that emphasizes the diffusion of innovations, we added to this by articulating three (3) groups of stakeholders relevant to the field of IB, namely students in the classroom, institutions of higher learning and the broader IB community. The major novelty in our framework is to combine innovation types with impact. Our typology of nine (9) different pedagogy innovations opens up a broader view on teaching innovations, as well as outlines pathways to impact for educators.

The novel framework developed in this paper is an attempt to advance theory on teaching innovations by stimulating and reorienting future pedagogy research, while also encouraging educators to design their teaching innovations for greater impact. The more ambitious agenda we envision for educators would likely lead to more pedagogy collaborations, particularly with stakeholders, disciplines, or regions outside of one's own scope, in particular those that are currently underrepresented. There is much opportunity to create a community of reflective and impactful IB educators that stimulate IB learning through collaborating with students, peers, HE institutions, publications, and corporations. We hope our framework that emphasizes impact will help in further developing a vibrant, innovative IB educator community.

REFERENCES

AIB Teaching and Education Shared Interest Group (SIG). (2021, September 29). Video capsules. Retrieved July 12, 2022, from https://tesig.aib.world/short-video-capsules/

Akdeniz, M. B., Zhang, C., & Cavusgil, S. T. (2019). Innovative pedagogical approaches in teaching international business. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 30(2), 96-101.

Alon, I. (2003). Experiential Learning in International Business via the World Wide Web. Journal of Teaching in International Business, v.14(2-3), p. 79-98.

Anderson, K. L., Boyd, M., Ariemma Marin, K., & McNamara, K. (2019). Reimagining service-learning: Deepening the impact of this high-impact practice. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *42*(3), 229-248.

Anthony, B., Kamaludin, A., Romli, A., Raffei, A. F. M., Phon, D. N. A., Abdullah, A., & Ming, G. L. (2020). Blended learning adoption and implementation in higher education: A theoretical and systematic review. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 1-48.

Anwar, G., & Abdullah, N. N. (2021). Inspiring future entrepreneurs: The effect of experiential learning on the entrepreneurial intention at higher education. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, *6*.

Asojo, A. O., Kartoshkina, Y., Jaiyeoba, B., & Amole, D. (2019). Multicultural learning and experiences in design through Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) framework. *Journal of Teaching and Learning with Technology*, *8*(1), 5-16.

Bain, S. F., & Yaklin, L. E. (2019). Study Abroad: Striving for Transformative Impact. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, *36*.

Barbosa, M. W., & Ferreira-Lopes, L. (2021). Emerging trends in telecollaboration and virtual exchange: a bibliometric study. *Educational Review*, 1-29.

Béchard, Jean-Pierre, and Patrick Pelletier. "Développement des innovations pédagogiques en milieu universitaire: un cas d'apprentissage organisationnel." Nouveaux espaces de développement professionnel et organisationnel (2001): 131-149.

Behara, R. S., & Davis, M. M. (2015). Navigating disruptive innovation in undergraduate business education. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, *13*(3), 305-326.

Ben-Zvi, T. & Carton, T.C. (2007). From rhetoric to reality: Business games as educational tools. INFORMS transactions on education, 8(3). https://doi.org/10.1287/ited.8.1.10.

Besley, J. & Nisbet, M. (2013) "How scientists view the public, the media and the political process," *Public Understanding of Science*, 22(6), 644-659.

Bleicher J., Forrester P., Honal A., Velinov E. (2019) Virtual Business Projects in the Classroom: Enhancing Intercultural and Business Skills of Students. In: Gonzalez-Perez, M., Lynden, K., Taras, V. (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Learning and Teaching International Business and Management*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp 124-140.

Blewitt, J. M., Parsons, A., & Shane, J. M. (2018). Service learning as a high-impact practice: Integrating business communication skills to benefit others. *Journal of Education for Business*, *93*(8), 412-419.

Bogers, M., & Sproedt, H. (2012). Playful collaboration (or not): using a game to grasp the social dynamics of open innovation in innovation and business education. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 23(2), 75-97.

Cantwell, J. (2017) Innovation and international business, *Industry and Innovation*, 24:1, 41-60.

Chang, J. W., & Wei, H. Y. (2016). Exploring engaging gamification mechanics in massive online open courses. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, *19*(2), 177-203.

Chen, C. H., & Yang, Y. C. (2019). Revisiting the effects of project-based learning on students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis investigating moderators. *Educational Research Review*, *26*, 71-81.

Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. *Ieee Access*, *8*, 75264-75278.

Christensen, C. M., & Eyring, H. J. (2011). *The innovative university: Changing the DNA of higher education from the inside out*. John Wiley & Sons.

Christensen, C.M., Raynor, M. E., & McDonald, R. (2013). *Disruptive innovation*. Harvard Business Review.

Christensen, C.M. (1997) The Innovators Dilemma: when new technologies cause great firms to fail, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts.

Collings, D. G., Mellahi, K., & Cascio, W. F. (2019). Global talent management and performance in multinational enterprises: A multilevel perspective. *Journal of Management*, *45*(2), 540-566.

Cowan, J. (2006). *On Becoming an Innovative University Teacher.* Society for Research Into Higher Education & Open University Press

Crossan, M. M., & Apaydin, M. (2010). A Multi-Dimensional Framework of Organizational Innovation: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(6): 1154-1191.

Cuervo-Cazurra, A., Dieleman, M., Hirsch, P., Rodrigues, S.B., & Zyglidopoulos, S. (2021). Multinationals' misbehavior. *Journal of World Business*, 56(5), 101244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2021.101244.

De Beule, F., Jaklič, A., Kania, A., Mroczek-Dąbrowska, K., Vardar, N., & Voss, H. (2019). Video case studies in IB teaching: An empirical comparison of academic and student perceptions and expectations. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 30(2), 175-195.

Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., & Nacke, L. (2011, September). From game design elements to gamefulness: defining" gamification". In Proceedings of the 15th international academic MindTrek conference: Envisioning future media environments (p. 9-15).

Dill, D. D., & Friedman, C. P. (1979). An analysis of frameworks for research on innovation and change in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, *49*(3), 411-435.

Eizaguirre, A., Alcaniz, L., & García-Feijoo, M. (2020). How to develop the humanistic dimension in business and management higher education?. In *Virtuous Cycles in Humanistic Management* (p. 3-20). Springer, Cham.

Erasmus+; University of Leuven, Belgium; University of Leeds, UK; University of Ljubljana, Slovenia; Poznan University of Economics and Business, Poland; and El

Izi Communications Consultancy UK Limited. (2022, March 24). *MNC Whispering series*. MNCwhispering. Retrieved July 12, 2022, from https://www.mncwhispering.com/?page_id=31

Ferreira-Lopes, L., Elexpuru, I., & Bezanilla, M. J. (2020). Developing business students' intercultural competence through intercultural virtual collaboration: A task sequence implementation. Journal of International Education in Business. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIEB06-2020-0055

Fishman, B., Marx, R. W., Blumenfeld, P., Krajcik, J., & Soloway, E. (2004). Creating a framework for research on systemic technology innovations. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *13*(1), 43-76.

Foster, J., & Yaoyuneyong, G. (2016). Teaching innovation: equipping students to overcome real-world challenges. *Higher Education Pedagogies*, *1*(1), 42-56.

García-Morales, V. J., Garrido-Moreno, A., & Martín-Rojas, R. (2021). The transformation of higher education after the COVID disruption: Emerging challenges in an online learning scenario. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 196.

Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2), 95–105.

Garud, R., Tuertscher, P., & Van de Ven, A.H. (2013). Perspectives on Innovation Processes, *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7:1, 775-819.

Govindarajan, V., Srivastava, A. & Enache, L. (2021). What the EdX acquisition means for the future of higher education. *Harvard Business Review*, July 15, 2021 (digital article).

Guidry, A., Leibowitz, J., & Adeyemi-Bello, T. (2020). Global BEEHIVE: developing good practice for multilateral, scalable, and sustainable virtual exchange. *Journal of Virtual Exchange*, *3*, 13-26.

Guo, P., Saab, N., Post, L. S., & Admiraal, W. (2020). A review of project-based learning in higher education: Student outcomes and measures. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *102*, 101586.

Hannan, A., & Silver, H. (2000). Innovating in higher education: Teaching, learning, and institutional culture. Buckgham, England: Society for Research into Higher Education and the Open University Press.

Hansen, B., Stiling, P., & Uy, W. F. (2021). Innovations and challenges in SDG integration and reporting in higher education: A case study from the University of South Florida. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*.

Harrison, J., & Palmer, T. (2019). Interprofessional study abroad: Enhancing social justice and sustainability through shared experiential learning. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, *30*(2), 125-146.

Hernandez-Pozas, O., & Carreon-Flores, H. (2019). Teaching international business using virtual reality. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 30(2), 196-212.

Hinchliffe, G. (2000). Education or pedagogy? *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *35*(1), 31-45.

Holmes, J. B., & Gee, E. R. (2016). A framework for understanding game-based teaching and learning. *On the Horizon*.

Huberman, A. M. (1973). Comment s'ope`rent les changements en e´ducation: Contribution a` l'e´tude de l'innovation, Se´rie: Expe´riences et innovations en e´ducation [How to operate the changes in education: Contribution to the study of innovation, Series: Experiments and innovations in education] Vol. 2, Paris, France: Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'éducation, la science et la culture. [Retrieved from] http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001377/137710fo.pdf.

Huda, M., Mulyadi, D., Hananto, A. L., Muhamad, N. H. N., Teh, K. S. M., & Don, A. G. (2018). Empowering corporate social responsibility (CSR): insights from service learning. *Social Responsibility Journal,* v.14(4), p. 875-894.

Huda, M., Teh, K. S. M., Muhamad, N. H. N., & Nasir, B. M. (2018). Transmitting leadership based civic responsibility: Insights from service learning. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems,* v.34(10), p.20-31.

Jimenez, A., Boehe, D.M., Taras, V., and Caprar, D.V. (2017). Working across boundaries: Current and future perspectives on global virtual teams. Journal of International Management, v. 23, p. 341-349.

Kahn, K. B. (2018). Understanding Innovation. *Business Horizons*. 61: 453-460.

Khurana, R. & Baldwin, E. (2013). The World Economic Forum's global leadership fellows program. *Harvard Business School*.

Kirste, L., & Holtbrügge, D. (2019). Experiential learning in the digital context: An experimental study of online cultural intelligence training. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 30(2), 147-174.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. FT press.

Koponen, J. (2019). The flipped classroom approach for teaching cross-cultural communication to millennials. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 30(2), 102-124.

Leal-Rodriguez, A. L., & Albort-Morant, G. (2019). Promoting innovative experiential learning practices to improve academic performance: Empirical evidence from a Spanish Business School. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *4*(2), 97-103.

Liou, R. S., & Rao-Nicholson, R. (2021). Multinational enterprises and Sustainable Development Goals: A foreign subsidiary perspective on tackling wicked problems. *Journal of International Business Policy*, *4*(1), 136-151.

Liu, Q., Geertshuis, S., & Grainger, R. (2020). Understanding academics' adoption of learning technologies: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, *151*, 103857.

Looney, J. (2009). Assessment and innovation in education. OECD education working papers. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/222814543073.

McCarthy, P.R., McCarthy, H.M. (2006). When case studies are not enough: Integrating experiential learning into business curricula. *Journal of Education for Business*, v. 81(4), p. 201-204.

Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers, not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development*. Sa Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishing.

Naumovska, I., V. Gaba, and H. R. Greve (2021). The Diffusion of differences: A review and reorientation of 20 years of diffusion research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 15: 377-405.

O'Dowd, R. (2021). What do students learn in virtual exchange? A qualitative content analysis of learning outcomes across multiple exchanges. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *109*, 101804.

OECD (2014). *Measuring innovation in education: A new perspective*. Educational Research and Innovation. OECD Publishing.

Oyedotun, T. D. (2020). Sudden change of pedagogy in education driven by COVID-19: Perspectives and evaluation from a developing country. Research in Globalization, 2, Article 100029. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.resglo.2020.100029

Panina, D. (2019). Global competency development in a short-term study abroad program. In Gonzalez-Perez M., Lynden, K., Taras V. (Eds). *The Palgrave Handbook of Learning and teaching International Business and Management*, p. 803-820. Palgrave Macmillan.

Panina, D. (2021). Developing global mindset through experiential learning in global virtual teams. In S. Swartz, B. Barbosa, I. Crawford, and S. Luck (Eds). *Developments in Virtual Learning Environments and the Global Workplace*, p. 108-123. IGI Global Publishers, New York.

Panina, D., & Lane, K. (2018). International experiential teaching: Program typology and student outcomes. In C. Maheshkar (Ed). *Handbook of Research on Cross-Cultural Business Education*, p. 89-114. IGI Global Publishers, New York.

Paul, P., and Mukhopadhyay, K. (2004). Experiential iearning in international business education. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, v. 16(2), p. 7-25.

Roth, K., & Kostova, T. (2003). The use of the multinational corporation as a research context. *Journal of Management*, *29*(6), 883-902.

Rubin, J. (2017). Embedding collaborative online international learning (COIL) at higher education institutions. *Internationalisation of Higher Education*, *2*, 27-44.

Sachau, D., Brasher, N., & Fee, S. (2010). Three models for short-term study abroad. *Journal of Management Education*, *34*(5), 645-670.

Salam, M., Awang Iskandar, D. N., Ibrahim, D. H. A., & Farooq, M. S. (2019). Service learning in higher education: A systematic literature review. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *20*(4), 573-593.

Schumpeter, J.A. (1934, 1980). *The theory of economic development*. Oxford University Press: London.

Serdyukov, P. (2017). Innovation in education: what works, what doesn't, and what to do about it?. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning. 10(1): 4-33.*

Šilenskytė, A. (2022). "Teaching diversity management online: A learning journey approach for achieving inclusion" in Bustamante, S.; Saltevo, E.; Schmitz, M.; Martinovic, M. (Eds.) (2022). *Shaping a Sustainable Future. Innovative Teaching Practices for Educating Responsible Leaders*. Nomos Publishing.

Smith, K., & Hill, J. (2018). Defining the nature of blended learning through its depiction in current research. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(2), 383–397.

Stracke, C.M.; Trisolini, G. (2021). A systematic literature review on the quality of MOOCs. *Sustainability*, 13, 5817. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13115817

Stringer, C., & Michailova, S. (2018). Why modern slavery thrives in multinational corporations' global value chains. *Multinational Business Review*, 26(3): 194-206. https://doi.org/10.1108/MBR-04-2018-0032

Subhash, S., & Cudney, E. A. (2018). Gamified learning in higher education: A systematic review of the literature. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *87*, 192-206.

SUNY Center for Collaborative Online International Learning. (2013). The COIL Institute for Globally Networked Learning in the Humanities final report. Retrieved from http://coil.suny.edu/sites/default/files/case_study_report.pdf

SUNY Center for Collaborative Online International Learning. (2019). Guide for collaborative online international learning course development. Retrieved from http://coil.suny.edu

Sureka, R., Donthu, N., & Kumar, S. (2020). Three decades of the Journal of Teaching in International Business: A bibliometric overview. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*: 31(3), 259-285.

Taras, V., Caprar, D.V., Rottig, D., Sarala, R.M., Zakaria, N., Zhao, F., Jimenez, A., et al., (2013). "A global classroom? Evaluating the effectiveness of global virtual collaboration as a teaching tool in management education." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 12(3), 414-435.

Tierney, W. G. & Lanford, M. (2016). Conceptualizing innovation in higher education. *In: Paulsen, M. (eds) Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. vol 31. Springer, Cham.*

Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Van Zanten, J. A., & Van Tulder, R. (2018). Multinational enterprises and the Sustainable Development Goals: An institutional approach to corporate engagement. *Journal of International Business Policy*, *1*(3), 208-233.

Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A., Eng, E., Garlehner, G., Lohr, K. N., Griffith, D., Rhodes, S., Samuel-Hodge, C., Maty, S., Lux, L., Webb, L., Sutton, S. F., Swinson, T., Jackman, A., & Whitener, L. (2004). Community-based participatory research: assessing the evidence. *Evidence report/technology assessment (Summary)*, (99), 1–8.

Viswanathan, M. (2012). Curricular innovations on sustainability and subsistence marketplaces: Philosophical, substantive, and methodological orientations. *Journal of Management Education*, 36(3), 389-427.

Walder, A. M. (2014a). The concept of pedagogical innovation in higher education. *Education Journal*, 3(3), 195-202.

Walder, A. M. (2014b). The relationship between discipline and innovation: A factor in professorial involvement in integrating pedagogical innovation. *Science Journal of Education*, 2(4), 108–122. http://dx.doi.org/10.11648/j.sjedu.20140204.13.

Walder A.M. (2015). A theoretical model for pedagogical innovation: A tripartite construction of pedagogical innovation focusing on reasons for and means of innovating. Journal of Studies in Social Sciences, 12(1): 180-197.

Walder, A. M. (2017). Pedagogical innovation in Canadian higher education: Professors' perspectives on its effects on teaching and learning. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *54*, 71-82.

Whatley, M., Landon, A. C., Tarrant, M. A., & Rubin, D. (2021). Program design and the development of students' global perspectives in faculty-led short-term study abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *25*(3), 301-318.

Wilson, H. J., Crozier, H. A., & Hadidon, D. (2020). Mapping out a high-impact service learning project for business undergrads. *Business Education Innovation Journal V. 12 (*211).

Wood, R., & Shirazi, S. (2020). A systematic review of audience response systems for teaching and learning in higher education: The student experience. *Computers & Education*, *153*, 103896.

Zhang, J. & Pearlman, G.A.M. (2018). Expanding access to international education through technology enhanced collaborative online international learning (COIL) courses. *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning* 14.1 (2018): 1-11.

Zwerg-Villegas, A.M., and Martinez-Diaz, J.H. (2016). Experiential learning with global virtual teams: Developing intercultural and virtual competencies. Revista Internacional de Investigacion en Educacion, v. 9(18), p. 129-146.