

## Internationalisation of Higher Education (0063)

**Sheila Trahar<sup>1</sup>, Wendy Green<sup>2</sup>, Hans de Wit<sup>3</sup>, Craig Whitsed<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>University of Bristol, UK, <sup>2</sup>University of Tasmania, Australia, <sup>3</sup>Hogeschool van Amsterdam, The Netherlands, <sup>4</sup>Murdoch University, Australia

Rizvi and Lingard (2010) link the dominance of neoliberal ideology in international education discourse - the trend towards minimal public funding, deregulation, and instrumentalist values of economic efficiency - to globalisation. The espoused aims of internationalisation – to promote international, intercultural and global understandings in higher education (Knight & Author (3) 1995) – are perceived as softening these negative effects (Sanderson, 2010).

Recently, there have been calls for greater criticality, reflexivity and diversity within internationalisation of higher education research and established discourse, definitions and concerns challenged more systematically (c.f. Author 2013, Clifford & Montgomery, 2014). Hawawani (2011), in particular, critiques Knight & Author (3)'s definition as being 'too narrowly defined' arguing it does 'not capture the essence of a process whose ultimate goal should be to *integrate the institution into the emerging global knowledge and learning network* rather than *integrate an international dimension into an existing institutional setting*' (original emphasis, p.5). As a way of 'decentering the hegemonic stranglehold of the Eurocentric epistemological order', Zeleza (2012, p. 3) argues for 'more empowering knowledges for the south and symmetrical forms of internationalization in higher education'. Additionally, 'the internationalisation of higher education has become institutionalised around a linguistic preference for English' (Phan, 2013, p. 160), rendering it impossible to reflect on it without recourse to the global spread of English as the *lingua franca*.

The aim of many universities to 'achieve more intensive and self-transformative international experiences.... to bring an international dimension to the knowledge content of the curriculum, to enhance global skill building and to improve intercultural relations in culturally mixed classrooms' Marginson (2013, p.14) is encapsulated, increasingly, in university policies and strategies for producing graduates who are 'global citizens' (Clifford & Montgomery, 2011). The trend for Anglo-European, and increasingly Asian, universities to describe themselves as 'global' institutions fostering global citizenship in their students is, however, attracting mounting criticism. Global citizenship covers a range of meanings from an inescapable dimension of capitalism (Dower, 2008) to a more transformative acceptance of our shared responsibility for the world's future (Clifford & Montgomery, 2011). If higher education is to prepare graduates to be global citizens, it will need to engage a radical, or 'emerging' curriculum (Barnett & Coate, 2005) which encompasses three domains: not only knowing (as in the traditional curriculum), but also doing and being; a curriculum with an ontological focus, that engages students as whole persons. Yet, the ontological domain is still 'an embryonic component' in many university curricula (Barnett & Coate, 2005).

As Rizvi and Lingard (2010, p.173) observe, 'the appeal of the idea of internationalisation of the curriculum appears ubiquitous [but] it is not always clear what it means and how it might represent a new way of prioritizing and organizing learning'. Internationalisation of the Curriculum (*IoC*) is a difficult term to define due

to its unrepentant focus on the 'curriculum' (Author (4) & Author, (2) 2013), but we argue that it is a particularly significant area for further critical investigation.

One definition that has gained considerable traction is:

the incorporation of an international and intercultural dimension into the curriculum as well as the teaching and learning arrangements and support services of a program of study (Leask, 2009, p.209).

If teachers are to assist learners to become more reflexive about their own cultural values in relation to others, it follows that the teachers will themselves need to develop reflexive teaching practices (Author (1), 2011). Yet in universities, curriculum design is rarely a reflective practice, primarily because the curriculum is 'invisible' (Barnett & Coate, 2005). The lack of debate about the curriculum has profound implications for IoC (Leask & Beelen, 2009), because 'decisions about curriculum innovation for internationalisation are not neutral'; rather they are ideological in nature, shaped by beliefs about internationalisation/ globalisation and about the curriculum itself (Leask 2008, p.13). What is needed, therefore, is a curriculum that fosters the formation of ethical 'human being and becoming' for a 'supercomplex' (Barnett, 2000), increasingly interconnected world. If IoC is to perform this role it needs to be characterised by a transformational approach to education with an emphasis on criticality for 'critical being' (Barnett, 1997, p.7). In short, the gap between IoC rhetoric and practice will remain unless academics, as the 'primary architects of the curriculum' (Leask & Bridge, 2013, p.80) adopt a more critically reflexive approach to the curriculum and its construction and then become intellectually and affectively engaged in that process.

Mestenhauser (2011) and Bell's (2004) work usefully conceptualised IoC as inseparable from academics' understanding and practice of curriculum and teaching rather than being an optional or specialised extra. Sanderson (2008) addresses this by sketching a theoretical 'foundation' for understanding academics' engagement with IoC as a personally transformative process. The research surveyed here highlights the importance of considering the situatedness of academic practice in the context of IoC, rendering it clear that more nuanced, multi-faceted understandings of academics' engagement with the (internationalisation of the) curriculum are needed. Moreover, 'engaging the curriculum', as Barnett and Coate (2005) argue, is personally demanding work – it is the forge where academic identities and those of students are formed and reformed. Internationalisation of higher education is occurring in a world that is far from 'flat' (Friedman, 2005). Research into internationalisation needs to name and disrupt processes such as the 'academic capitalism' practised by countries in the global North that make it increasingly difficult for those in the global South to contribute to knowledge production (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2009). While there are some exemplars (for example, Montgomery, 2010, Leask, 2013, Author, (1) 2011, 2013,) we need more robust research to reveal the myriad ways globalisation impacts on university staff, students, their families, employers and communities, and how these actors negotiate this landscape. The constant, rapid change across the sector means that our understandings will always be emergent, contingent and necessarily situated. Echoing Haggis (2009, p.389) we suggest that internationalisation of higher education research needs to expand its range of epistemological and methodological tools, in order to 'deal well with "the fleeting", the "disturbed" the "multiple" and the "complex"'.