



INTERNATIONALISATION OF THE CURRICULUM: Concepts and Working Practices

Sheila Trahar
University of Bristol
Graduate School of Education



CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
Higher Education and Social Justice	5
PART ONE	6
The International Higher Education Landscape	6
The International/Global University?	6
Internationalisation? Globalisation? Cosmopolitanism? Glocalisation?	7
Internationalisation = International Students?	8
'Internationalisation at Home'	10
Finally...Some Personal Musings	11
PART TWO	12
Internationalisation of the Curriculum: Concepts and Working Practices	12
Internationalising the Curriculum: Disciplinary Differences?	13
Internationalising the Content of the Curriculum	13
Diversity	13
Perspectives on Learning	14
Perspectives on Learning: Learning in Higher Education	14
The 'Classroom'	15
A Personal Story	16
Internationalising the Curriculum: A Story from Hong Kong	16
Language Complexities	17
Technology Enhanced Learning/e-Learning	18
Facilitating Intercultural Groupwork	20
Finally...	21
REFERENCES	22



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Some material in this publication has appeared in Trahar (2007), Trahar (2011) and Trahar (2013)

Copyright Sheila Trahar and TEMPUS – IRIS Project, October 2013

INTRODUCTION

This publication accompanies the IRIS Workshop 'Internationalisation of the Curriculum', held in November 2013. My intention, in writing it, is to enable you to engage with some of the broader issues that need to be considered in 'internationalising' the curriculum and to reflect on your own practice.

'Internationalisation of the Curriculum' or 'Curriculum Internationalisation' are terms that few people seem able to define and even fewer consider have anything to do with them (Leask, 2013). For that reason, although 'Internationalisation of the Curriculum' is the main focus of the publication, other issues that are fundamental to the 'internationalisation of higher education' are discussed in **Part One**. The definitions of internationalisation of the curriculum and 'working practices' proposed in **Part Two** are thus located firmly within empirical research and theoretical concepts prevalent in the field.

Blum & Bourn (2013, p.43) suggest that:

Central to higher education responses to globalisation is a need to identify and support learners in developing: (1) the skills to make sense of what is happening around them; (2) the ability to recognise diverse interpretations and viewpoints; and, perhaps above all, (3) the know-how to deal with uncertainty and complexity.

It would be difficult for any higher education practitioner to disagree that the development of these skills and qualities is central to the purposes of higher education – whatever the context - and irrespective of globalisation. It should be recognised, however, that globalisation has been, and continues to be, a significant, contributing factor in the changing landscape of higher education. It is this changing landscape that is the context for analysis in the publication.

The Centre for Curriculum Internationalisation (CCI) at Oxford Brookes University in the UK has a helpful website that explores many of the issues referred to in this publication www.brookes.ac.uk/services/cci/ The Centre establishes close links between curriculum internationalisation and the notion of a global citizen – as do I. Global citizenship is a contested term, however, that has both negative and positive connotations. It can be associated with the responsibility to act in the interests of social justice and, more negatively, with cultural imperialism (Mertova & Green, 2010). Throughout this publication,

I acknowledge these tensions. Bearing in mind the contested nature of global citizenship, I find the Oxfam (2006) definition of a global citizen valuable. A global citizen is someone who:

- Is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen;
- Respects and values diversity;
- Has an understanding of how the world works economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically and environmentally;
- Is outraged by social injustice;
- Participates in and contributes to the community at a range of levels from local to global;
- Is willing to act to make the world a more sustainable place; and
- Take responsibility for their actions.

It is this definition – and the values inherent in it – that underpin this publication.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Singh (2011) defines social justice as “the search for a fair (not necessarily equal) distribution of what is beneficial and valued...in a society” (p. 482). Drawing on a 2008 report by the European Science Foundation, which foregrounded the changing relationship between higher education and society, she highlights the connection made “between analyses of higher education’s role in contributing to overall social fairness and those relating to patterns of enquiry within higher education itself (e.g. equitable student access)” (p.484). As she points out, however, “the simple act of inclusion does not in itself bring about greater equality” (p. 491) nor does “the personal experience of an intercultural encounter ...automatically initiate intercultural learning” (Otten, 2000, p. 15). Internationalisation of the curriculum can initiate intercultural learning and thus engender a greater

sense of social justice in all of us by celebrating and working with diversity rather than positioning it as problematic - as I have learned through my own research and experience as a higher education teacher in the UK and in several other countries. Those experiences will be drawn on, as appropriate, throughout the publication to support the analysis and to offer practical suggestions.

The publication is divided into two parts. **Part One** focuses on the current international higher education landscape, highlighting how terms such as globalisation, internationalisation, cosmopolitanism are used in the discourse, offering some definitions and untangling some of the conceptualising behind them. In **Part Two**, I discuss how the presence of students from different contexts, faiths, ethnicities, academic traditions needs to be reflected in curriculum design – content, teaching, learning and assessment approaches - and student support, proposing some practical ways to 'internationalise the curriculum'.



PART ONE

THE INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION LANDSCAPE

The international higher education landscape is changing. In the 21st century, many more countries have well developed higher education systems and thus can attract visiting students, academics and researchers. Mobility, rather than being concentrated between the Anglo-Celtic countries, (such as Australia, the US and the UK), and 'the rest', is beginning to be distributed more evenly throughout the world. Marginson (2013, p.14) proposes that many institutions now want to:

Achieve more intensive and self-transformative international experiences. They want 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. They want to move from rhetoric and bland mission statements, to changing the nature of the education that everyone receives.

Yet, in spite of the 'culturally mixed classrooms' of 21st century higher education, there is still less attention given to the complexities of intercultural encounters and communication - the lived experiences of the participants - in those classrooms. Marginson's claim that many institutions 'want to move from rhetoric and bland mission statements to changing the education that everyone receives', may, therefore, continue to ring hollow unless there are opportunities created for critically reflective conversations among those who populate higher education about their personal experiences of daily encounters. The classroom - physical/virtual - brings everyone together, hence the importance of internationalisation of the curriculum which can enable all of us to bring an 'international dimension to the knowledge content of the curriculum', 'to improve intercultural relations' and to develop cultural capability (Trahar, 2011).

THE INTERNATIONAL/ GLOBAL UNIVERSITY?

Current higher education discourse is replete with theorising about internationalisation, globalisation, cosmopolitanism and glocalisation but universities existed long before the age of European empires and imperial science - the age when 'the university' became one of society's

most international organisations (Teichler, 2004). The University of Al Karaouine in Fes, Morocco, for example, established in 859 CE, claims to be the oldest university in the world. If universities have always been 'international', we may ask why, currently, there is so much emphasis on 'international higher education', 'internationalisation of higher education', 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. Undoubtedly one of the reasons is globalisation and its impact on higher education, in particular the creation of opportunities for increased mobility. The diversity of 21st century higher education can provide rich opportunities for developing "a more globalised sense of responsibility and citizenship" (Kahane, 2009, p. 49) and can prepare learners for a world that is interdependent and interconnected. Celebrating greater diversity, brought about by more extensive participation, can encourage all members of higher education communities to operate beyond the local and national perspectives that dominate two of the core activities of higher education - learning and teaching - and facilitate global understanding and greater sensitivity in our own local, multicultural societies. This can only be achieved, however, by "the creative utilisation of the imagination of all those that make up the university...in ways that are both self-reflexive and critical" (Rizvi, 2000, p. 6). A key aim of this publication is to enable critical reflexivity on approaches to learning, teaching and assessment in order to 'internationalise' the curriculum. In my experience, it is difficult to do this without questioning the beliefs and values that are held in relation to those practices.

In Israel, as to some extent in the UK:

The international dimension can be complicated as the "other" or "foreigner" can refer to those who are not of the country's majority population or to other nationalities from outside the country. The definition of an "international" versus "local" dimension is thus more complex among heterogenic, segregated populations (Cohen, Yemeni & Sadeh, 2013, p.4)

and "a national strategy to internationalize may also interfere with local and institutional values" (Skrbis & Woodward, 2007 cited *ibid*). But, in any context, no matter how complex and politically charged, we need to understand what those local and institutional values - in this case the values of higher education - are. These may be stated in 'vision' or 'strategy' documents but the extent to which those who populate the institution subscribe to them, or are even aware of them, may be questionable. Focusing on 'internationalisation of the higher education curriculum' presents us with opportunities to examine the vision, mission statements or internationalisation strategies of our institutions and to debate the extent to which they reflect perspectives to which we can adhere. In addition, it challenges us to surface and crystallise our beliefs and values about learning and teaching - and learning and teaching within different disciplines - that are seldom subjected to scrutiny.

INTERNATIONALISATION? GLOBALISATION? COSMOPOLITANISM? GLOCALISATION?

'Globalisation' is often used interchangeably with 'internationalisation' and, although they are "dynamically linked concepts" they are "different" (OECD, 1999, p.14), often inadequately understood and resisting simple explanation (Sanderson, 2004). Given the "centrality of higher education institutions in the globalized world... the relationships between globalization and higher education seem to be acuter, perplexing and open to multiple and divergent accounts" (Vaira, 2004, p.484). It is important to consider the meaning - or meanings - of 'the internationalisation of higher education', not least

because the TEMPUS - IRIS project has this as a central tenet. Does it mean the integration of an international/ intercultural dimension into all of the activities of a university, including the teaching, research and service functions (OECD, 1999) with the aim of achieving mutual understanding through dialogue with people from other countries (Yang, 2002)? Does the term simply mean increased numbers of students, 'sojourners' (Kiley, 2003) from countries other than the host country, who are studying in higher education? Mok (2003, p.123) adopts a more cynical perspective. By defining internationalisation of higher education as "market-related strategies such as...encouraging academics and universities to engage in business and market-like activities to generate revenue", including the recruitment of international students, he asserts that it serves the interests of reducing the financial burden of the state.

I find it helpful to differentiate between internationalisation and globalisation by thinking of internationalisation as the "growth of relations between nations and between national cultures (in that sense internationalisation has a long history)", and globalisation as "reserved for the growing role of world systems. These world systems are situated outside and beyond the nation state, even while bearing the marks of dominant national cultures, particularly American culture" (Marginson, 2000, p. 24). Moreover, Kreber (2009) proposes that 'internationalisation' communicates "an ethos of mutuality and practices geared at strengthening cooperation...By encouraging greater internationalisation across teaching, research and service activities, the quality of higher education can be enriched" (*ibid*, pp. 2-3) - a definition that resonates with me and one that underpins my own work.

Otten (2003, p.13) proposes another dimension of internationalisation and globalisation, that of the "regional/local level of...domestic multiculturalism". This more local perspective is embedded in the term "cosmopolitanism" by Caglar (2006, p.40). Similarly - and particularly pertinent within the context of international higher education - Cuccioletta (2001/2002, p.4) refers to "cosmopolitan citizenship...that recognizes that each person of that nation-state possesses multiple identities", linking her/him to her/his own cultural heritage and the culture of the host country. Yet another term, 'glocalisation', "can be divided into the terms 'global' and 'localization', a global outlook adapted to local conditions" (Mok & Lee, 2003, p. 35). More recently, the terms 'global citizenship' and 'global citizen' have become popular - as indicated in the introduction. It is my belief that, although it is valuable to be familiar with how these terms used to describe 'cross-border' activities are conceptualised, they have less significance than the importance of being clear about the assumptions and motivations that mediate constructive efforts to engage in the activities and processes.

INTERNATIONALISATION = INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS?

One reason why definitions of internationalisation continue to be contested is that a nation's history, culture, indigenous populations and resources shape its relationships with other countries (Yang, 2005). In Australia and Canada, for example, the meaning of internationalisation is linked with their domestic multicultural populations and international higher education research extends beyond the relationship between their own nationals and those from other countries, to recognise the shifting and multiple identities of all individuals and groups (ibid). In Hong Kong, a context in which I teach, internationalisation is defined as:

A wide spectrum of issues, including curriculum design, research collaboration, international faculty mix, student recruitment, integration of all students on campus...The UGC sees internationalisation with Mainland China as the key to Hong Kong's future and that it should be actively pursued by the UGC-funded institutions (UGC Annual Report, 2011- 2012).

The term *jiegui* – connecting the smaller with the larger - is widely accepted as a crucial facet of internationalisation in higher education in China (Yang, 2002, 2005) and many Chinese academics seem to have sufficient confidence in their traditional culture not to feel threatened by internationalisation (ibid). This confidence may reflect “the remarkable capacity of Confucian culture to accommodate other cultures” (Hayhoe, 2005, p. 582) or a naivety about the hegemonic effects of outside influences (Yang, 2005). In Malaysia, a country that is establishing itself as an education hub in the Asia Pacific region, the internationalisation of higher education is seen as a significant factor in increasing “Malaysians’ international awareness and developing a sense of national pride” (Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia, 2011, p.23), as well as accelerating the country towards Vision 2020 and its aspiration to join the league of developed nations.

The ways in which increased numbers of international students can ‘internationalise’ the experience of local students and staff and benefit UK higher education continue to be explored. A recent research project, funded by the Department for Business, Innovation

and Skills (2013), *The Wider Benefits of International Higher Education in the UK* is an example. There can, however, still be a gulf between the marketing strategies employed by such organisations as the British Council, which promotes the opportunities for mutual understanding offered by the fresh and enriching perspectives of international students, and the experiences of academics and students (Trahar, 2011). In addition, the meaning of internationalisation still tends to be elided with international students. For example, in 2008, I was the project manager of a qualitative study funded by the UK Higher Education Academy (HEA), which investigated ‘Perspectives on Internationalising the Curriculum’. A question that we posed to focus group participants - academic staff and students from throughout the world – was ‘What do you understand by the term “internationalisation”?’ People would try to offer a definition but, very quickly, would resort to foregrounding ‘international students’ in the conversations, irrespective of whether they identified as an ‘international student’ (or academic) or a ‘local student’ (or academic).

The UK is second only to the USA in its ability to attract students from other countries. In 2011/2012, 16.8% of all students in UK higher education were defined as ‘international’ i.e. coming from outside of the European Union (EU) but at postgraduate level study, 69% of full-time taught postgraduates and 46% of all taught postgraduates were international, with 41% of all research postgraduates falling within that category (www.ukcisa.org.uk/Info-for-universities-colleges--schools/Policy-research--statistics/Research-statistics/International-students-in-UK-HE/) The UK is the second most popular destination in the world for PhD researchers. Such students contribute more than £8 billion annually to the UK economy (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2013).

The Teaching International Students (TIS) project: www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/subjects/escalate/7479_Teaching_international_studentproject emerged from the UK Prime Minister’s Initiative 2 (PMI 2). It was a joint initiative of the Higher Education Academy and the United Kingdom Council for International Student Affairs (UKCISA). In spite of the implications of its title, its aim was to provide guidance for academics on how to meet the diverse learning needs of international students in ways to benefit all students. You may find some of its resources helpful.

Some years ago the University of Bristol’s Graduate School of Education established a Learning Skills seminar programme. This programme was designed to support all students in their return to learning. The intention behind it was commendable in wanting to support in particular, international students to become familiar with UK conventions for studying, writing and producing assignments (De Vita, 2001, 2002). It was less common, however, for us to subject our own teaching and learning

practices to critical scrutiny. We rarely questioned, for example, the validity of taking a ‘critical approach’ to study:

This thing we call “critical thinking” or “analysis” has strong cultural components.... it is a voice, a stance, a relationship with texts and authorities that is taught, both consciously and unconsciously, by family members, teachers, the media, even the history of one’s own country...It means...finding words that show exact relationships between ideas, as is required in a low-context culture...It means valuing separateness over harmony (Fox, 1994, p.125).

Even less often did we embrace the experiences of our international students and academic staff and consider how we might learn from them about alternative teaching and learning approaches (Trahar, 2006; Kim, 2009). Thankfully, this has now changed. The stated ethos of the School is the celebration of our rich diversity and is embedded in our Strategy for the Development of Learning, Teaching and Assessment, 2012 – 2016:

The Strategy stresses the need to provide excellent and intellectually demanding learning and teaching relevant for the 21st century, for a talented and diverse student population. Our students are experienced learners and we want them to enjoy a rewarding and fulfilling experience and to benefit from a rich learning environment that supports their diverse learning needs. We recognise that students and staff from different backgrounds bring a range of previous learning experiences and we want to ensure that everyone is encouraged to articulate these differences so that they can inform the continuous development of our pedagogical approaches and our distinctive and collaborative endeavours are celebrated.



To summarise:

Globalization is the context of economic and academic trends that are part of the reality of the 21st century. Internationalization includes the policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions – and even - individuals – to cope with the global academic environment... Globalization may be unalterable but internationalisation involves many choices (Altbach & Knight, 2007, pp. 290-291).

‘And even individuals’ implies, once again, that ‘individuals’ have a lesser role in the changing nature of higher education, yet it is the individuals who constitute the values, cultures and traditions of higher education that are rarely articulated, made transparent and exposed to critical scrutiny (Turner & Robson, 2008, Trahar, 2011). It is these more neglected areas that are explored in **Part Two**, with the aim of inviting you to reflect on your own learning and teaching approaches – and what informs them – and also to propose some strategies for internationalising the curriculum in the ‘international’ or ‘global’ classroom.

'INTERNATIONALISATION AT HOME'

Teichler (2009), focusing on the internationalisation of higher education in Europe, points to a recent shift in the discourse towards an increasing emphasis on 'internationalisation at home', highlighting that "efforts to internationalise higher education cannot opt anymore for stand-alone activities, but have to integrate border-crossing activities with some steps towards international convergence and with mainstream activities at home" (p.105). Internationalisation at Home (IaH) is a term coined by a group of Northern European academics to explain/communicate that, in spite of the substantive changes in higher education referred to earlier in this document, the majority of students, academics and other staff are *not* mobile, thus the development of the qualities and skills attributed to global citizenship and cultural capability will not be realised by travelling to other countries for study or work. IaH focuses our attention on constituting "academic learning that blends the concepts of *self*, *strange*, *foreign* and *otherness*" (Teekens, 2006, p.17, original emphasis) and is congruent with the perspectives of those such as Appadurai (2001), Haigh (2008; 2009), Sanderson (2007) and Trahar (2007) who foreground the importance and value of the personal awareness and reflexivity of academic staff in higher education, as I proposed earlier. Such personal awareness is especially important in our encounters with anyone who we may position as 'different' from ourselves and indeed, find ourselves differently positioned by. Harrison & Peacock (2010, p.129), draw attention to the "majority of existing studies which assume homogeneity among the international student population, ignoring important differences in culture, faith and ethnicity, which in fact exist across the home/international divide". Similarly, Haigh (2009, p. 272) suggests that "frequently the cultural gap between a local community and its minorities is greater than that between them and its 'international' learners who often come from other Western nations or Westernised elites". More

optimistically, a comment by a local, UK student, in the HEA (2008) study that I referred to previously, illustrates this concept of IaH well:

... I think the key thing I've learnt has been to accept other people's points of view... Because I think in the world we live in it is very important for us to learn to accept other people; other people's point of view.

A key point that I am striving to make, throughout the publication, is that in any discussion about internationalisation of higher education, we need to examine ourselves and our local populations, beliefs, values, so that we can be prepared to reach out to those - who may be from other contexts or from our own - who may have different academic traditions and educational experiences. Turner & Robson (2008, p.68) suggest that an "overall positive climate" can be developed through assisting "established and new participants" to identify ways in which learning and teaching can be more effective in internationalised institutions. Unfortunately, though, as suggested earlier, much of the literature (e.g. Montgomery, 2010; Peacock & Harrison, 2008; Montgomery, 2010) indicates that students with diverse cultural backgrounds are reluctant to interact, both within the classroom and elsewhere on campus. The comment below made by a local student in our HEA project (2008) supports this perspective:

It's not about rudeness or about people disliking each other, it's just the natural groups that people tend to form with people from their own countries. Sometimes people prefer to speak in their native tongue as well, which I find quite a lot with the Chinese students. But yeah (I) don't really see much of mixing with international students.

There can be complex reasons for a lack of student interaction (Hyland et al., 2008, Montgomery, 2010) including cultural cliques, language, cultural differences in socialising, and institutional and degree course barriers and, in **Part Two**, I propose some practical ways to overcome these perceived obstacles. On a more positive note, in my own research and practice, I have encountered some rather more encouraging views, as exemplified by the following local, UK, doctoral student:



The group consisted of all sorts of ages and nationalities and I enjoyed being forced to look outwards, to engage with all sorts of people and to be challenged. This is amazing!...I felt the local learner. I didn't feel that put me above everybody else, if anything - less. So I decided that the effort had to come from me. (Trahar, 2011, pp.88-89).

FINALLY...SOME PERSONAL MUSINGS

Before we can recognise the 'Other', we have to know ourselves well (Stromquist, 2003, p. 93).

When I first began contributing to the University of Bristol Master of Education (MEd) programme in 1999, I had extensive experience as an adult educator and of working with people often defined as 'non-traditional' students. They were mature students, part-time students combining study with work and family responsibilities, and those with little post-compulsory education. The majority, however, were white and British, like me. I rarely encountered students who were 'culturally different' and who did not speak English as their first language. In my first encounter with 'international students', I had planned a session on rational-emotive behaviour therapy (REBT); an approach to counselling developed by Albert Ellis a white, male North American. My discomfort in that first encounter is articulated more fully in **Part Two**,

but in hindsight, I feared that I was being "pseudo-etic" (Biggs, 2001, p. 293). I was very uncomfortable with the issues of colonisation and of educational imperialism implicit in the "transfer of skills and knowledge from the university sector to the broader community" when "this broader community is in Asia, Africa or the Middle East" (Cadman, 2000, p. 476). My discomfort is redolent of Crossley's (1984, 2000) identification of the potential problems that can occur from the uncritical transfer of educational theories, policies and innovations across international boundaries. In addition, I was concerned that 'internationalisation' was a "cover for creeping Westernisation" (Merrick, 2000, p.xii). Since then, I have continued to be provoked - and to provoke myself - to explore ways in which I might continue, unintentionally, to 'transfer uncritically' my own attitudes and practices of learning and teaching, grounded in particular philosophical and theoretical perspectives when working with people who have different traditions and values. By seeking to make transparent, not only the complexities, but also the rich potential in cross-cultural interactions, I am striving to recognise how my ethnicity and cultural affiliations serve as constructions of my identities as learner, as teacher, as human being, as they do those of the students.

Sanderson (2004, p.16) reconceptualises the meaning of becoming internationalised to be a "personal journey of deconstruction and reconstruction". Such a personal journey may not resolve the imbalances of power in the world, but it might help level the playing field (Appadurai, 2001), even if only a little. It may also help:

To show the extent and manner in which globalising processes are mediated on the ground, in the flesh and 'inside the head'... paying attention to diverse peoples and places, and their complex and contradictory experiences of, reactions to, and engagements with various aspects of globalisation as these intersect with their lives and identities (Kenway & Fahey, 2006, p.267).

In **Part Two**, we step into the landscape that I have sketched out in **Part One**, to investigate how 'globalising processes are mediated on the ground, in the flesh and in the head' by focusing on internationalisation of the curriculum and some practical ways to achieve it.

PART TWO

INTERNATIONALISATION OF THE CURRICULUM: CONCEPTS AND WORKING PRACTICES

Internationalisation of the curriculum, or curriculum internationalisation – as I indicated in the Introduction – is a term that, in my experience, very few people can define clearly. Hans de Wit argues that the internationalisation of higher education needs to be “brought back to where it belongs – in academia” (cited Leask, 2013, p.99). I agree wholeheartedly with this sentiment yet, as Leask herself comments, “disciplinary perspectives that incorporate the voices of academic staff as active participants in the process are relatively rare” (ibid). Maringe (2010, p.27) claims that curriculum internationalisation is not a top priority for many institutions of higher education because of academic resistance to “changing the purpose, content and methodology of teaching” and, as highlighted in Part One, there continues to be a gap between the institutional rhetoric of internationalisation and academic practice (Trahar, 2011, Green & Whitsed, 2013). Academics, however, are the core players in learning, teaching and assessment processes and therefore need to be proactive; the initiators of curriculum internationalisation. If we do not initiate it, we risk it being imposed by those who may be less appropriate to effect it.

Maringe & Woodfield, (2013) have developed a useful table “Mapping of Rationales of Internationalisation”. As the “pedagogical rationale” for internationalisation, they highlight “content, teaching principles and approaches, assessment, support for learning and the student experience” (p.15). In identifying “key strategies” they suggest “development of guidelines for preparing international curricula. Workshops for enhancing the pedagogical preparedness of staff to deal with aspects of international curricula” adding “there is a varied and highly limited view of the curriculum in different universities which constrains their understanding and application of pedagogical principles”. Leask & Bridge (2013, p.81) in their research into internationalisation of the curriculum across several disciplines in Australia, used Leask’s own definition of “the incorporation of an international and intercultural dimension into the content of the curriculum as well as the teaching and learning arrangements and support services of a program of study” as a framework for their study. Another definition that I like is:

Curricula, pedagogies and assessments that foster: understanding of global perspectives and how these intersect and interact with the local and the personal; inter-cultural capabilities in terms of actively engaging with other cultures; and responsible citizenship in terms of addressing different value systems and subsequent actions (Clifford, 2009, p. 135).

These definitions clarify that internationalisation of the curriculum goes beyond ‘internationalising content’; it encompasses approaches to teaching and learning. In addition, the ability to support students to engage with each other is essential in enabling them to develop the skills and qualities of the global citizen, as articulated in the Introduction.

INTERNATIONALISING THE CURRICULUM: DISCIPLINARY DIFFERENCES?

In 2011, the Australian Learning and Teaching council (ALTC) funded a study entitled “IoC in Action”. The key question in this study was “How can we internationalise the curriculum in this discipline area, in this particular institutional context, and ensure that, as a result, we improve the learning outcomes of all students” (Green & Whitsed, 2013, p.53)? This is an important question to ask, as disciplines vary in their conceptualising of knowledge and learning, teaching and assessment approaches. Research (e.g. Clifford, 2009, Leask & Bridge, 2013) tends to indicate that those academics in the ‘soft’ disciplines of the humanities and social sciences are better disposed towards looking beyond content in internationalisation of the curriculum discussions, to reflect on learning and teaching processes. Those in the ‘hard pure’ disciplines consider that their knowledge is already ‘international’ and can be more reluctant to consider their learning and teaching approaches and how they may be culturally mediated. The studies cited earlier highlight that much can be gained from interdisciplinary conversations as they can engender learning from each other and emphasise that, although “students need to grasp the concept of theoretical science...they will need some understanding of global issues and have ways of making ethical judgements about their work” (Clifford, 2009, p.142).

INTERNATIONALISING THE ‘CONTENT’ OF THE CURRICULUM

A straightforward way to ‘internationalise’ curriculum content is to draw on research conducted in different countries. This is not always as simple as it appears, however, because the research capacity in many contexts is not sufficiently well developed to effect it. In addition, there is the added complication that academic journals are dominated by the US and the UK, in particular the US, and are published in English. I consider this situation to be iniquitous – but more important than my indignation is the dilemma that it creates. One example is the University of Bristol’s transnational programmes in Hong Kong. We include as much locally produced research as possible in our teaching, but, because none of the people who teach on our Hong Kong programmes speak Chinese, our ability to use local research published in that language is limited. In Bristol, our learning communities are even more multicultural than in Hong Kong, so it is impossible to locate research published in English from every context. The students, however, especially if they are postgraduates, are a rich resource and can locate research from their local contexts published in their

languages. In doing so, they feel that their experiences and contexts are appreciated and valued by others, another step in encouraging everyone to engage actively with other cultures and with their knowledges.

DIVERSITY

Virtually everyone could in some fashion claim to be working across some kind of identity difference (Acker, 2011, p. 416).

Do we place too much emphasis on diversity? After all, we are all different from each other – that is what makes us human. But I agree with Manathunga (2007, p.95) who proposes that a “*liberal disavowal of difference*” (emphasis in original) can lead to important identity issues being ignored. In any discussion of internationalisation of higher education and of the curriculum, it is usually the differences between people that concentrate our attention; the struggle can be whether to articulate the differences and use them to effect change that will benefit everyone – or to ignore them – thus engaging in the ‘liberal disavowal’ that Manathunga advises against. The environments that I work in are completely ‘diverse’. Students and academics identify as male, female, transgender, lesbian, homosexual, Muslim, Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist, of no faith, Chinese, Pakistani, having a disability – which may be visible or invisible – all or none of these identities. I could continue endlessly. I find this heterogeneity to be very rich indeed but I would be being disingenuous if I did not also add that I find it complex – and challenging.

Forrest, Judd & Davison (2012) comment, “it is always easier to observe the framework within which someone else’s thoughts, feelings and behaviours are embedded, rather than to see, much less challenge one’s own” (p.1). ‘Unhomeliness’ is a postcolonial term that defines the discomfort that we can experience/feel when we encounter people whose values, beliefs, traditions are very different from our own. Rather than resist that discomfort, the exhortation is to encourage dialogue so that we can learn, not only why others hold the views that they do, but also why we hold them ourselves. I recall several situations where, considering myself sensitive to diversity, I have encountered beliefs and values that I find very difficult to accept or that I cannot accept at all. In each case, initiating dialogue has enabled me to understand why the person holds those beliefs and also why they are so alien to me. At the end of these conversations, neither of us may have changed our beliefs but our understanding of why we hold them has become clearer (Trahar, 2013).



PERSPECTIVES ON LEARNING

Our perspectives on learning matter: what we think about learning influences where we recognize learning (Wenger, 2009, p.214)

What is learning? Are there different types of learning? Does learning depend on what is being learned? What makes good learning happen? To what extent is the way you teach informed by your understanding of how people learn? Or, do you teach in the way that you were taught? In this section, I discuss some learning perspectives and show how they continue to be dominated by 'Western' ideas. I include some 'other' perspectives on learning – and teaching – that I have distilled from my own research and practice over several years.

There are three broad, commonly used perspectives on learning, often referred to as the:

- reception model;
- constructivist model;
- co-constructivist model.

The reception model reflects behaviourism and is premised on knowledge being a fixed set of ideas or skills that can be transmitted from an educator to a learner. The learner is positioned as a passive recipient and learning is defined in terms of competencies to be acquired. The educator gives the learner knowledge and s/he absorbs it. When learners are not able to 'absorb' the knowledge, they are positioned as problematic. Behaviourism permeates higher education discourse in the form of aims, objectives, learning outcomes. Teaching is considered to be successful when the outcomes match the aims and objectives that have been established.

The constructivist model is related to the theories of those such as Jean Piaget. Learners have an active role in learning and, rather than absorbing knowledge from outside, they

construct knowledge based on their experiences. These experiences might include doing activities, talking with other people or thinking. The educator's role is to facilitate learning by providing the learner with suitable activities from which they can construct knowledge. The learner, however, is still seen in isolation.

The co-constructivist or social constructionist model is an extension of the constructivist model and reflects the sociocultural concepts of Vygotsky (1978) and Lave and Wenger (1991). The learner is positioned as an active participant but, from this perspective, learning develops through participation in activities with other people - and is social. Rather than acquiring knowledge, meaning-making happens through collaboration and dialogue with others. The educator is an expert learner, who participates in the learning and dialogue, contributing her/his greater experience to the collaboration.

In addition, the cultural critical discourse perspective takes the view that learning can only be understood within a broader cultural context; certain knowledges are privileged and therefore connected to power. The role of the educator is to facilitate learner transformation – 'critical pedagogy' - informed by the work of Freire (1972) and Giroux (1992).

PERSPECTIVES ON LEARNING: LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Tennant et al. (2010) draw on Skelton's (2005) four discourses that he proposes inform the everyday teaching practices in higher education. These are the traditional liberal, the psychologised, performative understanding and critical understanding. Everyone in higher education will be familiar with the traditional liberal perspective as it focuses on "disciplined study, engagement in rational argument... and the acquisition of universal and timeless knowledge" (Tennant et al, 2010, p.15). The students' mastery of the discipline is important and 'knowledge' is usually communicated via lectures. Disciplinary authority is vested in the academic and the needs, interests, motivations and capabilities of the learner are assumed. Psychologised perspectives assume that learners have qualities – personality, intelligence, learning preferences and learning behaviours – which are presented as stable characteristics rather than being mediated by social, cultural and historical contexts. Performative understanding emphasises the 'performance' of the teacher, which is subject to scrutiny, for example, through students' evaluation of teaching, quality audits, employment outcomes, and student retention. Critical understanding positions disciplinary cultures, curriculum and teaching practices as excluding certain groups that are not part of the mainstream, for example, ethnic minorities, students that are disadvantaged economically or who have a disability.

"Who shapes the culture of learning and intellectual HE spaces"? (Turner & Robson, 2008, p.11). If teachers are significant in "mediating knowledge, values and behaviours" (ibid, p.83) then problematising not only pedagogical practices but the philosophical concepts that inform them is crucial in internationalising the curriculum (Trahar, 2011). Learning, teaching and assessment are practices that, like any other, are constructed and mediated by cultural norms and academic traditions. The positioning of the learner as autonomous pervades higher education discourse in many 'Western' contexts – a perspective grounded in philosophies that privilege individual development:

In the traditional university disciplines, the ways of thinking are derived, historically, from the underlying philosophy of the Western world, involving causal explanations and critical reasoning, which can then be alien to students coming from very different cultural backgrounds...there needs to be a greater awareness of the ways in which thinking and acting are found in other cultures and the implications these have for university teaching (Entwistle, 2009, p.23).

Interrogating our own beliefs and values can help us to understand "the impact of our positioning as teachers and learners with different linguistic, cultural, disciplinary and experiential knowledge" (Ryan & Viète, 2009, p.305).

As I have indicated, I work with students from all over the world and, therefore, have attempted to research how learning and teaching are conceptualised in many different contexts. In the Confucian heritage cultures (CHC) of China, Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan, for example, contrary to stereotypes of 'the Chinese learner' as being passive and reluctant to participate in discussion (Turner & Acker, 2002), I have discovered that questioning and discussion are encouraged but after the learner has focused on understanding and acquiring concepts (Pratt, Kelly & Wong, 1999, Watkins, 2000). Thus, a dominant belief that learning does not occur *through* discussion but by discussion following acquisition of 'knowledge' may explain apparent reluctance to contribute to group discussions and to challenge the opinions of others. Silence, rather than communicating a lack of engagement in the process of learning - which is how I perceived it - is an active process used to reflect more deeply, in contrast to behaviour that may be seen as confrontational in the encouragement to be 'critical'.

THE 'CLASSROOM'

In this section I focus on the classroom, as a physical space for learning and teaching – and on what happens there. Later I discuss virtual learning environments and e-learning but, here, I want to focus on the 'traditional classroom'.

Take a few moments to think about the rooms in which you teach:

- How is the furniture arranged? Is it fixed? Or can it be moved?
- Do the rooms have natural light?
- What are the information technology (IT) facilities like? Are there power points for students' laptops/iPads? Are there interactive whiteboards? Flipcharts? Do you use these teaching tools?
- How do students with disabilities negotiate the space?
- Where do the students sit? Where do you sit – or stand? Do you move around – or do you stay in one place?

I have taught in a variety of spaces. My preference, undoubtedly, is for rooms with moveable furniture, preferably without tables so that students can be seated in a semicircle. Why do I consider this to be important? I believe that in order to communicate, we need to be able to see each other. If students are seated in serried rows, the only face that they can see is mine – if I am standing or sitting at the front. If/when they make a comment, they are making it to the back of another person's head, thus the only reaction they can see is mine. I, undoubtedly, hold the power in the room – by being situated at the front.

In Hong Kong, I teach in rooms that have no natural light. The rooms are equipped with state of the art facilities but these are located at the front of the room. The furniture is fixed – although arranged in a horseshoe shape – with two rows of connected tables and chairs. The chairs are very comfortable but this layout means that, when the students are working in groups, they have to climb over the tables or work with the people closest to them, which is not always conducive to getting to know others. In addition, without careful 'choreography' it can result in all of the Hong Kong local students sitting on one side of the room and all of the non-locals – usually from the UK, Australia, Canada and first language English speakers – on the other.

Why am I paying so much attention to the physical environment in a publication that focuses on 'internationalisation of the curriculum'? Learning environments are designed by people. Whether they are designed by people who are familiar with learning and teaching perspectives and principles is debatable, therefore it is useful to reflect on this dimension. Earlier, I discussed perspectives on learning and teaching. What

perspective did the architect have in mind when s/he designed your learning spaces? The classic 'teacher at the front' space that I have described seems to me to be informed – if it is informed at all – by behaviourism and a transmission model of teaching. From this theoretical perspective, teaching is a one-way transmission process. I talk – students listen – and learn. Or not of course. Classrooms that are designed so that furniture can be moved, where there are fewer barriers to interaction, reflect social constructionist or co-constructivist principles. Such spaces foster learning as a social process where we learn through engaging in dialogue with others.

How much responsibility do you take for where students seat themselves? In a research project in which I was involved, one of the student participants said:

"The Chinese students sit at the front, the British students at the back".

I have worked in Malaysia, where the men sit on one side of the room and the women on the other. The 3 ethnic groups – Malays, Indians, Chinese – remain in those discrete groups. In Hong Kong, the local people tend to sit together on one side of the room and the expatriates on the other. In Bristol, it is not uncommon for people to sit with those that they perceive to be similar to themselves. Suggestions on how to avoid such configurations and ways to effect greater interaction will be discussed later.

A PERSONAL STORY

In Part One, I recalled my first experience (1999) of what I would define as an 'international' classroom. This was profound for me and set me travelling on many journeys, including my PhD, which focused on the ways in which postgraduates in our Graduate School of Education experienced our learning and teaching 'cultures'. The 'discomfort' that I mentioned in Part One was caused by walking into a room and being in the minority, minority in so far as ethnicity and first language were concerned. My experiences on that cold, winter evening are recounted elsewhere (e.g. Trahar, 2011) but, suffice to say, that I walked out of that room after the class had ended, deep in thought and considerably troubled. The questions on which I was pondering were:

- What relevance do the theoretical concepts that I have been charged with introducing to the students have for them? These are concepts developed by a white North American male
- What motivates people to come to the UK to study a subject – counselling – for which there is not a word in their own language?

Some days later I bumped into a colleague in the street and shared with him my consternation. By this time, having reflected more deeply on my experience that evening, I had begun to question the ethical issues inherent in teaching a theoretical approach developed in one context and at a particular time in history to people from very different contexts. In addition, partly because I am British and many people in that class were from former British colonies, I was also musing on whether I was engaging in a form of colonialism. His reply startled me, "I don't know what you're worrying about. We treat our international students very well here". This response, albeit well intentioned, communicated to me that a) he positioned 'international students' as a homogeneous group and b) an imperialist undercurrent, which subsequently I found to be prevalent in much of the published research at the time.

INTERNATIONALISING THE CURRICULUM: A STORY FROM HONG KONG

I teach a course entitled Contemporary Perspectives on Learning on our Master of Education (MEd) in Hong Kong. The overall aim of this course, as the title suggests, is to introduce students to sociocultural perspectives on learning through the work of those such as Vygotsky (1978) and to emphasise learning as a social activity, exemplified, for example, through the work of Lave and Wenger (1991). The personal tensions that I experience between presenting students with 'Western' ideas and wanting to eschew ethnocentricity in my teaching, have

led me to include material on perspectives on learning in Confucian heritage cultures. Many of the students, however, resist engaging with these perspectives developed in their own context and mediated by values and beliefs that they tell me, consistently, are 'typically Chinese.' Why is this? Is it related to the perceived dominance of ideas developed in and informed by 'Western' contexts? Is it related to Hong Kong's history as a colony in which Chinese traditions were seen to be inferior? Or could it be because – and this is much more uncomfortable for me – they are reluctant, still, to challenge, question, critique, the Eurocentric concepts that continue to dominate education? I strive to ensure that a space is created for articulation of these complexities, but to what extent is that a reinforcement of a neocolonialist perspective? By encouraging such debate am I pursuing my own agenda and not respecting those students who have no desire to engage in such critical reflection?

LANGUAGE COMPLEXITIES

Hofstede, (1986), proposes that the chances of "successful cultural adaptation" are increased "if the teacher is to teach in the students' language rather than if the student is to learn in the teacher's language, because the *teacher* has more power over the learning situation than any single student" (p.314, emphasis in the original). I dispute the sentiment conveyed in the latter phrase but, undoubtedly, if I am operating in my first language and the majority of students are not, then the power imbalance cannot be denied. The politics of language are complex and beyond the scope of this publication but teaching in English is undeniably a dimension of internationalisation of higher education. Teaching in a language that is not the first language of many of the students – and of the academic staff in many contexts - is multilayered in its complexity.

In Mainland Europe, in particular in Scandinavia but also in France, Germany and the Netherlands, much higher education teaching is in English. In these countries, English is very widely spoken but, nonetheless, teaching in English restricts many academics. Petra de Vries, writing in the Times Higher Education (08/09/11), about her experiences in international higher education in the Netherlands expresses this poignantly:

What about our beautiful Dutch language? Was it really sensible to force unhappy Dutch lecturers who spoke English badly to discuss difficult subject matter with equally unhappy Dutch students?



Most of those defined as 'international students' in Hong Kong are from Mainland China. In that context, many of the complexities of the international classroom and internationalising the curriculum relate to language and Hong Kong as a postcolonial context. The first language of Hong Kong is Cantonese – the first language of people from Mainland China is Mandarin; unless they come from the South of China, the Mainlanders do not speak Cantonese. In order to attract Mainlanders and other 'international' students, the teaching language in Hong Kong is English. Many local students do not speak very fluent English and are often resentful of the Mainlanders because their English is better. In addition, of course, the majority of academics are teaching in a language that is not their own. In Hong Kong, what often happens is that the lecturer begins by speaking in English but will then switch to Cantonese, thus alienating the international students – including those from Mainland China. In Malaysia, a country that is also establishing itself as an education hub, teaching is in English to attract international students, who are usually from Iran, Indonesia and Africa. Fewer of the local students, certainly at undergraduate level, speak English fluently and many of the academic staff do not speak it sufficiently fluently to be able to teach in it. Similar to Hong Kong, the lecturer switches to Bahasa Malaysia, the local language, excluding immediately the international students.

The moral of the stories told above is that appropriate support must be given to students, and in many cases, to academics, if the language of learning and teaching is not the first language of the context.

TECHNOLOGY ENHANCED LEARNING/E-LEARNING

Just as books did not get rid of teachers, e-learning is very unlikely to do so. In fact, there is a call for more human interaction in teaching and learning that could probably be achieved by technology (Njenga & Fourie, 2010, p.209).

In this section, I offer a brief overview of how technology enhanced learning – e-learning – can be valuable in the process of internationalising the curriculum. I also explode some ‘myths’ about the use of technology in learning in higher education.

A definition of internationalisation of the curriculum that I cited at the beginning of Part Two was:

Curricula, pedagogies and assessments that foster: understanding of global perspectives and how these intersect and interact with the local and the personal; inter-cultural capabilities in terms of actively engaging with other cultures; and responsible citizenship in terms of addressing different value systems and subsequent actions (Clifford, 2009, p. 135)

In reflecting on the place of e-learning in internationalising the curriculum, we need to consider, therefore, how it fosters understanding of global perspectives, how it enables us to engage actively with other cultures as well as to reflect on how it can enhance our teaching and, by implication, student learning. Tait & Gaskell, (2011, p.11) reflect that “e-learning has the potential to support the development of communities and promote social justice” but, at the same time, they propose that there is a question “as to whether [Open, Distance and e-learning] contributes to or detracts from social justice in its facility for supporting the development of education on an international basis” (p.7). As they continue to say, “social justice can, however, be served by ensuring access for diverse groups of students” provided that “issues of programme relevance and cultural dilution” in cross-border education are addressed. (p.10).

Coursera, one of the largest providers of Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCs) indicates on its website <https://www.coursera.org/about> that:

We believe in connecting people to a great education so that anyone around the world can learn without limits.

Coursera is an education company that partners with the top universities and organizations in the world to offer courses online for anyone to take, for free. Our technology enables our partners to teach millions of students rather than hundreds.

We envision a future where everyone has access to a world-class education that has so far been available to a select few. We aim to empower people with education that will improve their lives, the lives of their families, and the communities they live in.

In examining this ‘vision’ in the light of what I have identified as key elements in internationalising the curriculum, MOOCs, according to Coursera, may be able to play a significant role in that process. MOOCs, for example, engage people from different cultures and on a global scale. Do they, however, develop intra-cultural capabilities and responsible citizenship? MOOCs are

claimed as a “tool for democratising higher education”, ‘free, creditless and massive’ but two criticisms are that “providing feedback is tricky” and “people want to be acknowledged for the amount of effort they’re putting in” www.youtube.com/watch?v=KqQNvmQH_YM A further criticism is that MOOCs perpetuate a transmission model of learning (Vardi, 2012) but a recent study (2013) by Glance, Forsey & Riley www.moocfeeds.com/the-pedagogical-foundations-of-massive-open-online-courses-david-g-glance-martin-forsey-miles-riley-first-monday/ claims that they are “based on sound pedagogical foundations that are at the very least comparable with courses offered by universities in face-to-face mode”.

Njenga & Fourie (2010, p.202) pose a crucial question “Is e-learning being adopted to improve teaching and learning or because it is a ‘virtual fashion’ with promising progress in the marketplace?” An advantage of e-learning/technology enhanced learning is considered to be that it transfers the responsibility for learning on to the learner. The learner takes control of her/his own learning process by, for example, being able to choose when s/he accesses material online, when - or whether - s/he engages in discussion groups. Research indicates, however, that “there is an enormous need for human interaction, and there is a limit to the number of students an expert teacher can support online at any given time” (ibid, p.203).

I reflected on the ways in which we use e-learning in our Master of Education (MEd) and Doctor of Education (EdD) programmes in Hong Kong. These are transnational programmes where the students study for a University

of Bristol degree in Hong Kong and Bristol academics travel there to teach. The programmes are supported by the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) Blackboard – as are our programmes delivered in Bristol – and academic support is provided via email and Skype. All of the learning materials for the courses are uploaded to Blackboard, students submit their assignments and they are returned, via the VLE. Personally, I do not find Blackboard to be very attractive, visually, but I am also aware that I do not exploit its facilities to the full by, for example, making use of the discussion forums. When we began to use Blackboard some 10 years ago, I recall that we tried to initiate the use of these, unsuccessfully. Now of course the students often set up their own Facebook groups and can eschew Blackboard for online discussions.

Finally, the words below encapsulate technology enhanced learning/e-learning as a resource, rather than a universal panacea in international higher education:

What is therefore needed for the successful and effective transmission and creation of knowledge using e-learning, is a ‘common understanding’ of the nature of knowledge and learning across HEIs, and a transformation of the teaching fraternity into ‘reflective practitioners’ (Njenga & Fourie, 2010, p.209).





FACILITATING INTERCULTURAL GROUPWORK

In this section I address such questions as:

- What are the advantages and disadvantages of group work in a multicultural environment?
- What is a small group? What is a large group? How can a large group be divided into smaller groups?
- What are some useful strategies/activities for small groups that enable students to get to know each other and foster a sense of global citizenship?

As I have established, I believe that, as an academic, I am a core player in the process of internationalisation and internationalisation of the curriculum in my own organisation. I consider, therefore, that I am responsible for effecting intercultural communication in the classroom. In my view, this involves gaining understanding of the different ways in which learning, teaching and assessment are culturally mediated (as discussed earlier) to ensure that my teaching is ethnocentric, rather than ethnocentric. It also means that I recognise that communication between people who perceive themselves to be different from each other does not happen by osmosis – it has to be initiated. At the beginning of any learning group, I have the responsibility to do that. All group dynamic theories emphasise the importance of the first few moments of a group – any group – in establishing the climate. What I do in those first few moments is crucial. The students will take their cue from me. If I am sarcastic and unwelcoming, that will set the tone for the group. On the other hand, if I am friendly, it will be very different. In those early moments, until they become more confident, students see me as a role model; therefore, I consider it crucial to model ‘inclusive’ behaviour. If I exclude people, so will they. If I use jargon, so will they.

At the beginning of any new group, I invite people to look around the room to observe what an ‘international’ classroom looks like. I acknowledge that our common language is English but that we all speak it in different

ways. Such a statement is inclusive and lets all students know, in particular those whose first language is English, that if we are to understand each other and learn – not only about the topic, but about each other – then we all need to be mindful of how we speak and exercise a little patience. I ask that we all speak clearly, avoid slang or jargon and that if anyone does not understand a word or a phrase, it is important that they feel able to seek clarification.

Earlier, I explained my preference for students being seated in a semicircle when I am teaching. Walking into a room and being greeted by a semicircle can be terrifying, however, for many people, especially if they come from a context where the relationship between students and teacher is very formal. The informality communicated by a semicircle can be strange and frightening – especially if there is an absence of tables – and a semicircle, although important for communication, is very exposing. Students have nowhere to hide and can be embarrassed by their lack of language fluency. I share with students that I am aware that they may be concerned and explain my rationale – as I have done in this publication. The majority of students, once they know the reasons, will accept the layout more readily, however unusual to them.

The suggestions that I offer in this section are informed by my own social constructionist principles on learning. Those who favour more behaviourist principles may be reluctant to try out some of these ideas. Research indicates, consistently, that most human beings are reluctant to move from their ‘comfort zones’ to make the effort that is required to engage with someone who they perceive to be ‘different’ from themselves in some way (e.g. Montgomery, 2010). It can be daunting, however, to be faced with a large group of people sitting in discrete groups – these may be friendship groups, all male/female groups – or ethnic groups. Occasionally, I have encountered resistance when I have proposed that people move from their comfort zones to work with others, but, by being firm and persistent I have succeeded. Sensitivity is required, in particular in contexts where groups segregate themselves. For example, when I was a visiting academic in Malaysia, I realised that it would be disrespectful to ask men and women to form mixed gender groups, but it was much less problematic to integrate the different ethnic groups for discussion activities.

Taking time at the beginning of any group to enable people to begin to get to know each other and to establish some ground rules or a learning contract is time well spent. In larger groups in lecture theatres, this is more difficult, but is not impossible. Students can talk to the person next to them or you can ask them to move, physically, to introduce themselves to a person that they do not know or that they perceive to be different from themselves in some way. Groups can be frightening places for many people until they get to know each other and, therefore, using paired activities at the beginning, is helpful. Even the shyest person can talk with one other person. Each pair

can then join another pair and then gradually confidence is built up to speak out in larger groups.

The following activities can be used to encourage greater interaction:

- Numbering people off – a useful strategy for breaking up any cliques and one that is usually perceived as non-threatening by students. Simply number them off – 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 – and then ask all of the ‘1s’, all of the ‘2s’ etc. to group together for the task
- Pre-prepared groups according to some shared interest – I share with students that I have formed them into groups based on what I understand to be commonalities. This formation enables them to discuss a topic or a concept knowing that their experiences and/or understanding are similar
- Pre-prepared groups according to different interests – students always comment on how much they learn when they are encouraged to work with people that they perceive to have very different backgrounds from themselves. It is important to explain the rationale for grouping them in this way, as with all of the suggestions
- Buzz groups – provide students with opportunities to discuss a concept/problem so that they can ‘rehearse’ their knowledge and understanding in a smaller group, rather than risking being exposed in the larger group
- Using groups to problem solve – an excellent way to facilitate students to deal with problems in their learning, such as concepts that they may struggle to comprehend. I ask students to write on ‘post-its’, or similar, one or two problems or concepts that they do not understand. For example, in running a basic teaching course for beginning teachers in higher education, I ask them to write down their most acute anxiety about what might happen in the classroom. I gather what they have written down and read out the ‘anxieties’. They feel reassured by hearing that several people share their anxiety (ies). I then form people into groups and distribute the problems together with a series of questions:
 - Why do you think this happens?
 - How can you set up your group so that it doesn’t?
 - If it does happen, how can you deal with it constructively?The advantage of this activity is that learners are working on problems/questions that they have generated – not those that I have generated. It is important to facilitate it carefully and, depending on the nature of the problem, to provide a series of ‘answers’, but this is an excellent peer learning activity
- Snowballing – small groups discuss the same topic, one person from each group moves to another group and shares the key points of the discussion. This

activity helps students to develop skills of summarising complex concepts and communicating them to others in ways that are understandable

- Guided reading – an excellent activity that enables students to wrestle with difficult concepts and to discuss them with each other. I give them a reading – an article or a book chapter – together with a series of questions that are intended to guide them to the salient points in the text. This activity is very helpful for those students who are less confident about the fluency of their English as they are guided by the questions, rather than having to extrapolate points unaided
- ‘Jigsaw’ activities – each small group is provided with a different text that presents a different perspective on a concept/topic. The groups have to present the text’s perspective in the next class session and debate the differences
- Writing letters to.... students are asked to write a letter to a theorist from an earlier period and explain to the person how the field has developed. An activity that can be used in any discipline
- ‘Being’ a theorist – I take the role of the theorist and invite students to question ‘me’ about my theoretical concepts. An activity that can help clarify understanding of complex concepts

FINALLY...

The aim of this publication was to enable you to engage with some of the broader issues that need to be considered in internationalising the curriculum, to reflect on your own practice and to share some of the strategies that I have developed through my experiences as a practitioner researcher. If we are to move beyond “rhetoric and bland mission statements to changing the nature of the education that everyone receives” (Marginson, 2013, p.14), then, as academics, we need to be the core players in effecting that process. I hope that I have been successful in encouraging you to become one of those core players.

REFERENCES

- Acker, S. (2011) Reflections on supervision and culture: What difference does difference make? *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 48 (4), 413-420.
- Altbach, P. & Knight, J. (2007) The internationalization of higher education: motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (3/4), 290 – 305.
- Appadurai, A. (2001) (Ed.) *Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Biggs J.B. (2001) Teaching across cultures. In F.Salili, C.Y. Chiu & Y.Y. Hong (Eds.) *Student motivation: The culture and context of learning* (pp 293-308). New York: Kluwer Associates/Plenum.
- Biggs, J.B. (2003) *Teaching for quality learning at university*. 2nd ed. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University.
- Blum, N. & Bourn, D. (2013) Global perspectives for global professionals in the UK: Engaging students within engineering and health. *Compare*, 43 (1), 37-55.
- Cadman, K. (2000) 'Voices in the Air': evaluations of the learning experiences of international postgraduates and their supervisors. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5 (4), 475-491.
- Caglar, A. (2006) Transdisciplinarity and transnationalism: challenges to "Internationalization at Home" In *Internationalization at Home: A Global Perspective* (pp33-48). The Hague: Nuffic.
- Clifford, V. (2009) Engaging the disciplines in internationalising the curriculum. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 14 (2), 133-143.
- Cohen, A., Yemeni, M. & Sadeh, E. (2013) Web-based analysis of internationalization in Israeli teaching colleges. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, XX (X), <http://jsi.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/02/27/1028315313479131.full.pdf+html>
- Coursera. (2013). *Pedagogical Foundations*. Retrieved 17 October 2013, from Coursera: <https://www.coursera.org/about/pedagogy>
- Crossley, M. (1984) Strategies for curriculum change and the question of international transfer. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 16 (1), 75 – 88.
- Crossley, M. (2000) Bridging cultures and traditions in the reconceptualisation of comparative and international education. *Comparative Education*, 36 (3), 319 –332.
- Cuccioletta, D. (2001/2002) Multiculturalism or transculturalism: towards a cosmopolitan citizenship. *London Journal of Canadian Studies*, 17, 1-11.
- De Vita, G. (2001) Learning styles, culture and inclusive instruction in the multicultural classroom: a business and management perspective. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 38 (2), 165-174.
- De Vita, G. (2002) Inclusive approaches to effective communication and active participation in the multicultural classroom. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 1 (2), 168 – 179.
- Entwistle, N. (2009) *Teaching for understanding at university: Deep approaches and distinctive ways of thinking*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Forrest, K.A., Judd, L.R. & Davison, J.R. (2012) Coming to know within 'Healthy Uncertainty': An autoethnography of engagement and transformation in undergraduate education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 17 (6), 710-721.
- Fox, H. (1994) *Listening to the world: Cultural issues in academic writing*. Urbana. Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Giroux, H.A. (1992) *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. London: Routledge.
- Glance, Forsey, & Riley. (2013). The pedagogical foundations of massive open online courses. *First Monday*, 18. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5210%2Ffm.v18i5.4350> Retrieved 19 October 2013.
- Great Britain Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2013) *The wider benefits of international higher education in the UK*.
- Green, W. & Whitsed, C. (2013) Reflections on an alternative approach to continuing professional learning for internationalization of the curriculum across disciplines. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17 (2), 248-164.
- Haigh, M. (2008). Internationalisation, planetary citizenship and Higher Education Inc. *Compare*, 38(4), 427–440.
- Haigh, M. (2009). Fostering cross-cultural empathy with non-western curricular structures. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 271–284.
- Harrison, N. & Peacock, N. (2010) Interactions in the international classroom: the UK perspective. In E. Jones (Ed.) *Internationalisation and the student voice: Higher education perspectives* (pp125-142). London: Routledge.
- Hayhoe, R. (2005) Peking University and the spirit of Chinese scholarship. *Comparative Education Review* 45 (2), 575 –583.
- Hofstede, G. (1986) Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 10 (3), 301 –320.
- Hong Kong University Grants Committee (2012) *UGC Annual Report 2011 – 2012*.
- Hyland, F., Trahar, S., Anderson, J., & Dickens, A. (2008). *A changing world: The Internationalisation experiences of staff and students (Home and International) in UK Higher Education (ESCalate & LLAS report)*. Retrieved on 19 October 2013 from: <http://escalate.ac.uk/downloads/5248.pdf>
- Kahane, D. (2009) Learning about obligation, compassion, and global justice: the place of contemplative pedagogy. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 118 Summer, 49 –60.
- Kenway, J. & Fahey, J. (2006) The research imagination in a world on the move *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4 (2), 261-274.
- Kiley, M. (2003) Conserver, strategist or transformer: the experiences of postgraduate sojourners. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8 (3), 345-356.
- Kim, T. (2009) Transnational academic mobility, internationalization and interculturality in higher education. *Intercultural Education* 20 (5), 395-405.
- Kreber, C. (2009) Different perspectives on internationalization in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 118, 1-14.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Leask, B. (2013) Internationalization of the curriculum and the disciplines: Current perspectives and directions for the future. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17 (2), 99-102.
- Leask, B. & Bridge, C. (2013) Comparing internationalisation of the curriculum in action across disciplines: Theoretical and practical perspectives. *Compare*, 43 (1), 79-101.
- Manathunga, C. (2007) Intercultural postgraduate supervision: ethnographic journeys of identity and power. In D.Palfreyman & D.L.McBride (Eds.) *Learning and teaching across cultures in higher education* (pp93-113). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marginson, S. (2000) Rethinking academic work in the global era. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 22 (1), 23-35.
- Marginson, S. (2013) The growing pluralisation of higher education. *International Association of Universities (IAU) Horizons*, 18 (3), 14 -15.
- Maringe, F. (2010) The meanings of globalization and internationalization in HE: Findings from a world survey. In F.Maringe & N. Foskett (eds.) *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: theoretical, strategic and management perspectives* (pp.17-34). London: Continuum.
- Maringe, F. & Woodfield, S. (2013) Emerging internationalization models in an uneven global terrain. *Compare*, 43 (1), 9-36.
- Merrick, B. (2000) Foreword. In B.Hudson & M.J.Todd (eds.) *Internationalising the curriculum in higher education: Reflecting on practice* (pp xi-xiv).
- Mertova, P. & Green, W. (2010) Internationalising teaching and learning: Perspectives and issues voiced by senior academics at one Australian university. www.proceedings.com.au/isana/docs/2010/paper_mertova.pdf
- Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia (2011) *Internationalisation policy for higher education Malaysia 2011*
- Mok, K-H. (2003) Globalisation and higher education restructuring in Hong Kong, Taiwan and Mainland China. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 22 (2), 117-129.
- Mok, K-H. & Lee, M.L.L. (2003) Globalization or glocalization? Higher education reforms in Singapore. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 23 (1), 15-42.
- Montgomery, C. (2010) *Understanding the international student experience*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Njenga, J.K. & Fourie, L.C.H. (2010) The myths about e-learning in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41 (2), 199 -212
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (1999) *Quality and internationalisation in higher education*. Brussels: OECD.
- Otten, M. (2000) Impacts of cultural diversity at home. In P. Crowther, M.Joris, M. Otten, B. Nilsson, H.Teekens & B. Wachter. *Internationalization at Home: A Position Paper* (pp.15 – 20). European Association for International Education/Academic Cooperation Association, IAK, IESEG, Nuffic, Katholieke Hogeschool Limburg and Malmo University.
- Otten, M. (2003) Intercultural learning and diversity in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 7 (1), 12- 26.
- Oxfam Development Education Program. (2006). *Education for global citizenship: a guide for schools*. Retrieved 19 October 2010 from www.oxfam.org.uk/education/gc/files/education_for_global_citizenship_a_guide_for_schools.pdf
- Peacock, N. & Harrison, N. (2009) "It's so much easier to go with what's easy": "Mindfulness" and the discourse between home and international students in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13 (4), 487-508.
- Pratt, D.D., Kelly, M. & Wong, W.S.S. (1999) Chinese conceptions of 'effective teaching' in Hong Kong: towards culturally sensitive evaluation of teaching. *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 18 (4), 241 –258.
- Rizvi, F. (2000). Internationalisation of curriculum. Retrieved on 19 October 2013 from www.eotu.uiuc.edu/EOTUMODEL/Event/RIZVIPaperInternatRMIT.pdf
- Ryan, J. & Viète, R. (2009) Respectful interactions: learning with international students in the English-speaking academy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14 (3), 303-314.
- Sanderson, G. (2004) Existentialism, globalisation and the cultural other. *International Education Journal*, 4 (4), 1 – 20.
- Sanderson, G. (2007) A foundation for the internationalization of the academic Self. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 12 (3), 276-307.
- Singh, M. (2011). The place of social justice in higher education and social change discourses. *Compare*, 41(4), 481-494.
- Stromquist, N.P. (2002) Globalization, the I, and the Other. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 4 (2), 87- 94.
- Tait, A. & Gaskell, A. (2011) Internationalisation, social justice and open, distance and e-learning. 14th Cambridge International Conference on Open and Distance Learning, 2011.
- Teekens, H. (2000) Teaching and learning in the international classroom. In P.Crowther, M.Joris, M. Otten, B. Nilsson, H.Teekens & B. Wachter et al. *Internationalization at Home: A Position Paper* (pp.1-18). European Association for International Education/Academic Cooperation Association, IAK, IESEG, Nuffic, Katholieke Hogeschool Limburg and Malmo University.
- Teichler, U. (2004) The changing debate on internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*, 48 (1), 5-26.
- Teichler, U. (2009) Internationalisation of higher education: European experiences. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 10, 93 -106.
- Tennant, M., McMullen, C. & Kacynski, D. (2010) *Teaching, learning and research in higher education: A critical approach*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Trahar, S. (2006) A part of the landscape: the practitioner researcher as narrative inquirer in an international higher education community. In S. Trahar (Ed.) *Narrative research on learning: Comparative and international perspectives* (pp201-219). Oxford: Symposium.
- Trahar, S. (2007). *Teaching and learning: The international higher education landscape. Some theories and working practices*. Available to download at <http://escalate.ac.uk/3559>
- Trahar, S. (2011). *Developing cultural capability in international higher education: A narrative inquiry*. Oxon, England/New York, NY: Routledge.
- Trahar, S. (2013) Autoethnographic journeys in learning and teaching in higher education *European Educational Research Journal*, 12 (3), 367-375.
- Turner, Y. & Acker, A. (2002) *Education in the new China: Shaping ideas at work*. Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate.
- Turner, Y., & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalizing the university*. London, England: Continuum.
- Vaira, M. (2004) Globalization and higher education organizational change: A framework for analysis? *Higher Education*, 48 (4), 483 –510.
- Vardi, M. (2012, November). *Will MOOCs destroy academia?* Retrieved 19 October 2013, from Communications of the ACM: <http://cacm.acm.org/magazines/2012/11/156587-will-moocs-destroy-academia/fulltext>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978) *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Edited by M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Soubberman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Watkins, D. (2000) Learning and teaching: a cross-cultural perspective. *School Leadership and Management* 20 (2), 161–173.
- Wenger, E. (2009) A social theory of learning. In K.Illers (ed.) *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists...in their own words* (pp.209-218). London: Routledge.
- Yang, R. (2002) University internationalisation: its meanings, rationales and implications. *Intercultural Education*, 13 (1), 81 – 95.
- Yang, R. (2005) Internationalizing Chinese higher education: a case study of a major comprehensive university. In P.Ninnes & M. Hellsten (Eds.) *Internationalizing higher education: Critical explorations of pedagogy and policy* (pp97-118). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.

