The internationalisation of UK higher education: from 'technical observance' to 'relational participation', the road to CAPRI …

Dr Viv Caruana, Leeds Metropolitan University

Macauley Hall

Headingley Campus

Becketts Park

Leeds, UK   LS6 3QS

Email: v.caruana@leedsmet.ac.uk

Biography

Viv is currently reader in internationalisation at Leeds Metropolitan University. Prior to this appointment in March 2009, she worked in educational development for five years at the University of Salford leading the PG Diploma in Higher Education Practice and Research and co-delivering the PG Certificate. As an education developer, Viv has developed research interests in the global knowledge economy and learning society, with particular reference to internationalisation and interdisciplinarity. Her work in the field has benefited from her prior experience as a lecturer in modern economic and social history.

Abstract

This article reflects on a review of the literature on the internationalisation of UK higher education (HE) commissioned by the Higher Education Academy (HEA) in 2006. Recent progress on some of the key themes is considered and likely issues and possibilities for the future explored. Methodology is grounded in the author's own experience in the context of research in the field and recent developments in assessment, learning and teaching policy and practice as they affect the internationalisation agenda. Emerging themes include global citizenship and graduate attributes at the institutional level and notions of critical thinking and phronesis as they relate to the internationalised curriculum. A key consideration is how academics may be supported in developing the internationalised curriculum. The author argues that a focus on generic graduate attributes for employability could unintentionally detract institutions from a much-needed reassessment of purposes, principles and practices required by diversity. Such reassessment implies the deconstruction of our understanding of concepts like critical thinking and critical literacy in pursuit of a curriculum that embraces multiple perspectives and provides the space to cross cultural boundaries through the deployment of threshold concepts in teaching and learning strategies. While acknowledging that facilitating border-crossing may seem quite alien to some teachers in HE, it is argued that the most effective way forward is via a research-informed and evidence-based approach to curriculum design rather than a 'best-practice checklist' approach.

Keywords: internationalisation, curriculum, critical thinking, technical observance, relational participation, phronesis, threshold concept, global citizenship, graduate attributes, pedagogy of recognition, academic development

Introduction

In 2006, I was fortunate to have the opportunity – with my colleague Nicola Spurling – to review the UK literature on the internationalisation of UK higher education (HE). This project commissioned by the Higher Education Academy (HEA) was the outcome of the Internationalisation Forum held on 5 December 2005 that focused on 'internationalising the curriculum' and 'the support of international students'.

The project report (Caruana and Spurling, 2007), available at www.heacademy.ac.uk/ourwork/learning/international, has had some impact on the sector globally. This is evidenced by the fact that, since April 2008, it has scored 35 to 45 hits per month, is the top pdf download on the internationalisation pages of the HEA website, and while the majority of viewers are from the UK, significant numbers are located in Australia, New Zealand, the USA, the Netherlands, Germany, India and Canada. This global spread of interest is unsurprising since the review explored a range of issues likely to have broad appeal. Indeed, the review noted a richness of literature on specific areas of internationalisation originating from other parts of the world. For example, Australia boasts a high level of engagement with strategic considerations and issues of diversity and inclusivity in the curriculum. The North American literature, particularly that of the USA, has long been preoccupied with notions of multiculturalism, while much work in the field of 'internationalisation at home' has been conducted in the Netherlands (Caruana and Spurling, 2007). This article reflects on the literature review, considering recent progress on some of the key themes and exploring some of the likely issues and possibilities for the future.

In contrast to my work for the HEA, which involved systematic review, the methodology underlying this paper is grounded in my own experience and my past and present serendipitous engagement with the global literature on the theme of internationalisation of HE. Complementing this approach, some of the more recent developments in strategic and practice-based thinking in assessment, learning and teaching in HE are considered to determine how

those developments may influence the future trajectory of the internationalisation agenda.

Reflexivity is an essential quality of the approach, as thoughts move back and forth in time and space in order to try to make sense of where we are now and where we might find ourselves in the future. In common with the review and in the spirit of reflective practice, this work is informed by an epistemological and ontological position that foregrounds the search for socially constructed and negotiated meaning. A set of values, beliefs and attitudes formulated on the basis of notions of social justice and social equity are complemented by past experience as a lecturer in modern economic and social history and, more recently, as an academic or education developer.

Evolving institutional perspectives: international student recruitment, global citizenship and generic graduate attributes

The HEA literature review (Caruana and Spurling, 2007) explored the influence of globalisation on the internationalisation agenda in the UK, noting the pervasiveness of the 'marketisation discourse' and the focus on international student recruitment. However, a countervailing influence was identified in the form of the 'knowledge economy and learning society', which was prompting universities to consider issues of graduate capability in general and, for some, capability in terms of global citizenship in particular. While the debate surrounding priorities seemed to centre on international student recruitment versus international education, a marginal shift away from the ethos (campus culture), student mobility and content approaches to internationalisation towards the graduate attributes approach was apparent.

Institutions continue to acknowledge the point made by Leask, 1999 (cited in Caruana and Hanstock, 2005) that the ethos approach may embed internationalisation in physical structures and the underlying values of an institution but will not impact upon academic practice or the quality of the student learning experience. Therefore global citizenship and perspectives are continuing to shape developments in terms of the student learning experience

at universities like Bournemouth
([www.bournemouth.ac.uk/about/the_globaldimension/centre_for_global_persp](www.bournemouth.ac.uk/about/the_globaldimension/centre_for_global_perspectives)
[ectives](www.bournemouth.ac.uk/about/the_globaldimension/centre_for_global_perspectives)), Leeds Metropolitan (www.leedsmet.ac.uk/internat/choose.htm) and
UCL (www.ucl.ac.uk/).

UK universities seem to be increasingly aware of the importance of
sustainable partnerships and collaborations as key enablers in providing a
student learning experience that embraces global perspectives. For example,
the University of Salford has recently selected collaborations and
partnerships, along with global citizenship, as key priority areas for
development within an internationalisation strategy which encompasses eight
themes in total (University of Salford, 2008). The London Institute of
Technology (LIT) similarly differentiates itself from other institutions in
celebrating 20 years of experience in global education partnerships
(www.litr.ac.uk/).

Student mobility has long been the focus for international educators and
remains firmly on the agenda, although UK institutions are now turning their
attention towards the internationalisation of staff and curriculum largely to
provide for the needs of non-mobile students. The HEA literature review
(Caruana and Spurling, 2007) concluded that there was relatively little
evidence of research that explores graduate capability and employability in
the context of internationalisation strategies. In a sense, this mirrors the US
experience where activities that constitute an internationalisation strategy are
often the means towards goals that are 'left fuzzy' (Green, 2002). In
articulating goals, Killick (2008) argues that university education should be 'fit
for purpose' in a globalising world, and a 'starting point' is graduate attributes.

The notion of generic graduate attributes originally swept the Australian HE
sector in the late 1990s. Since that time ensuring that graduates complete
their studies with well-developed attributes that prepare them for employment
and for lifelong learning has gradually become an established and desirable
goal of HE worldwide (Barrie, 2009). Nonetheless, it is a relatively new

phenomenon for UK HE. Of course, those institutions in the forefront of internationalisation, global perspectives and global citizenship have already developed 'attributes' or qualities for cross-cultural capability and global citizenship. Influenced by the University of South Australia's (UniSA) G7 graduate attributes for international and intercultural perspectives – nine competencies covering cognitive, attitudinal and behavioural attributes in the intercultural context available at

www.unisanet.unisa.edu.au/gradquals/staff/indicators.asp – Leeds Metropolitan University (Leeds Met) has distilled cross-cultural capability into three attributes: awareness, knowledge and skills to operate in multicultural contexts and across cultural boundaries; awareness, knowledge and skills to operate in a global context; and, finally, values commensurate with those of responsible global citizenship (Killick, 2008). Bournemouth University, with its close association with the Development Education Association (DEA), has similarly adapted Oxfam's curriculum for global citizenship, identifying three essential attributes: familiarity with global issues and processes (particularly the interconnectedness between the local and the global); appreciation of the need for sustainable development; and effectiveness in working across cultures and in contexts of diversity
(www.bournemouth.ac.uk/about/the_global_dimension/global_perspectives/global_perspectives.html). What is of particular significance currently is that the notion of graduate attributes is being embraced within the UK not only as part of the internationalisation agenda, but also as a means of making objectives transparent to stakeholders and measuring graduate outcomes for employability. An example of the kind of work being undertaken can be found at Sheffield University (www.shef.ac.uk/sheffieldgraduate/).

A moot question is whether, like our Australian counterparts, UK universities will be obliged to develop a core list of graduate attributes. A key event signalling the new interest in graduate attributes was the Scottish QAA enhancement themes conference, *Graduates for the 21st century*, held at Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, 5–6 March 2009, which was the culmination of the Scottish sector's two-year focus on research–teaching linkages: Quality enhancement theme – graduate attributes (reports available

at

www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/themes/ResearchTeaching/outcomes.asp).
According to the final report (Land and Gordon, 2008), the characteristics
identified by the Scottish sector study differ from those recently identified by
the Council for Industry and Higher Education (CIHE). CIHE has adopted the
American Council for Education's set of graduate attributes as representing
those most likely to be required by global corporations. It is interesting to note
that these bear more resemblance to the kind of attributes generally ascribed
to the global citizen than those identified by the research–teaching linkages
theme. This apparent disagreement reflects a fundamental issue with the
graduate attributes approach: that terminology is ambiguous and tends to vary
amongst stakeholders (Crebert, 2002).

The Edinburgh conference was also significant in addressing the Australian
experience to date, where there is a perceived 'national gap' between the
rhetoric of graduate attributes and the reality of the student learning
experience, which may reflect the way we think about them and the limitations
inherent in conceptions based on the 'generic' and 'skills' (Barrie, 2009). De la
Harpe and Radloff (2008), citing projects at Griffith University (Crebert, 2002)
and MacQuarie University (Sumsion and Goodfellow, 2004), note that, in
addition to the ambiguity of terminology, other difficulties include a lack of
conceptual and methodological rigour in the selection of attributes, a lack of
attention to the disciplinary context, a lack of adequate resources to support
initiatives and the impact of political and managerial drivers. Su (2008)
demonstrates how lists of graduate attributes that are essentially the outcome
of technical-rational thinking may be a wholly inappropriate response to the
challenges of the twenty-first century economy and society. They are
described as the outcome of a 'container view' of the mind where possession
of knowledge and skills assumes the ability to apply, transfer and manipulate
them. Perhaps, contrary to current practice, lifelong learning in times of
uncertain change requires a 'mind as constructor' view that emphasises the
ability of knowledge construction and interaction with the world. This point
assumes tremendous significance in the context of the internationalised
curriculum, where students should be encouraged not only to reproduce

knowledge, but also to recognise cultural bias and create new knowledge from the process of engaging multiple perspectives.

As far as the impact of graduate attributes on the process of internationalisation is concerned then, evidence from Australia suggests that they may hinder progress. They may reinforce the gap that already exists between rhetoric and reality in internationalisation, which as a social practice takes time to put into effect and will always occur at different levels of engagement. If the internationalised curriculum is viewed as progression along a continuum from 'technical observance' (where the curriculum is simply infused with international case studies) to 'relational participation' (where cultural production is the outcome of a dialectical relationship between text and learner, teacher and taught, student and milieu), graduate attributes may perpetuate the tendency towards the former. Alternatively, it may be the case that engagement with graduate attributes will prompt a fundamental shift away from a university-centred approach based on 'old style' conceptions of internationalisation, reinforcing the trend towards student-centredness that is capable of accommodating the multiple, yet complementary perspectives that represent the internationalised curriculum across the disciplines, and a move towards 'relational participation' (Caruana and Hanstock, 2008). Whatever the outcome of discussions surrounding graduate attributes, what is clear is that institutional internationalisation cannot be effective without curriculum change, since it is the curriculum which 'forms the backbone of the experience' (Killick, 2008).

Back to basics: the internationalised curriculum and the concepts of 'critical thinking' and 'phronesis'

Caruana and Spurling (2007) identified good practice in the multicultural classroom, citing the importance of group mix, transparency of rationale, guidance on group processes, etc. However, they also noted that, rather than understanding and transcending difference, students may find themselves simply 'dealing with it' in the context of an unequal dialogue that has the unintended consequence of marginalising particular groups and reinforcing stereotypes. Recent research with home students regarding integration across

diverse groups reinforces this earlier stance, highlighting, for example, avoidance of difference, discomfort around acknowledging difference and fear of discriminating in cross-cultural engagements (Alexander, 2006; Harrison and Peacock, 2007, as cited in Caruana, in press).

It would seem that while there is little doubt that the intercultural rather than the international perspective will be more effective in engaging students with the rich diversity of the global economy and society, the problem is trying to determine exactly what this means in terms of teaching, learning and assessment strategies. For some authors, education itself is a site of struggles of cultural production, and the curriculum can never be neutral, always legitimising some groups while marginalising others (Apple, 2004; Giroux, 2001, as cited in McLean, 2006). Caruana and Spurling (2007) noted a relative lack of small-scale empirical research addressing global perspectives in teaching and learning, and speculated that this might reflect a preoccupation with the internationalised curriculum as a matter of content rather than skills, attitudes and behaviours. More recent research with new lecturers seems to affirm this scenario (Caruana, in press). Fyfe et al (1993), in their work addressing education for cultural diversity in the US context, have noted the prevalence of the 'cultural additive approach' whereby teachers add content, concepts, themes and perspectives to the curriculum without changing its basic structure, purposes and characteristics. However, adding a book, unit or course within the existing curriculum framework perpetuates a view of multicultural content which is based on the perspectives of 'mainstream thinkers'. In other words, infusing the curriculum with international examples, cases and perspectives fails to challenge the basic and fairly entrenched assumption that knowledge emerges from a single cultural base.

A higher education system that values only western ways of knowing will effectively make concessions to global perspectives through a pedagogy that encourages surface understanding of 'culture bites' (Killick and Poveda, 1998). In the absence of teaching and learning strategies based on interpretivist and constructivist learning which promote reciprocity, cross-

cultural experiences which dissolve difference while valuing it will not transpire. Rather, international students, already confounded by a mismatch of cultural knowledge, are likely to find themselves further dislocated from their educational context by the absence of any opportunity to enable them to contribute from their own cultural experience (Warren, 2005).

In the context of the cultural landscape as a place of 'struggle' between meanings, and in challenging the surface-deep and over-simplified understandings of culturally-specific approaches to learning, it has been argued that in HE we – as both managers and teachers – need to consider the extent to which what is taught in modern universities may *not* encourage the skills of analysis and critical thinking. In embracing what has been termed a 'pedagogy of recognition' we should consider the guidance we afford students when asking them to engage with texts and theories in the multicultural classroom, and this, in turn, suggests that perhaps we need to deconstruct what we mean by critical thinking (Nield and Thom, 2006; Warren, 2005). Jenny Moon (2008) refers to critical thinking as a disposition, a way of engaging with the world. In terms of developing 'habits' of engagement, she argues that the manner in which people process experiences, how they write, speak or express themselves in other ways, are the determining factors. In effect, the habits flow from academic or thoughtful activity which engages the everyday world. The notion of depth in critical thinking is closely associated with the level of epistemological development of the thinker, in that the capacity to think critically will grow in relation to how we perceive knowledge. In other words if knowledge is regarded simply as fact, the capacity for criticality will be limited. Thus, teaching and learning strategies should, first and foremost, seek to challenge all students beyond their 'comfort zone of knowing'. Learning to think and express oneself critically also involves the taking of risk, and the classroom should feel like a safe place that will tolerate risk-taking 'where there is time to tease out problems rather than jump to a solution in an absolutist manner' (Moon, 2008; Braskamp, 2007).

It seems then that the key to developing the 'pedagogy of recognition' is knowing how to challenge without causing discomfort or anxiety within

culturally diverse groups. Jones and Caruana (in press) suggest that engagement with the medium of text which recognises critical thinking and multiple perspectives as a developmental process will encourage integration and cross-cultural learning by depersonalising interaction, thereby lessening anxiety and encouraging risk-taking. Teaching and learning strategies which recognise the progressive stages of engagement from traditional reading, through critical reading to critical literacy, with each stage encompassing, for example, greater awareness of the cultural bias of knowledge itself, will serve to acknowledge multiple perspectives, enabling students to deconstruct their worldviews and contemplate more complex alternatives. In principle, criticality and independence may be fostered by this kind of strategy, which encourages open dialogue and debate through the process of engagement with the medium of text. The University of Nottingham's Centre for the Study of Social and Global Justice provides a useful example of how teachers may operationalise this principle in its Open Spaces for Dialogue and Enquiry (OSDE) methodology available at www.osdemethodology.org.uk/.

In 2007, there was a paucity of research addressing the issue of the learning experience of UK students abroad (Caruana and Spurling, 2007). It is clear that experience abroad offers the potential for high-impact learning within the context of cross-cultural capability. Studying in another country provides students with experiences they may not encounter at home, but it may be difficult to know with any certainty whether a programme or module taught in another country really develops students' awareness of intercultural and/or international issues (Caruana and Hanstock 2003). Cultural competence is not implied by cultural knowledge since new experiences are not necessarily synonymous with new understanding. Indeed, cultural contact can have the unintended consequence of reinforcing stereotypes (Bennett, 2008). Woolf (2007) certainly regards the 'non-traditionalism' of study in 'far away and exotic lands of Africa' potentially as a form of educational tourism, 'a trip' motivated at worst by a kind of voyeurism or, at best, by the 'travel agent's attraction to the exotic' allied with a 'quasi missionary zeal to engage with poverty' (Woolf, 2007). The growth of short-term experiential learning programmes and international volunteering schemes, such as those

developed at Leeds Met originally designed to facilitate mobility, suggest that full, long-term immersion in an academic culture overseas is not the only means through which the benefits of learning from experience abroad can be maximised. However, motivation remains a key issue in determining the nature of engagement. Are international volunteers, for example, motivated by altruism that has mutual benefits for both host and self, or are they engaging in a self-serving attempt to appear more employable by indulging in 'volunteer tourism' which might imply a measure of cross-cultural capability (Wearing, 2001; Brown, 2005)?

In essence, there are parallels with the discussion regarding intercultural learning in the context of the multicultural classroom at home. Deep and transformative learning based on experience abroad requires the disturbance of epistemological and ontological positions to challenge existing worldviews and dispositions. The key issue is the degree to which intervention is required to foster an empathetic and reflective level of engagement that transcends mere observation. Jones (2005) introduces us to the notion of 'pre-reflection' in preparing students for encounters in unfamiliar surroundings. Woolf (2007) emphasises the need for intentional intervention that 'invigorates experiential learning', supporting students in capturing critical incidents that trigger engagement. In this way, immersion is modified by some element of reasoned distance, creating a distinct intellectual space which, complemented by time for critical reflection with home culture peers, will enable students to realise the transformative learning in relation to 'self' and 'other' which goes beyond the 'silent observer' who returns home with little to share. However, in her research with international volunteers at Leeds Met, Jones (in press) found that 'real transformation' had resulted from international experience despite focused intervention.

While research regarding intervention before and during international experience may be inconclusive, the rationale for embedding cross-cultural experiences abroad (and indeed, similar experiential cross-cultural encounters at home) in the curriculum is nonetheless reinforced by the concept of 'phronesis' borrowed from current work on graduate attributes. Su (2008)

argues that engagement involves integral, tacit and non-linear aspects of perception and the result of the engaging process is often a 'quantum leap' that can never be predicted. Graduate attributes, whether in the cross-cultural or any other context of learning for employability and personal development, do not arise from the decontextualised acquisition of knowledge and skills, but are grounded in the *immersed* application of knowledge and skills (phronesis) through 'wholeness of engagement' that cannot dispense with a link to the 'real context' and 'reflecting on it'. Phronesis is otherwise described as a way of 'being and engaging with the world', which is not a process of linear transmission of knowledge, skills and dispositions by being taught directly, but a process in which knowledge, skills and dispositions are integrated, embedded and developed as a whole, through being constantly immersed in activities and 'being with things'. Thus, phronesis emphasises the importance of acting and being which is developed through the process of understanding self in context, rather than simply knowing (Su, 2008).

Academic dispositions: ideology, irrelevance and uncertainty on the 'threshold' of a 'concept'

The literature on graduate attributes suggests that academic beliefs play a significant part in determining outcomes, and that progress may be hindered by the fact that academic staff tend to value content over skills, seeing their role primarily as teachers of their discipline. Furthermore, it is argued, academics' notions of curriculum goals and how best to achieve them may be at odds with current literature on student learning (De la Harpe and Radloff, 2008). Essentially, this scenario is mirrored in the context of internationalisation. Warren (2005, cited in Caruana and Spurling, 2007) suggests that academic dispositions vis a vis multicultural education include 'cultural restorationists' who seek to preserve traditional values and academic standards, 'modernisers' who see the main function of education as producing the workforce to enable employers to compete globally, and 'progressives' who stand for the cause of social justice (Warren, 2005). Such ideological positions have their equivalence in how we view the internationalised curriculum, with the restorationists espousing assimilationist models, the

modernisers supporting the notion of generic graduate attributes and the progressives developing a curriculum which embraces the concept of graduates as global citizens.

While these ideological positions may have relevance, what is perhaps more significant is that many academics see internationalisation and multiculturalism as fundamentally conflicting with their discipline. This is more likely to be the case in the absence of a holistic approach, which merges the aims of internationalisation and multicultural education with those of the subject curriculum. In such an environment, dissent may be legitimate, expressed in such views as 'How will my students be good engineers or teachers without 60 hours in my subject?' and 'Those are subjects that should be dealt with elsewhere, not here' (Nilsson, undated, cited in Caruana and Hanstock, 2003). The challenge is one of creating synergy, and Caruana (in press) notes a significant dilemma in research conducted with 'new' academics. On the one hand, where academics claim to have internationalised their curriculum, often the driving force has been the perceived needs of their discipline alone, rather than any broader notion of generic cross-cultural capability for all students irrespective of discipline. In other disciplines, the holistic approach, which nurtures a seamless relationship between subject norms and multiculturalism, is rejected on grounds of irrelevance. A resulting strategy of avoiding high levels of integration of the multicultural within the mainstream curriculum is often confounded by a fundamental resistance to multiple perspectives borne of the 'conserving orientation', not towards academic standards as such, but towards the very construction of knowledge itself. This disposition may be founded on a fundamental misconception and lack of awareness of 'cultural encapsulation'. In short, academics may misconceive multicultural education by mistakenly considering themselves and their texts to be free from political and social values (Vavrus, 2002).

The 'lack of space' argument borne of ideological and disciplinary dispositions may reflect a fundamentally traditional orientation towards learning in HE; and, to a degree, the concept of teacher as knowledge giver may represent

something of a comfort zone, affording an element of control in the multicultural classroom which may be viewed potentially as a site of chaos and misunderstanding. However, it seems reasonable to assume that many academics will genuinely perceive a lack of the space needed for them to aspire to a transformative model of learning. In this, the key question is how academics can modify their practice to create space. In this context, the notion of the 'threshold concept' is engaging. Threshold concepts in learning and teaching are a means by which teachers can avoid the 'stuffed curriculum', where 'not everything is of equal value, but nothing gets thrown out' and students become confused about what really matters and what does not (www.doceo.co.uk/tools/threshold_3.html). There is a growing body of research which suggests that every discipline has its threshold concepts, ideas which enable students to 'get it', ideas which are not the whole story but are necessary, ideas which open doors revealing many other aspects of the subject which have remained hidden (Cousin, 2006; Meyer and Land, 2003).

So, in terms of creating space for cross-cultural encounters in the curriculum, the threshold concept has much to offer. But is it enough? Evidence suggests that, having created the space, teachers still experience difficulty in knowing *how* to incorporate multiple perspectives (Vavrus, 2002). Thus, some academics may readily acknowledge the merit of a curriculum that encourages the capacity to empathise with people of different backgrounds through open-mindedness and sensitivity to diverse perspectives, and they may seek to develop the ability in their students to feel at home anywhere. Others may even go so far as to strive to provide a learning experience that involves transformation and social action in the global context. But *how do they do it?* Evidence suggests that in the context of such aspirations academics perceive themselves as struggling against an inadequate knowledge base. Recent research (Caruana, in press) with new academics at a UK university reveals that while espousing teaching and learning strategies which would enable students to challenge the cultural bias in knowledge construction within their own discipline and valuing qualities of criticality and empathy in the context of multiple perspectives, attempts to operationalise these strategies are dogged by feelings of uncertainty and lack of confidence.

(Caruana, in press; Vavrus, 2002). Similarly, evidence from the University of South Australia, which has developed a comprehensive internationalisation information kit to assist academics in developing learning outcomes for different cognitive and attitudinal levels of cross-cultural engagement, suggests that this continues to be a significant challenge (Caruana, in press). So, are toolkits and resources sufficient to promote and support curriculum change in the field of internationalisation?

Supporting curriculum innovation: from toolkits to CAPRI …

Undoubtedly toolkits and resources have a part to play in effecting curriculum change, but perhaps they only serve to facilitate the efforts of those who are already familiar with the concept of internationalisation and relatively comfortable with it within the context of their own practice. This strategy of 'distance' support may perpetuate a piecemeal approach whereby the academic 'tribes' involved in international and intercultural programmes and teaching constitute separate domains, effectively operating in isolation from their colleagues. It may well be that in regarding the internationalised curriculum as a set of best practices we are missing the point: in reality, the internationalised curriculum is a construct which is determined by practitioners' understanding of 'key phrases, code words and concepts' (Caruana, in press; McTaggart, 2003).

If resources and toolkits serve to engage those who have already relinquished the security of their 'comfort zone', what kind of support strategy will enable lecturers who are willing but lack the confidence to engage with the internationalisation agenda? Should strategies be geared towards raising awareness and promoting dissonance at the institutional level where interdisciplinary engagement and cross-fertilisation may fuel debate, or should development processes seek to reinforce what is often an emergent and unconnected process at the level of the discipline and programme of study? The Australian literature alerts us to the need to avoid 'burdensome prescription' of practices and the need to engage with the internationalised curriculum as 'an idea', with specialists such as education developers and education technologists working closely with teams of academics to 'merge

thinking and doing' within the context of whole programmes of study (phronesis for academics!) (cited in Caruana and Hanstock, 2005).

Caruana and Hanstock (2008) argue a similar case when they question the effectiveness of centralised 'staff development' in bringing about change, given that events which are permissive tend to be oversubscribed by 'willing converts', leaving the vast majority untouched, or, alternatively, events billed as mandatory (seemingly an increasing trend) conscript the masses but the level of engagement of the majority is, at best, minimal. Rather than staff development, the authors favour a curriculum development model based on Rogers' (1995) notion of 'diffusion': 'the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among members of a social system'. This model of change seems highly appropriate when the degree programme is the lens through which we view innovation in teaching and learning. Thus, rather than seeking change from the 'top down', the diffusionist model promotes a more effective 'middle out' approach to curriculum change based on the education development function, working with programme teams and acting as an interface between policy makers and programme staff, interpreting policy in terms of programme enhancement, as well as providing sound practical solutions as a means of implementing internationalisation policy (Chang et al, 2004).

Although the middle out approach has been an ideal worth aspiring to in the context of the internationalised curriculum, it has always had far-reaching resource implications and is likely to be rejected by many a pro vice-chancellor responsible for teaching and learning on the grounds of prohibitive cost alone. However, recent developments within the areas of education and learning development may negate any positive movement towards middle out models, and furthermore could prove a retrograde step, particularly for the prospects of the internationalised curriculum. The HEA literature review (Caruana and Spurling, 2007) refers to the fundamental division within HE organisational structures between support staff and academics that hinders progress in the field of the internationalised curriculum. Bridging the divide between the international student experience, popularly viewed as a concern

for support staff, and the internationalised curriculum, more frequently regarded as the territory of the academic, was highlighted as 'probably the greatest challenge to internationalisation'. More recently, Chris Rust (2009) noted that, rather than gravitating towards its natural home within education development organisations like the Staff and Education Developers Association (SEDA), the burgeoning learning development community has formed the Learning Development in Higher Education Network (LDHEN), an organisation which has undergone 'recent, rapid and successful growth'. Rust (2009) argues that this development reflects the ways institutions tend to separate the learning development role from other academic support functions. In terms of the internationalised curriculum in general, and inclusivity, multiple perspectives and cross-cultural capability for all students in particular, this development may hamper integration, reinforcing the 'deficit' model which marginalises international students. It may also signal a return to 'assimilationist' views within HE whereby international students are expected to adjust to UK academic culture.

Assuming that there is little mileage in the middle out approach based on the education development function, are there other ways of promoting change on the principle of diffusion which can foster understanding and reduce anxieties? De Wit (2008) argues that internationalisation, as one of the drivers of innovation in HE, requires a new research agenda to help universities shape innovative practice. In particular, there are few qualitative studies exploring teachers' and students' perspectives, their experience of internationalisation in all its guises, and how they interpret various aspects of the process in relation to their respective educational contexts. A shift in research perspective is favoured, from an overall external perspective to a relational, experience- and context-based perspective. In this way the research agenda will focus squarely on understanding how internationalisation in HE, with its attendant global perspectives and multiculturalism, is developed in practice. This practice orientation is essential to shed light on issues of meaning making in learning, understanding knowledge content and in unpacking both academics' and students' understanding of 'key phrases, code words and concepts' (Wihlborg, 2009).

Across the UK HE sector there is some evidence of the influence of this new research agenda in the emergence of centres dedicated to internationalisation, some attached to units with a broad development remit and others autonomous at institutional level. Oxford Brookes' Centre for International Curriculum Inquiry and Networking (CICIN) (www.brookes.ac.uk/services/ocsld/ioc/), for example, forms part of the Oxford Brookes Centre for Staff and Learning Development (OCSLD). Broadly, the centre aims to identify, promote, facilitate and share good practice and research in internationalising the curriculum both at Brookes and nationally. Bournemouth University has established a Centre for Global Perspectives (www.bournemouth.ac.uk/about/the_global_dimension/centre_for_global_perspectives.html). This centre fulfils a hubbing and co-ordinating function in supporting global perspectives in the curriculum at Bournemouth. Operating primarily as a portal, the centre claims no educational research agenda to evaluate and evidence the impact of existing interventions or to inform future strategy in assessment, learning and teaching practice. The UK Council for International Student Affairs (UKCISA) and the HEA have recently agreed to establish Teaching and Learning for International Students (TALIS), which will be a national resource centre, acting as a repository for research on teaching and learning for international students, identifying and disseminating information and guidance, and advising on appropriate staff development strategies.

While embracing different foci and incorporating different organisational and operational models, it seems reasonable to assume that all these centres share the common aim of achieving 'mind change' in the context of the internationalised curriculum. Gardner (2006) identifies seven levels that underpin what he calls 'mind change'. These include *inter alia*: reason, or a well-reasoned argument, rationale and analysis of facts; research, or relevant formal and informal data to verify or cast doubt; resonance, the 'gut feeling' that it is right; and representational description, multiple modalities that express the desired change. Gardner's model of mind change (rather than managerial models of institutional change) informs Leeds Met's current plans to establish the Centre for Academic Practice and Research in

Internationalisation (CAPRI) based in its Leslie Silver International Faculty. Rather like the faculty itself, CAPRI is ambitious in scope and in the role it seeks to fulfil within the university and beyond. The centre will be concerned with the learning experience of all students, both international and home-based. It will operate in both formal and informal learning environments, which tend to merge in, for example, the process of embedding volunteering and other community-based learning opportunities in the formal campus-based curriculum. In terms of dissemination within the university, the emphasis will be on providing support for colleagues in the form of joint publication and formulation of research proposals and bids, which will, in turn, surface evidence-based and research-informed practice that may be shared with the wider HE community. Thus, in principle, the concept of CAPRI readily acknowledges that those who are 'passionate about the learning experience of both students and staff [will] often shy away from writing bids and proposals' (Hill, 2009). Moreover, engaging those new to educational research with small development projects is an effective way not only of identifying and disseminating transferable innovative practice, but it is also the means by which local ingenuity can be harnessed to facilitate mind change, normalising internationalisation as a process right across the institution. In effect, CAPRI will 'establish an emergent community of motivated individuals [in internationalisation] who … have a bigger stage for their risk-taking' (Hill, 2009). In an out-facing capacity, CAPRI will seek to draw together good practice and actively promote research collaborations with like-minded, values-driven institutions, thereby giving prominence to the conception of internationalisation as a process that goes far beyond international student recruitment to embrace equality, diversity, inclusivity and global citizenship. In essence, CAPRI will extend the portal approach and complement the 'technicist' approach by promoting active engagement, mutual support and collaboration through its focus on research to enhance practice.

Conclusions

While acknowledging the importance of the internationalised curriculum and international staff in the context of nurturing the graduate for the twenty-first

century, UK universities continue to direct their efforts towards student mobility and strategic partnerships in the global context. As graduate employability assumes overwhelming significance in the current global climate, this trend could be rapidly overtaken by a drive towards defining generic graduate attributes in an attempt to gain consensus among a diverse group of stakeholders and to measure graduate employability in absolute terms. This paper argues that there is a need to be conscious of the possibility that a focus on generic graduate attributes could unintentionally reinforce the trend, identified by De Vita and Case (2003), for globalisation to detract attention away from the fundamental reassessment of purpose, principles and practice required by the diversity encountered in the sector today. Furthermore, graduate attributes based on a discourse of knowledge, skills and dispositions alone may neglect the importance of 'being with the world' based on reflective processes and engagement with self, which is surely the essential quality of employability in a world of uncertainty, complexity and rapid change.

The key to developing the 'pedagogy of recognition' as an educational process which embraces 'being with the world' in the multicultural classroom is to deconstruct our understanding of processes of critical thinking and critical literacy and address *how* we engage students with texts and theories in order to create a safe place for the exploration of multiple perspectives which construct, rather than reproduce, knowledge. Beyond the multicultural classroom, experience abroad promises the potential for high-impact learning and the development of cross-cultural capability. However, in order for such experience to translate into deep and transformative learning, it needs to be suspended within an intellectual space that will accommodate critical reflection in the company of peers.

Evidence suggests that while adopting alternative ideological and disciplinary dispositions towards the internationalised curriculum, there are those who readily aspire to the ideals encapsulated within notions of multicultural education and cross-cultural capability for education and citizenship. However, some perceive themselves as struggling against an inadequate

knowledge base while obliged to deliver a stuffed curriculum which affords little space to engage multiple perspectives. The notion of the 'threshold concept' within the discipline offers a means by which space may be created, but the *how* of facilitating border-crossing may still seem quite alien, almost akin to another discipline entirely. This paper argues that, in moving forward, a research-informed and evidence-based approach rather than a best-practice, checklist approach is required to enable practitioners to explore their practice and imagine alternatives. In the digital age, where knowledge itself has a short shelf life, we need to effect a mind change in self-perception, relinquishing the safe space of knowledge transmission and replacing it with a safe space to enable learners to construct their own knowledge through engaging multiple perspectives and crossing cultural borders. In effect, our journey from 'technical observance' to 'relational participation' is by the road to CAPRI …

References

Alexander, S (2006) 'Do campuses embrace internationalisation?', paper delivered to *Going global* 2 conference, British Council, 6–8 December.

Apple, MW (2004) *Ideology and curriculum*, London: Routledge Falmer.

Barrie, S (2009) 'Achieving graduate attributes', presentation to the Scottish QAA enhancement themes conference, *Graduates for the 21st century,* Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, 5–6 March.

Bennett, JM (2008) 'On becoming a global soul', in V Savicky (ed) *Developing intercultural competence and transformation*, Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Braskamp, L (2007) 'Three 'central' questions worth asking', *Journal of College and Character*, IX (1), pp 1–7.

Brown, S (2005) 'Travelling with a purpose: understanding the motives and benefits of voluntary vacationers', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 8 (6), pp 479–496.

Caruana, V and Hanstock, J (2003) 'Internationalising the curriculum: from policy to practice', proceedings of conference, *Education in a changing environment*, University of Salford, 17–18 September.

Caruana, V and Hanstock, J (2005) 'Internationalising the curriculum – at home or far away? Making connections through a holistic approach based on inclusivity', paper delivered to conference, *Education for sustainable development: graduates as global citizens*, Bournemouth University, 12–13 September.

Caruana, V and Spurling, N (2007) *The internationalisation of UK higher education: a review of selected material*. Available at: www.heacademy.ac.uk/ourwork/learning/international.

Caruana, V and Hanstock, J (2008) 'Internationalising the curriculum: from

rhetoric to reality at the University of Salford' in A McKenzie and C Shiel (eds) *The global university: the role of senior managers*, London: Development Education Association (DEA).

Caruana, V (in press) 'The relevance of the internationalised curriculum to graduate capability: the role of new lecturers' attitudes in shaping the "student voice"', in E Jones (ed) *Internationalisation and the student voice: higher education perspectives*, London: Routledge.

Chang, R, Wahr, F, De Pew, D, Gray, K, Jansz-Senn, A and Radloff, A (2004) *Knowledge, wisdom and a holistic approach: a case study of change management in academic development.* Available at: www.herdsa.org.au/conference2004/Contributions/RPapers/P019-jt.pdf (accessed 10 November 2007).

Cousin, G (2006) 'An introduction to threshold concepts', *Planet*, No 17, December. Available at: www.gees.ac.uk/planet/p17/gc.pdf (accessed 10 October 2007).

Crebert, G (2002) *Institutional research into generic skills and graduate attributes: constraints and dilemmas.* Available at: www.griffith.edu.au/centre/gche/griffith_graduate/institutional.pdf (accessed 29 May 2009).

De la Harpe, B and Radloff, A (2008) 'Developing graduate attributes for lifelong learning – how far have we got?', paper for conference, *Lifelong learning*, Rockhampton, Qld: Central Queensland University. Available at: http://hdl.cqu.edu.au/10018/13354.

De Vita, G and Case, P (2003) 'Rethinking the internationalisation agenda in UK higher education', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 27 (4), pp 383–398.

De Wit, H (2008) 'A research agenda on globalisation and internationalisation in higher education', as cited in 'Internationalisation: a research agenda', *University World News*, 0049, 19 October 2008.

Fyfe, A, Peter, M and Figuero, E (1993) *Education for cultural diversity: the challenge for a new era*, New York: Routledge.

Gardner, H (2006) *Changing minds: the art and science of changing our own and other people's minds,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Giroux, HA (ed) (2001) *Theory and resistance in education: towards a pedagogy for the oppression,* Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Green, MF (2002) Address to panel session at International Association of Universities international conference, *Internationalisation of higher education: policy and practice,* Lyon-Rhone-Alpes, France.

Harrison, N and Peacock, N (2007) 'Understanding the UK student response', *Worldviews*, Summer.

Hill, R (2009) 'A personal journey of academic development', Higher Learning blog post, 17 February, pre-print version of article published in *Educational developments,* March, London: SEDA

Jones, E (in press) '"Don't worry about the worries": transforming lives through international volunteering', in E Jones (ed) *Internationalisation and the student voice: higher education perspectives*, London: Routledge.

Jones, E and Caruana, V (in press) 'Nurturing the global graduate for the 21st century: learning from the student voice on internationalisation', in E Jones (ed) *Internationalisation and the student voice: higher education perspectives*, London: Routledge.

Jones, SR (2005) 'The underside of service learning', *About Campus*, 7 (4), pp 10–15.

Killick, D (2008) 'Internationalisation: graduate attributes for a globalising world', Higher Education Academy conference, *Transforming the student experience*, Harrogate, 1 July.

Killick, D and Poveda, J (1998) 'Cross-cultural capability: good citizenship in the global village', *Capability*, 3 (4), pp 35–38.

Land, R and Gordon, G (2008) *Research-teaching linkages: enhancing graduate attributes, sector-wide discussions*, vol 1, Scotland: QAA. Available at:
www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/documents/ResearchTeaching/SectorWideDisc_vol1_final.pdf

Leask, B (1999) 'Internationalisation of the curriculum: key challenges and strategies in the state of the art', paper given at Australia International Education Conference, *Internationalising the curriculum, international perspectives,* IDP Education, Australia, 5 October.

McLean, M (2006) *Pedagogy and the university: critical theory and practice*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

McTaggart, R (2003) 'Internationalisation of the curriculum', discussion paper. Available at:
www.jcu.edu.au/office/tld/teachingsupport/documents/International_Curriculum-AB.pdf.

Meyer, J and Land, R (2003) 'Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: linkages to ways of thinking and practising within the disciplines', Enhancing Teaching-Learning Environments in Undergraduate Courses Project, Occasional Paper No 4, Edinburgh. Available at:
www.tla.ed.ac.uk/etl/docs/ETLreport.pdf accessed 20 November 2007.

Moon, JA (2008) *Critical thinking: an exploration of theory and practice,* London: Routledge.

Neild, K and Thom, V (2006) 'International students – opening hearts and minds, creating a new framework for teachers and learners', paper delivered to conference, *International education: a matter of heart*, Monash University, Australia, 14–16 February.

Rogers, EM (1995) *Diffusion of innovations,* New York: The Free Press.

Rust, C (2009) 'A call to unite in a common cause', *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education,* 1, Feb (opinion piece).

Su, Y (2008) *Assessing graduate attributes for employability in the context of lifelong learning: the holistic approach.* Available at: www.iaea2008.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/ca/digitalAssets/164891_Su.pdf (accessed 20 May 2009).

Sumsion, J and Goodfellow, J (2004) 'Identifying generic skills through curriculum mapping: a critical evaluation', *Higher Education Research and Development*, 23 (3), pp 330–346.

University of Salford (2008) *Evolving our internationalisation strategy* (unpublished).

Vavrus, MJ (2002) *Transforming the multicultural education of teachers*, New York: Teachers' College Press.

Warren, D (2005) 'Approaches to the challenge of student cultural diversity: learning from scholarship and practice', in D Warren and J Fangharel (eds) *International conference on the scholarship of teaching and learning: proceedings 2003 and 2004*, London: Education Development Centre, City University, pp 237–253.

Wearing, S (2001) *Volunteer tourism: experiences that make a difference*, Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

Wihlborg, M (2009) 'The pedagogical dimension of internationalisation? A challenging quality issue in higher education for the twenty-first century', *European Educational Journal*, 8 (1), pp 117–132.

Woolf, M (2007) 'Impossible things before breakfast: myths in education abroad', *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 3/4, pp 496–509.