

Enhancing the engagement of academic staff in international education

Author(s)

Beelen, J.; Leask, B.

Publication date

2010

Document Version

Final published version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Beelen, J., & Leask, B. (2010). *Enhancing the engagement of academic staff in international education*. Proceedings of a Joint IEAA-EAIE Symposium.

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please contact the library: <https://www.amsterdamuas.com/library/contact/questions>, or send a letter to: University Library (Library of the University of Amsterdam and Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences), Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.



IEAA-EAIE SYMPOSIUM:
ADVANCING AUSTRALIA-EUROPE ENGAGEMENT

**ENGAGING ACADEMIC STAFF IN INTERNATIONAL
EDUCATION IN EUROPE AND AUSTRALIA**

Background paper 2



Enhancing the engagement of academic staff in international education

Associate Professor Betty Leask, University of South Australia

Drs. Jos Beelen, Hogeschool van Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Introduction

Internationalisation is not a new concept in higher education (Altbach 2004). The “wandering scholar” has been an integral and accepted member of the higher education community since the Middle Ages. However, the shape and purpose of internationalisation in higher education has undergone many changes over time. It has also been conceptualised and enacted differently in different places around the world. There are a number of regional variations in its enactment and many claims made in relation to its worth and value for nations, institutions and individuals. The focus in this paper is on internationalisation in higher education in Australia and Europe today, on the role of academic staff in this activity and on how we can enhance their engagement with the concept and the reality. This is not intended as a statement of the value of internationalisation in higher education in places outside Europe and Australia or to imply that there is nothing to be learned on this topic from them. It is a pragmatic necessity. Our purpose in the symposium is to share learning from our own experiences and exchange ideas and possibilities for the future. **The paper argues that the engagement of academic staff in international education is critical to its success and that it is in fact urgent that we find new and effective ways to engage academic staff purposefully in its enactment in both Europe and Australia.** It begins by briefly outlining the reasons why we should engage academic staff in international education, with reference to the history and current state of international education in Australia and Europe. It describes some current issues related to staff engagement in international education and some strategies that have been and others that might be used to engage academic staff in international education. It finishes by posing some questions for consideration as we move into the future – questions that we are likely to be able to answer more effectively through collaboration and conversation than in isolation.

How is internationalisation relevant to academic staff?

Internationalisation is a dynamic concept and a key issue in higher education in Europe and Australia. Academic staff have critical roles to play as actors on the stage of internationalisation - roles that are both constant and changing.

Internationalisation has undergone some significant changes in focus in Europe in the past 20 years (Teichler, 2004). Internationalisation became a key issue in higher education in Europe in the 1990s, when it was primarily focussed on issues related to “physical mobility, academic cooperation and academic knowledge transfer”. A major focus was the preparation of “faculty, staff and students to function in an international and intercultural context” (Knight & de Wit, 1995: 13) and on “making higher education (more) responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalisation of societies, economy and labour markets” (Van der Wende, 1997: 19). International offices played a critical role in the brokering and management of cross institutional

agreements and assisted in the organisation of staff and student exchange. Individual academics engaged in non-commercial knowledge transfer, international education and research, and the associated border-crossing communication and discourse also played an important part in what Teichler refers to as the “knowledge dimension” of internationalisation (p. 10). “Europeanisation” emerged as the regionally defined version of internationalisation (p. 7). In the early 2000s, however, a view emerged that it would be appropriate for universities to “give more consideration to the opportunities arising with communication, cooperation, and mobility in other areas of the world” (p. 20). At the same time a decrease in government funding and administrative control of higher education in Europe resulted in “a trend towards an increasing proportion of commercial knowledge transfer in higher education” (p. 12) and changed the focus of internationalisation for both institutions and scholars to more market-driven activities. Thus, internationalisation in the early 2000s in Europe became something for all institutions, relevant to all working within them and touching all areas of study and research to some extent (p.9). That is not to say that the “non-commercial” mobility of staff and students did not remain a central focus of internationalisation in European institutions. There was at this time, however, a recognition that something needed to be done to address the fact that “traditional forms of internationalisation fail to reach significant numbers of students” who cannot go abroad to study (Beelen, 2007: iii). There were calls for different measures to reach the non-mobile majority of students. In large part this was a response to increasing globalisation and the need, therefore, to equip all students for an international career, regardless of whether they lived and worked in their home country or abroad. Indeed it was argued that “internationalised curricula are the only way to equip all students for their roles in this world” (Beelen, 2007: 4).

Internationalisation at Home (IaH) emerged as a concept in 2000 through the publication of a position paper on IaH by the European Association for International Education (EAIE). This was followed by the formation of an IaH Special Interest Group (SIG) and a special IaH edition of the *Journal of Studies in International Education* in 2003. IaH requires that curricula have to be changed to include international elements for all students. It supports and is supported by student mobility, building on the international experiences that students have outside the campus walls and equipping them with the international and intercultural skills they need to go abroad. It places academic staff at the centre of internationalisation, as it is the lecturer who is the initiator of internationalisation of the curriculum responsible for making the classroom a site of intense international and intercultural learning experiences for all home students.

In Australia, internationalisation in higher education has also undergone significant changes over a relatively short period of time. It moved from a focus on “aid” to a focus on “trade” in less than 50 years (Back, Davis & Olsen, 1997). Since the 1980s Australian universities have undoubtedly been very successful in attracting large numbers of international students to study in Australia and in exporting their programmes to other countries (predominantly in Asia) with unmet demand. The sheer volume of international activities in which Australian universities have been involved has resulted in intensive and extended contact with diverse cultural, linguistic and pedagogical traditions, and has challenged traditional approaches to curricula and pedagogies and opened up many opportunities for research (Marginson, 2000: 26). In the literature, international education has been seen by some as a “salvation”, a way for universities to survive in a climate of ever-decreasing public funding, and by others as a source of almost insurmountable problems and a threat to the quality and standard of Australian higher education. It has been the subject of vigorous debate focused around concerns related to the balance between the commercialisation and market-driven aspects of internationalisation in higher education and the academic, knowledge dimension aspects; between academic and economic drivers and rationales (Kalantzis & Cope, 2000; Leask, 2005). There have been

attempts to redefine its meaning. For example, in 1998 Stuart Hamilton, of the Australian Vice Chancellors' Committee, defined internationalisation as "the complex of processes that gives universities an international dimension [...] relevant to all facets of university life, including scholarship, teaching, research and institutional management" (Hamilton, 1998: 1). Since the late 1990s in Australia there has been increasing emphasis placed on the need to pay more attention to what internationalisation means for the academic work associated with teaching and research and with issues related to recognizing and utilising the culturally diverse perspectives brought to the classroom by international students rather than maintaining a singular focus on international student recruitment as the primary focus of internationalisation and an end in itself.

Not surprisingly, therefore, the critical role of academic staff in internationalisation has received considerable attention in the literature of internationalisation in higher education in Australia in the past ten years (Webb, 2005; Leask, 2008). Today, internationalisation is seen by many Australian universities as critical to success in an increasingly globalised society in which there are economic imperatives to sell educational products and services in the world marketplace. However, it is simultaneously acknowledged that universities have a responsibility to prepare all graduates for life in an increasingly globalised society. There is growing recognition that the latter will not occur automatically as a result of student mobility, whether that be the outbound mobility of Australian students through study abroad and exchange or the presence on Australian campuses of large numbers of international students. It is increasingly understood that if we are to develop international and intercultural perspectives in all students we will need to make significant changes to the way we organise the curriculum; that we will need to purposefully incorporate international and intercultural dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the teaching and learning processes and support services of a programme of study. An internationalised curriculum, one that engages all students with internationally informed research and cultural and linguistic diversity and purposefully develops their international and intercultural perspectives as global professionals and citizens, is seen as a critical part of internationalisation in Australian universities today (Leask, 2009).

The recognition of the need to increase the emphasis on internationalisation of the curriculum as part of the Australian approach to internationalisation in higher education resulted in the formation of an Internationalisation of the Curriculum (IoC) SIG in the newly-formed International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) in 2005. A key objective of this group is to increase the engagement of academic staff in the internationalisation agenda of universities and other institutions of higher education through professional development that includes international conversation and dialogue with academics in other parts of the world who are interested in similar issues (such as those involved in the IaH SIG within the EAIE).

In recent years there has been some convergence in the focus of internationalisation in Europe and Australia. The knowledge dimension of internationalisation is the foundation for Internationalisation of the Curriculum and Internationalisation at Home. IoC in Australia and IaH in Europe are responses to the historical as well as the contemporary, and the local as well as the global contexts within which universities operate. Both have their origins in the need to provide all students with an international education that prepares them for life in a global society. IaH is defined as any internationally related activity *with the exception of* outbound student and staff mobility. IoC is defined as incorporation of an international and intercultural dimension into the content of the curriculum as well as the teaching and learning processes and support services of a programme of study. Both require that academic staff are engaged in international education; that their teaching is informed by international research,

experience and understanding, and is focussed on the development in all students of international and intercultural skills, knowledge and attitudes that will prepare them for life as global professionals and citizens.

Academic staff are the principal actors on the new internationalisation stage. They have a critical role to play in the knowledge economy, they understand the academic value inherent in gathering information from all over the world and generating innovation on a world scale; only they can design curricula to develop interculturally competent graduates for life as global citizens and professionals. In this environment, it is critical that we increase the engagement of academic staff in international education to ensure meaningful and deep engagement with intercultural issues in research and teaching. *For many, this will require a transformation in the way they go about their academic work.*

Why is staff engagement important?

The 2006 *Global Survey Report* of the International Association of Universities (Knight, 2006) gives an overview of the most common elements of internationalisation policy. International and intercultural dimensions of the curriculum rank sixth after international institutional agreements, outgoing mobility for staff and students, research cooperation and visiting scholars. It has been something done in the background, of secondary importance to other aspects of internationalisation. However the curriculum perspective of internationalisation is essential to the achievement of internationalisation goals for all students. The *Global Survey Report* (Knight, 2006) concludes that the biggest obstacle to the implementation of internationalisation in general is lack of faculty interest and involvement. The Report concludes that “issues related to staff interest, involvement, expertise and recognition ranked higher than obstacles related to financial and material resources” (p. 133).

Barnett and Coate (2005) make “engagement” the measure of a successful curriculum - engagement of the students, both individually and collectively, but also of academics: “the tutor himself [sic] has also to be engaged in the experiences being put before the student” (p. 129). The “field of play” of academics’ engagement is broad:

Curricula live in and are subject to the interpretations and intentions of those conducting the activities that in part constitute a curriculum. Curricula live in hearts and minds, it might be said; more formally speaking, in intentions. But curricula also live in educational structures (courses, programmes, and the like), in educational concepts and in institutional and disciplinary cultures.

(Barnett & Coate 2005: 151)

Academic staff engagement is clearly critical to international education. However, staff who are interested in engaging in the development and delivery of international education will not necessarily find the next step an easy one. Many lack the skills to add a meaningful international dimension to their courses. This is not surprising, since it is no easy task to implement deep level international learning. The student group is likely to be diverse and its members will be characterised by different learning styles, preferences and expectations. Levels of proficiency in the language of instruction may differ and that language may not be the first language of either the staff member or the students. If lecturers have not been prepared for this task in any way, it is not surprising that they may feel reluctant to become involved in the internationalisation process at the faculty and curriculum level. Enhancing the engagement of academic staff must therefore happen at both the personal and the professional level. At both levels, the notion of the intercultural is critical to staff engagement in internationalisation.

The importance of the intercultural

Definitions and discussion of internationalisation in higher education have repeatedly emphasised the intercultural. Intercultural competence or intercultural literacy, the “understandings, competencies, attitudes, language proficiencies, participation and identities necessary for successful cross-cultural engagement” (Heyward, 2002: 10) is a recurring theme, as is evidenced by the following quotes related to internationalisation in higher education:

- The preparation of “faculty, staff and students to function in an international and intercultural context” (Knight & de Wit, 1995:13)
- “Australian students [...] learning from foreigners and learning about their cultures” (Gallagher, 2002:4)
- The process of integration of “an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2003:5)

Knight (2003:7) describes the intercultural as “relating to the diversity of cultures that exist within countries, communities, and institutions”. Intercultural engagement and learning is not, however, an easy thing to achieve. It is psychologically intense and has a number of risk factors associated with it, including risk of embarrassment and risk of failure (Paige, 1993). But intercultural engagement is at the heart of intercultural education which “strives to develop critical engagement, self-reflection and sensitivity towards any aspect of interaction and communication between ‘self’ and ‘others’” (Papademetre, 2003: 1). As Pedersen (1998 in Sanderson, 2008: 283) observed: “culture is not a vague or exotic label attached to faraway persons or places, but a personal orientation to each decision, behaviour and action in our lives” (p. xi). Intercultural engagement requires an understanding of how the languages and cultures of others influence their thoughts, values, actions and feelings, and it is frequently argued that this understanding of others must be predicated by an appreciation of the ways in which our own language and culture influences our actions, reactions, values and beliefs. This is complex and challenging in the classroom and involves students and staff moving into a “third place” (Crozet, Liddicoat & Lo Bianco, 1999: 13), a meeting-place between different cultures where there is recognition of the manifestation of cultural difference, and where equal and meaningful reconstructive cross-cultural dialogue can occur. Within this framework, internationalisation is concerned with processes and activities which develop the skills, knowledge and attitudes of staff and students to relate, interact and function interculturally. This is clearly the “territory” of Internationalisation at Home and Internationalisation of the Curriculum.

In 1998, Josef Mestenhauser argued that, if we are to internationalise the curriculum, we will need to challenge both the nature of the curriculum and the paradigms on which it is based (p.21). He argued that up to that point in time internationalisation of the curriculum had been focussed too much on projects and programmes designed to train a few students as future international affairs specialists, completely ignoring the fact that all graduates will work in a global setting, as engineers, accountants, doctors, and so on. An internationalised curriculum must be concerned with the development of the intercultural if it is to cater to the rapidly changing and divergent needs of all students as global citizens (Leask, 2009). Academic staff, as those responsible for both curriculum design and delivery, for the selection of the content and the pedagogy

associated with the transfer of knowledge, are critical players in the design of curricula. To do this, they must themselves be interculturally competent. This requires what Sanderson (2008) refers to as “internationalisation of the academic Self”, a process requiring “critical reflection and self-reflection on the basic assumptions of one’s own culture and worldview” (p.283), including the basic assumptions of one’s discipline and its worldview. This requires “educational reform” in that academic staff will need to think differently about the universality of knowledge (Mestenhauser, 1998: 21). Curriculum innovation is needed to transform our national curricula into an internationalised curriculum (Leask, 2009).

An internationalised curriculum must encompass a broad range of knowledges, experiences and processes, but it needs to do much more than this. It should be the result of, and encourage, critical evaluation of the cultural foundations of that knowledge itself. It must also explore and evaluate the effectiveness of many ways of teaching and assessing student learning. This will require continuous effort focussed on the nature of knowledge, pedagogy, learning processes, content and the achievement of outcomes. Some or all of this may require radical, rather than incremental innovation – that is, new ways of conceptualising knowledge and the curriculum, rather than minor improvements to existing ways of organising and delivering the curriculum. Initiating and managing such curriculum reform in an educational organisation is complex. People and systems may be equally resistant to change and find it difficult to move into new paradigms.

Definitions and approaches to internationalisation in higher education highlight:

- the significance of the intercultural dimension of internationalisation in higher education. This is in stark contrast to the notion that internationalisation of the curriculum simply requires inclusion of knowledge of particular facts about other cultures and countries;
- the need to focus on the development of skills, attitudes and knowledge that will assist the development of intercultural competence in students and staff. Ryle makes a useful distinction between “knowing that” and “knowing how” in relation to the intercultural (Ryle, 1949). That is, knowing that attitudes to, for example, social work vary greatly in different parts of the world is quite different from understanding the cultural norms and values that provide a rationale for the differences; and
- the importance of the intercultural skills, knowledge and attitudes of academic staff on both a personal and a professional/academic dimension.

Curriculum innovation for internationalisation requires an understanding of the way in which discipline knowledge and professional practice are culturally constructed and active engagement with the diversity of cultures existing within classrooms, countries, communities and institutions. Internationalisation of the curriculum is concerned with the development of intercultural understanding in all students and all staff, with the ability to see professional issues from a variety of national and cultural perspectives, and with building cross-cultural communication and understanding through new curriculum content and teaching and learning processes. The intercultural is a key component of this process: academic staff are again centre stage, and it is therefore critical that we ensure they have the skills, knowledge, time and inclination to engage.

What skills do staff need to engage?

The biggest challenge in internationalising the curriculum is still moving beyond traditional discipline perspectives focussed on the provision of international examples and teaching international students to engage in “interdisciplinary and integrative thinking” (Mestenhauser, 1998: 23). Staff must be aware of how the curriculum as a whole and each of its components contribute to the development of the international aspects of the students’ knowledge, skills and attitudes. There are no rules as to where the inclusion of international aspects is most effective and how much internationalisation should be included in a given course. Theoretically, this lack of overview could lead to an “overdose” of internationalisation, but it is more likely that academic staff sit waiting for the others to make a first move.

Cultural diversity in classrooms may provide the stimulus to make this move and include different cultural perspectives in the curriculum. A common response is to broaden the range of case studies used to illustrate key concepts. Another is to ask students to contribute examples of practices from their country or culture by way of contrast or support for theories and concepts that are being presented. However, unless academic staff are themselves deeply engaged in a critique of traditional discipline perspectives as well as the origins of their personal values and their impact on their behaviour as teachers and academics, what results ensue may be little more than a somewhat shallow “cultural tourism” within the dominant disciplinary tradition. As Hofstede (2001) noted, “intercultural contact does not automatically breed mutual understanding” (p.424 in Sanderson, 2008: 299). If academic staff are to move beyond traditional discipline perspectives, they must be critically self-reflective. As Sanderson (2008) highlights, they need to know themselves before they can understand others. This requires high levels of self-reflection as a means to identifying the cultural basis of their own practices as well as those of their discipline.

Academic staff must also possess a range of practical skills if they are to engage in international education. A fundamental obstacle to becoming involved in the internationalisation of the curriculum in many European universities is language. Most international education in Europe is delivered in English, but this is the first language only in the United Kingdom and Ireland. Even when academic staff are fluent in English, it is no small step to develop learning environments in a second language, in many cases for students for whom English is a second language too. Many non native speakers that teach in English may have a good command of that language, but most will not have received training in the specific methodology for teaching and learning in a second language.

Several studies have identified specific skills and knowledge required of staff teaching in international settings. Teekens (cited in Beelens, 2007) provides an extensive list of competencies for international teaching academics, stressing that “the lecturer is the one who is able to make the classroom into an intense international and intercultural learning experience for the home students” (p. 38). Teekens highlights the need for academic staff to possess a broad range of skills as well as English language skills. She emphasises the need (Beelens 2007: 40-45) for academic staff to:

- be aware of and familiar with the fact that the established canon of knowledge in his or her field may differ substantially in other academic traditions;
- be aware that some students expect a different role from him or her than the one he or she is accustomed to in his or her own educational setting;

- be aware that there may be other reasons for students not to speak up, other than lack of proficiency in the language of tuition;
- realise that the use of IT in education is determined by culture and that, unless this has been made explicit, will exclude some students; and
- have basic knowledge of the main international differences on the labour market regarding qualifications, professional recognition and possible periods of probation for the specific profession for which the students are educated.

Leask (2005) identifies four key areas of competence for academic staff teaching Australian programmes offshore. Arguably, these apply to onshore teaching as much as to offshore or transnational teaching. They are that academic staff need to:

1. Be experts in their field - knowledgeable in the discipline within both an international and a local context (where “local” refers to the offshore context), and both informed about the latest research and able to incorporate it into their teaching.
2. Be skilled teachers and managers of the learning environment and able to acquit the operational issues involved in teaching offshore effectively and efficiently.
3. Be efficient intercultural learners - culturally aware and able to teach culturally appropriate materials, using culturally appropriate methods which recognise the critical role played by language and culture in learning, and flexible enough to make adjustments in response to student learning needs.
4. Demonstrate particular personal attitudes and attributes, such as being approachable, patient, encouraging and passionate about what they are teaching.

These descriptions of the skills required of academic staff responsible for designing and teaching an internationalised curriculum are broad and wide-ranging, and context is clearly important. The challenges faced by academic staff, and the skills required to address these are both similar and different in Europe and Australia; when the curriculum is taught “at home” and when it is taught “transnationally”. Many of the skills are those we associate with “good teaching” in any setting and for any purpose. However, it is also clear that staff need quite specific skills in relation to the design of learning processes and assessment tasks. Van der Wende (2000:25) notes that cultural diversity on campus and intercultural learning are linked through internationalisation of the curriculum only if there is a strong emphasis on carefully structured and designed interactive and collaborative learning processes. Leask (2009) identifies the importance of the design of learning and assessment tasks in the international classroom, particularly where the goal is to develop intercultural competence in students. She notes the importance of tasks that have meaning within the context of the course and that students cannot complete successfully unless they engage with cultural others. The design of such learning processes and assessment tasks requires high levels of competence in all four areas identified above.

What are the key enablers of engagement?

Leadership is an important enabler of academic staff engagement in internationalisation. A recent Australian Learning and Teaching Council project, “Embedding the development of intercultural competence in Business education” provides some insights into how to encourage the adoption and long-term survival of change, including changes associated with internationalisation of the curriculum, through staff engagement. The project found that such things as the creation of resources for academic staff and opportunities for their professional development, while important, were in themselves insufficient to ensure long-term engagement of academic staff and thus the survival of innovations. It is also necessary to win “the hearts and minds of leaders at various levels distributed across the organisation” (Freeman *et al.*, 2009: 57). These leaders are then able to be instrumental in introducing and sustaining innovations into their “communities of practice”, a concept arising from Wenger (2004), who defines it as follows:

Since the beginning of history, human beings have formed communities that share cultural practices reflecting their collective learning: from a tribe around a cave fire, to a medieval guild, to a group of nurses in a ward, to a street gang, to a community of engineers interested in brake design. [...] Communities of practice are the basic building blocks of a social learning system because they are the social “containers” of the competences that make up such a system (p. 241).

The same project also noted the importance of a symbiotic approach, the ability to:

Link where possible to other relevant drivers or levers for change that already exist in the institution ... [e.g.] National priorities on quality [...] University policy [...] membership of [...] international accreditation agencies [...] Capitalise on existing communities of practice that have an interest in intercultural competence [...] Capitalise on existing resources or tools that easily accommodate alignment.
(Freeman *et al.* 2009: pp. 47-48).

The project highlights the importance of leadership, the formation of self-sustaining communities of practice related to internationalisation of the curriculum within discipline groups and national and institutional priorities as levers for staff engagement.

Another possible driver of staff engagement in internationalisation is the relationship between the institution’s internationalisation agenda and professional identity in the globalising workplace. Employers increasingly place importance on intercultural skills and international perspectives in their employees. They regard those with these skills as being better prepared for the global workplace.

This is increasingly true in a wide range of occupations where graduates:

will often find themselves working in virtual teams with colleagues from all over the world, sometimes without ever meeting face to face. They will be expected to agree objectives, develop a project plan, implement agreed actions and review results with colleagues who are from societies with different values, religions, beliefs and priorities. They will have different understandings of the role of a leader, how to measure success and other critical factors that they may never discuss, but which will drive their behaviour in ways which will often surprise and sometimes frustrate their distant colleagues.

(Melkman & Trotman 2005: 4)

International connectedness is now a universal characteristic of almost all organisations in which our graduates will work, indeed:

it is now virtually impossible to conceive of a completely domestic, unicultural organization or organizational communication practices that do not have intercultural dimensions.

(Stohl, 2001: 324).

In the business context, Crossman and Bordia (2008) note that, despite this ubiquity, research continues to identify a serious lack of intercultural training among graduates.

It is possible that, in the future, students may also become agents of change in internationalising curricula in Europe and Australia. The foundations for a more internationally-minded student body are laid in primary and secondary education. In many European countries, English is now an obligatory subject in the upper years of primary education. In the Netherlands, more than a hundred bilingual schools have sprung up, where part of the curriculum is being delivered in English (or in some cases in German). Students not only learn English for personal use but also learn how to apply that language for study purposes. Many secondary schools in both Australia and Europe are involved in innovative international projects including, but not limited to, student exchanges with schools in other countries. Students may therefore have considerable international experience when they enrol in higher education and may want to see a more international curriculum.

There are several compelling reasons for academic staff to engage with internationalisation in higher education. These include the importance of intercultural skills in the global workplace, the responsibilities of universities to develop such skills in students and of academic staff in ensuring that this happens, and, possibly, in the future, the expectations of students who have come through an increasingly internationalised schooling system. However, neither individually nor collectively will these be enough. Leadership in the formulation of policies and support for the development of communities of practice devoted to the achievement of internationalisation goals is also required.

What are the key obstacles to engagement?

Motivation, the desire to make the effort to engage with internationalisation at home and internationalisation of the curriculum, is an obstacle to staff engagement in universities in Europe and Australia. Lack of motivation may be due to a number of factors. Many European staff and students are continuously exposed to international influences. Distances are small and travel is cheap. An easy international experience may be gained during a weekend in Paris or a week's autumn holiday in Turkey or Spain. A majority of students have a lifestyle that resembles that of their lecturers. This often leads to *feelings* of cosmopolitanism, both in academic staff and in students, which may reduce the motivation to internationalise the curriculum. Why internationalise the curriculum when both academic staff and students feel that they are already active players in the field of internationalisation? In some Australian universities there is a persistent belief that increasing the presence of international students in class will create a rich international experience for all students, and so little more needs to be done to internationalise the curriculum. Research indicates that this is not however the case (Leask, 2009; Volet & Ang, 1998). A lack of motivation of academic staff to engage in internationalisation of the curriculum is an important obstacle to overcome in both Europe and Australia.

The way in which international education is managed within an institution can be an obstacle to the effective engagement of academic staff. For example, if international students are placed in a separate group and the task of teaching this group is assumed by

an enthusiastic lecturer, the international impact for the department is limited to that one lecturer, who hardly needed that impact in the first place. The home students will hardly be exposed to the international students and that means that the considerable effort involved in bringing international students into the department has not resulted in great benefit. This is more commonly an issue in European than in Australian universities.

Academic staff's conceptualisation of internationalisation may also be an obstacle to staff engagement in internationalisation in Europe. If they see internationalisation in the traditional way, as primarily being concerned with student mobility which is organised by "others", they may show little interest in it. They may also pass this view on to their students, who will associate the development of international and intercultural competence with going abroad, and make no effort to utilise opportunities to do this at home. Indeed, going abroad may seem a much more exciting way to develop international perspectives and intercultural competence than staying at home, particularly if it involves a placement in an exotic location. European students do indeed seem to have a marked and growing preference for "exotic" placements in Africa and South America, for example. While this may lead to changes in the curriculum, for example in preparing students for these placements, it may also enforce the feeling in academic staff that internationalisation is something that takes place (and should take place) far away, sometimes on the other side of the world. A strong emphasis on outgoing student mobility may be an obstacle to the engagement of academic staff in internationalisation.

Barnett and Coate (2005: 158) identify a variety of challenges in engaging academic staff in curriculum redesign that are of relevance to this discussion:

Challenges of language: finding terminology that is going to resonate with the recipients' interests and situations, disciplinary and otherwise [...]

Challenges of legitimacy: [...] affirmation at the most senior levels in the system is crucial [...]

Challenges of text: [...] They have to include accessible and open texts, not just relatively closed texts such as academic journals [...]

The challenge of value: [...] curriculum matters have to be valued and seen to be valued at all levels of the sector [...]

The challenge of identity: [...] engaging seriously with curricula ultimately is a matter of one's professional identity.

Collectively, the above suggests that academic staff must see the relevance of internationalisation to them and their students within the context of who they are and what they teach. We cannot assume that the language we use to discuss internationalisation will resonate with them, or will indeed make any sense at all. They are immersed in the discourse of their discipline, which has its own cultural foundations. They will need to feel affirmed in the process of curriculum innovation for internationalisation through institutional policy and local disciplinary and cross-disciplinary communities of practice. They will expect to see that Internationalisation at Home and Internationalisation of the Curriculum are valued in practical ways, such as through the provision of resources and rewards and recognition for achievement. If there is no extra pay, no support or coaching and hardly any recognition for a staff member that invests much time in developing and delivering internationally-oriented education, faculty staff that ask "What's in it for me?", will hardly find a positive answer. It is not surprising that staff members that have come to this realisation will stay on the side lines and will wait for others to take on the internationalisation process.

Many will need assistance to adapt their curriculum and their teaching to an international, culturally diverse teaching and learning environment rather than expecting learners to adapt to a “mono-cultural”, inflexible curriculum and classroom. They will require access to practical resources to assist them to move beyond their traditional disciplinary perspectives, to develop their own intercultural awareness and competence, and to develop the intercultural competence of their students. These resources will need to be written in ways that are accessible to them when they are not experts in the field. They will require the time to make significant changes and to respond to the challenges associated with critical self-reflection. Above all, they must themselves be highly efficient and effective intercultural learners with the skill to engage with and utilise diversity to develop their own and their students’ international and intercultural perspectives. Most of this work is best done in teams. Unfortunately, though, when an enthusiastic supporter of internationalisation in the department stands up, he or she is automatically seen as the owner of the internationalisation process. This may cause one or a few of the courses of the curriculum to become internationalised to some degree but is not an ideal situation. Other academic staff can then lean back as they feel they are relieved of the arduous task of internationalising their parts of the curriculum, and there will ultimately be no coordination or planning across the program to develop advanced international and intercultural skills, attitudes and knowledge in students.

In managing curriculum innovation for internationalisation, it is important to recognise the complexity of what we are attempting and to recognise that the beliefs and perceptions of academic staff, themselves culturally influenced, will impact on their readiness to embrace and drive change in the curriculum. Bland *et al.* (2000, in Gijsselaers & Harendza, 2006) identified three components for curriculum change in medical schools - internal networking, resource allocation and the institution’s relationship with its external environment. Communities of practice (Wenger, 1999) comprised of multi-cultural staff across a range of disciplines; access to resources to support intercultural engagement (e.g. funding for travel to undertake collaboration with scholars from other cultures on inter-disciplinary projects), and strategies to extend international partnerships with universities beyond study abroad and exchange agreements may provide some way forward.

Reflecting on the experience of implementing a major curriculum innovation for internationalisation, Leask (2009) suggests that it is vitally important to engage academic staff with the change agenda from the outset, in order to avoid a reactionary response and entrenched and defensive behaviour. Curriculum change is inevitably somewhat “messy” and chaotic. Not all staff will feel equally comfortable with any change. Leask found that at all times it was important to recognise and respond to the need for professional development that encouraged and rewarded engagement with the change agenda. It is important to remember that ultimately it is what happens in the classroom that will determine the effectiveness or otherwise of any change agenda driven by the institution. The key obstacles to enhancing academic staff engagement in internationalisation are the challenges associated with changing personal and professional cultural mindsets.

Conclusion

Enhancing the engagement of academic staff in internationalisation is critical if we are to move internationalisation in higher education beyond notions of student and staff mobility and international student recruitment towards the development of key skills, attitudes and knowledge in all students. Curriculum innovation for internationalisation requires not only that that academic staff critically reflect on their own cultural identity

but that they understand the way in which discipline knowledge and professional practice are culturally constructed. They also need to be actively engaged with the diversity of cultures existing within classrooms, countries, communities and institutions. Strategic approaches at national, regional and institutional levels are necessary, but attention must also be given to the details of pedagogy and professional development for academic staff. It is important to recognise the complexity of the task of curriculum reform, understand the relationships between knowledge and culture, and challenge the way staff and students think about knowledge, learning and teaching. Even so, little will be achieved without a shared will and resources to support the personal development of students and staff, who together will ultimately determine the success or otherwise of any curriculum innovation for internationalisation. Professional associations such as EAIE and IEAA have an important role to play, including, for example, through influencing the formulation and communication of policy at national and regional levels, providing training and development for academic staff and academic leaders, and supporting national and international cross-disciplinary communities of practice.

Questions for discussion

1. Are there further enablers of staff engagement in international education that are not identified in this paper? What are they? What can we learn from each other in this area?
2. Can you rank the obstacles to staff engagement identified in the paper in order of importance from your perspective? Are there additional obstacles not outlined in the paper that should be considered?
3. What suggestions do you have for overcoming any of the identified obstacles to staff engagement in international education? What opportunities are there for collaboration between Europe and Australia in this area?
4. In what ways can our associations support academic staff to become more international in their outlook?
5. Do you agree that, within a decade, concern about the environmental impacts of student mobility will increase the importance of IaH/IoC – perhaps making this the core element of international education?
6. What are the three most urgent things we need to do to increase the engagement of academic staff in international education?

References

- Altbach, P. (2004). Globalisation and the University: Myths and Realities in an Unequal World. *Tertiary Education and Management* 10, 3-25.
- Back, K., Davis, D., & Olsen, A. (1997). Chapter 3, Strategies for internationalisation of higher education in Australia. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Internationalisation of higher education in Asia Pacific Countries*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education (EAIE).
- Barnett, R & Coate, K. (2005), *Engaging the curriculum in higher education*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press. Maidenhead, UK: MacGraw-Hill.
- Beelen, J, (Ed.) (2007). *Implementing internationalisation at home*. EAIE professional development series for international educators, no. 2. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education
- Crossman, J. & Bordia, S. (2008). Emerging issues in international education in business contexts. *Journal of International Education in Business* 1 (1), 2-14.
- Crozet, C., Liddicoat, A. J., & Lo Bianco, J. (1999). Intercultural competence: from language policy to language education. In C. Crozet, A. J. Liddicoat & J. Lo Bianco (Eds.), *Striving for the third place: Intercultural competence through language education*. Canberra: Language Australia.
- Freeman, M, Treleaven, L, Simpson, L, Ridings, S, Ramburuth, P, Leask, B, Caulfield, N & Sykes, C (2009). *Embedding the Development of Intercultural Competence in Business Education*. ALTC project report.
- Gallagher, M. (2002). Benefits and challenges of internationalising education. Paper presented at the XIII triennial conference of The International Association of University Presidents, Sydney, 26 June, 2002.
- Hamilton, S. (1998). Setting the foundations for the internationalisation of Australian higher education. Paper presented at Education '98, the Industry Practitioners Forum, Sydney, March, 1998.
- Heyward, M. (2002). From international to intercultural: Redefining the international school for a globalised world. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 1(1) 9-32.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2000). Towards an inclusive and international higher education. In R. King, D. Hill & B. Hemmings (Eds.), *University and diversity: Changing perspectives, policies and practices in Australia* (pp. 30-53). Wagga Wagga: Keon Publications.
- Knight, J. (2003). *Updating the definition of internationalization*. Retrieved 17 November, 2003, from: http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News33/text001.htm

- Knight, J. (2006). *Internationalization of Higher Education: New directions, new challenges*. 2005 IAU Global Survey Report. Paris: International Association of Universities.
- Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: historical and conceptual perspectives. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education*. Amsterdam: EAIE.
- Leask, B. (2005). Competing rationales for and discourses of internationalisation: Implications for academic staff development. Higher Education in a Changing World. University of Sydney, Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA)
http://conference.herdsa.org.au/2005/pdf/refereed/paper_424.pdf
- Leask, B. (2008a). Chapter 1: Internationalisation, globalisation and curriculum innovation. In A. Reed & M. Hellsten (Eds.), *Researching international pedagogies: Sustainable practice for teaching and learning in higher education* (pp 9-26). Netherlands: Springer.
- Leask, B. (2008b). Chapter 12: Teaching for learning in transnational courses and programs. In L. Dunn & M. Wallace (Eds.), *Transnational teaching and learning* (pp 120-132). Melbourne: Routledge.
- Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13 (2), 205-221.
- LTU (2009), Internationalisation at teacher level, Learning and Teaching Unit, University of South Australia
<http://www.unisa.edu.au/ltu/staff/practice/internationalisation/teacher.asp>
- Marginson, S. (2000). Rethinking academic work in the global era. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 22, 23-35.
- Melkman, A & Trotman, J. (2005). *Training international managers: Designing, deploying and delivering effective training for multi-cultural groups*. Aldershot, UK: Gower.
- Mestenhauser, J. (1998). Portraits of an internationalized curriculum. In J. Mestenhauser & B. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum* (pp. 3-35). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Paige, M., R. (1993). Chapter 1: On the nature of intercultural experiences and intercultural education. In M. R Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Papademetre, L. (2003). Division of Education Arts and Social Sciences, Internationalisation Workshop Notes. Adelaide: University of South Australia.
- Sanderson, G. (2008). A foundation for the internationalization of the academic Self in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 12 (3), 276-307.
- Stohl, C. (2001). Globalizing organizational communication. In F. Jablin & L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Accessing theory, research and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education* 48, 5-26.
- Van der Wende, M. (1997). Missing links. In T. Kalvemark & M. van der Wende (Eds.), *National policies for the internationalisation of higher education in Europe*.
- Van der Wende, M. (2000). Internationalising the curriculum: new perspectives and challenges. In B. Hudson & M. Todd (Eds.), *Internationalising the curriculum in higher education: Reflecting on practice* (pp. 25-38). Sheffield: Sheffield Hallam University Press.
- Volet, S. E., & Ang, G. (1998). Culturally mixed groups on international campuses: An opportunity for inter-cultural learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 17(1) 5-23.
- Webb, G. (2005) Internationalisation of curriculum: An institutional approach. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.) *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all*. London: Routledge.
- Wenger, E. (2004). Communities of practice and social learning systems. In K.P. Starkey, S. Tempest & A. McKinlay (Eds.), *How organizations learn: Managing the search for knowledge* (pp. 238-258). London: Thomson.