Internationalisation at Home
A Position Paper

by
Paul Crowther
Michael Joris
Matthias Otten
Bengt Nilsson
Hanneke Teekens
Bernd Wächter

published by the
European Association for International Education
in cooperation with the Academic Cooperation Association,
IAK, IÉSEG, Nuffic, Katholieke Hogeschool Limburg
and Malmö University

Internationalisation at Home. A Position Paper
by Paul Crowther, Michael Joris, Matthias Otten, Bengt Nilsson, Hanneke Teekens
and Bernd Wächter

Published by the European Association for International Education (EAIE)

Copyright © 2000 EAIE. All rights reserved.

ISBN 90-74721-16-8

Printed by:
Drukkerij Raddraaier, Amsterdam

The European Association for International Education (EAIE) is a non-profit membership association which provides networking facilities, information, training and other services to professionals in the field of international education.

Contents

Introduction 1

1 **Internationalisation at home – the context** 5
by Bernd Wächter

2 **Impacts of cultural diversity at home** 15
by Matthias Otten

3 **Internationalising the curriculum** 21
by Bengt Nilsson

4 **Teaching and learning in the international classroom** 29
by Hanneke Teekens

5 **Internationalisation at home – institutional implications** 35
by Paul Crowther

Introduction

In the Spring 1999 issue of *EAIE[1] Forum* Bengt Nilsson contributed an article on 'Internationalisation at home – theory and praxis'. In this article Nilsson raised several questions, based on the fact that after more than 10 years of European student mobility programmes like ERASMUS, still no more than 10% of students go abroad to study at foreign universities. How do we give the rest of the students a European and international dimension to their education? How do we give the non-mobile majority of students a better understanding of people from different countries and cultures, increase their knowledge of and respect for other human beings and their way of living and create the global society in a multicultural context? Can intercultural education as a mainstream in all educational programmes increase the students' interest for studies abroad?

This article was well received, with more than 80 representatives from 50 universities responding to express their interest in discussing these matters and forming a network around this theme. Out of this interest resulted the foundation of a 'Special Interest Group' within the EAIE (an informal network of EAIE members interested in a particular topic). The Internationalisation at Home (IaH) Special Interest Group was recognised by the EAIE Executive Board in August 1999, and first presented itself and its plans to a wider audience at the 11th Annual EAIE Conference in Maastricht in December 1999. Since its creation, it has grown to 120 members.

The main goals of the network are:

- to define and describe the basic concept of 'internationalisation at home';
- to start and stimulate a debate for university educators on this issue, both electronically and at conferences and seminars;

1 *European Association for International Education*

- to gather ideas and good examples for the internationalisation process for non-mobile university students at all levels, including adult students in a life-long learning perspective;
- to produce a publication describing experiences and useful examples from the project.

A Steering Group for the network was proposed in Maastricht and had its first meeting in Malmö in February 2000. The Steering Group consists of the following persons:

Paul Crowther, IÉSEG School of Management, Lille, France
Michael Joris, Katholieke Hogeschool Limburg, Diepenbeek, Belgium
Bengt Nilsson, Malmö University, Sweden
Matthias Otten, Universität Karlsruhe, Germany
Hanneke Teekens, Nuffic, 's-Gravenhage, The Netherlands
Bernd Wächter, Academic Cooperation Association (ACA), Brussels, Belgium

For its start-up phase, the group decided to concentrate on two products. First, a short outline paper stating the main elements of the concept of 'internationalisation at home', which was submitted to the members of the wider network in early summer 2000. Second, a more substantial publication, based on the earlier outline paper and any comments it drew, which would look into the phenomenon in some more detail, and which would be widely distributed to international educators and administrators in general, and to those belonging to or working within the context of EAIE in particular. It was also decided to distribute the publication to participants of the 2000 EAIE Annual Conference, where it would serve as a basis for discussions on the future work of the network. The publication in question is the booklet you are reading now.

The present publication is a collection of five essays which attempt to shed some light on different aspects of the concept of internationalisation generally, and 'internationalisation at home' in particular, and which also look at these aspects from slightly different angles. The latter is very important: the group took the conscious decision not to 'homogenise' the contributions by the individual authors, but let them reflect the various interpretations of the theme. We hope that the diversity which results from this approach will be felt by the reader as the publication's richness.

The five essays explore different themes of the overall subject, as already mentioned. They were ordered in what the authors feel to be a progression from generality to detail.

In the first chapter, *Internationalisation at home – the context*, Bernd Wächter looks into the wider framework conditions for internationalisation and 'internationalisation at home'. While 'internationalisation at home' is a matter taking place *inside* higher education institutions, these institutions do not live in a vacuum and are therefore, to an extent, determined in their work by influences and limits set by external 'actors'. The factors on which Bernd Wächter mainly focuses are the legislative and regulatory framework set by different levels of government, the funding provided by governments and internationalisation agencies, and the different forces and constraints which emanate from what is today referred to with the concept of globalisation.

In the second chapter, Matthias Otten looks at the *Impacts of cultural diversity at home*. Taking into account theoretical approaches and findings from intercultural communication research, this chapter highlights the valuing of (cultural) diversity as a mutually enriching condition of social interaction in the academic environment. The theoretical approach of this chapter also serves as a conceptual foundation for the discussion of the practical implications of internationalisation at home in the following chapters.

In the third contribution, Bengt Nilsson discusses the issue of *Internationalising the curriculum*. He analyses the objectives and conditions for an internationalised curriculum and gives examples of implementation efforts for such curricula at Malmö University.

In chapter 4, on *Teaching and learning in the international classroom*, Hanneke Teekens discusses the question of how to raise awareness of the specific qualities and skills required to function in the international classroom. She describes a profile for the "ideal lecturer and student" to provide insight into the demanding role they play when confronted with an internationalised curriculum. The profiles are by no means intended as a blueprint, but as a means to further reflect on interactions at the classroom level.

Paul Crowther, in chapter 5, deals with the *Institutional implications of internationalisation at home*. Drawing on the other chapters, he discusses the reasons why internationalisation is essential, how an institution might formulate its response to the international environment and the consequences of its implementation for the institution's management. The viewpoint is that of a European practitioner.

The present publication consists of five chapters, but it has six authors. How is this possible? Originally, it had been planned to devote a separate article to the ICT dimension of internationalisation at home. As work on the booklet progressed, it became increasingly clear that this horizontal theme is so intricately interlinked with the other thematic aspects that it appeared more appropriate to integrate the ICT dimension into these other essays. The sixth author, Michael Joris, is therefore present with his ideas and contributions throughout the publication. He provided the five chapters with their ICT inputs.

We hope that this booklet will serve the cause for which it was created: to stimulate the debate on 'internationalisation at home', to help refine the concept itself, and to lead to better practice at higher education institutions in Europe and beyond. For our immediate purposes, the latter aspect is the most important one. The publication will provide the basis for discussions at the next plenary meeting of the IaH Special Interest Group, which is due to take place at the EAIE Annual Conference in December 2000 in Leipzig. It will, we hope, also inspire the future course of this network's activities.

Finally, the EAIE would like to express its appreciation for the financial support from the Academic Cooperation Association (ACA), Brussels, Belgium; Institute of Applied Studies in Culture and Society (IAK), University of Karlsruhe, Germany; IÉSEG School of Management, Catholic University of Lille, France; Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education (Nuffic), 's-Gravenhage, The Netherlands; Katholieke Hogeschool Limburg, Diepenbeek, Belgium; and Malmö University, Sweden; which made this publication possible.

1

Internationalisation at home – the context

Bernd Wächter

Introduction

One of the most commonly quoted and, by and large, most widely accepted definitions of 'internationalisation' is already seven years old and describes the phenomenon as:

> The process of integrating an international dimension into the research, teaching and services function of higher education.
> (Knight 1993)

The most striking feature of this process-based definition is that it does not inform us in any explicit way what the process consists of, *ie* which are the means by which the "teaching, research and service function" of institutions is to be made international. The definition rather assumes the existence of a consensus on this question. In other words, the question remains as to which activities are meant, and which are excluded, when we talk about internationalisation.

I do not raise this point in order to embark on a deep conceptual analysis of the various definitions and meanings of internationalisation. However, it will be difficult to develop a meaningful notion of the concept of 'internationalisation at home' if it is not possible to say what 'internationalisation' as a whole consists of. And, in turn, I will have difficulties in coming up with intelligent observations about the 'context' of 'internationalisation at home' if I fail to know exactly to what it is a context.

In order to resolve this dilemma, I shall adopt a historical approach. Internationalisation, and international cooperation, was for a long time regarded as the equivalent of the mobility of persons in general, and of students in particular. This is in any case true of Europe, the only continent I can speak of with some authority. In the European debate, the idea of 'internationalisation at home'

emerged as a consequence of the announced shift of the ERASMUS programme from what was almost entirely a student mobility scheme to an instrument which would also cater for the needs of the vast majority of non-mobile students, mainly through the development of international curricula. ERASMUS had not even reached its mobility target of a 10% study abroad rate, and there was no hope of ever achieving more substantial results in the future. Therefore, the issue was raised of what to do 'for the remaining 90%'. If they could not go out into the international world, how could this world be brought to their home campus?

In line with the historical genesis of the phenomenon I will, for the purposes of this article, understand 'internationalisation at home' to denote:

> Any internationally related activity with the exception of outbound student and staff mobility.

I know that this leaves a number of important questions open and that it is conceptually not the soundest of understandings, but it is sufficient to enable us to speak about 'context' in a meaningful way. Furthermore, and in line with the reforms brought in by SOCRATES ('institutionalisation') and changes in the commonly shared assumptions about the *modus operandi* of universities in Europe which occurred in the 1990s (the shift towards strategic management and 'managerialism'), I take 'internationalisation' as a whole, and 'internationalisation at home' in particular, to mean not simply the sum of all international activity in a given institution, but also a coherent relationship between these activities, brought about by some form of institution-wide coordination and central steering.

'Context', then, is the sum of all framework conditions which impact on the above process, and which do not originate from inside the university itself. The latter, which belong to the sphere of management, are dealt with by Paul Crowther in a different essay in this collection. Contextual framework conditions are given variables which the university cannot influence, but which nonetheless have a profound bearing on the process of internationalising a university. If favourable, they can work as stimulating factors, encouraging and facilitating internationalisation. If negative, they will reduce the institution's degree of freedom and act as factors limiting change. Furthermore, they do not only impact on the scope of any internationalisation process, they also influence the exact way in which an institution can or cannot internationalise itself. In any event, the university needs to take them into account and adapt its strategies to them, if it wants to be successful in any way.

The context of internationalisation at home consists of many factors. The most important of these contextual factors I take to be, in this order: governmental policies; the process of globalisation; the changed environment brought about by the IT revolution; the trend towards accountability and responsibility expressed in the expectations of the so-called stakeholders; and the widespread 'commodification' of higher education. In this chapter, I will concentrate on the first two of these aspects, and I will devote some space, as do all my fellow authors, to the IT aspect. The themes of accountability and commodification are dealt with by Paul Crowther.

Governmental policies

The vast majority of universities, at any rate in Europe, are state institutions. Even those which are not operate within a regulatory framework set by governments. To a high degree, the state determines the extent of a university's degree of freedom. This applies to higher education policy in general, and it equally applies to internationalisation policies. As far as I can see, governments intervene in two main ways: through legislative and regulatory acts (higher education laws), and through funding mechanisms.

Legislation

In Europe, government exists in at least three layers, with varying rights and responsibilities. These are the (supranational) level of the European Union, the level of national government, and the regional government level. In a strict sense, there is even a fourth layer, that of international intergovernmental organisations (UNESCO, OECD), but their regulatory power is extremely limited, and therefore marginal for my present concern.[1]

European Union level

The European Union is a supranational organisation, characterised by a delegation of power from the national to the Union level in certain policy fields. This concerns also the field of education and training, where the rights of the European Union have been enshrined in Articles 149 and 150 of the Amsterdam Treaty (Articles 126 and 127, Maastricht). Apart from generally mandating the Union to contribute to a 'high quality' of education and training in the member states, the respective articles empower the Union to support mobility and cooperation between member states, but also with 'third countries', as well as credit transfer arrangements. The Union's SOCRATES and LEONARDO programmes are based on these articles. Since the legislative and regulatory rights of the Union concern almost exclusively cooperation *between* the different states and their education institutions (and exclude responsibility for the education systems as such), the Union's activity almost by definition tends to favour internationalisation.[2] The legislative framework (Articles 149 and 150) was after all entered into in order to surmount national borders and to reduce obstacles to mobility and to cooperation, and not to increase them.

National level

National government today still holds most legislative and regulatory powers over education, with the exception of countries with a highly federalist structure. In Europe, and elsewhere even more, it is national government that decides on the structure and content of higher education, which are therefore explicitly mentioned as national prerogatives in the European treaties. National parliaments pass higher education laws. On the basis of these, and with the help of subsidiary regulatory mechanisms, national governments influence the degree to which universities operating under this legislation can or cannot become internationally oriented organisms.

For example, whether or not a higher education institution is entitled to award internationally known degrees of the Bachelor and Master type is decided through this framework. The national framework also sets (limiting or encouraging) conditions for the employment of foreign nationals. It regulates which may be the languages of tuition. It can facilitate or hinder the recognition of qualifications earned abroad, through the establishment or otherwise of credit accumulation systems.

By and large, national government policies in Europe have, in the past decade, tended to promote rather than limit internationalisation. This tendency has become even stronger since the conclusion of the Sorbonne and Bologna Declarations. However, national policies have at the same time also displayed strong 'isolationist' tendencies, which found their expression in long debates over the issue of 'subsidiarity' between them and the Union, or in 'defensive' language strategies.

Regional government

In some countries, the responsibility for education lies with regional entities (for example the German *Länder* or the Swiss *Kantone*). Usually, in such federalist cases, there is some sort of coordinating body, the purpose of which is to ensure a minimum degree of commonality across the various sub-systems. As such, regional autonomy and a high degree of federalism need not impact negatively on internationalisation. In practice, however, strong regional identities often hinder the development of an international outlook. For example, an insistence on a rarely spoken regional language as the mode of tuition tends to act as an obstacle to international cooperation in some of these regions. Although very often such 'isolationist' policies are directed against the federal level of

the country, or its other constituent parts, and not against other countries, the insistence on regional specificity *de facto* also often works against an international orientation.

Funding

Internationalisation, of the 'at home' type and generally, is rarely 'decreed' by law.[3] Legislation, by providing a regulatory framework, rather decides on the extent of systemic internationalisation obstacles, *ie* their relative dominance or absence.

Traditionally, internationalisation, at the European, national and regional level, has been and is still today driven by an encouragement approach. Encouragement simply means the provision of extra funds for such institutions as are willing to enter into internationalisation. The classical instruments to encourage internationalisation are funding programmes.

Some European countries, with well-developed international agencies and substantial funds allocated to this area, have a long tradition of promoting internationalisation (although they tended, until a few years ago, to concentrate very much on activities in the field of the mobility of persons). By and large, however, it was the European Union which became the 'prime mover' of international cooperation[4] in Europe. Programmes such as ERASMUS, LINGUA or COMETT, and later the SOCRATES and LEONARDO schemes, have massively challenged the continent's higher education institutions. While the public attention for these schemes has classically focused on their mobility components, they have since their early days also supported structural cooperation more relevant to the issue of 'internationalisation at home', such as curriculum development, the creation of networks or credit transfer arrangements.

ERASMUS under SOCRATES has tried to move one step further, by attempting to strengthen curriculum development, and by introducing the 'institutional' principle, thereby trying to make internationalisation a strategic concern of an institution's top management.

The Union has also fostered cooperation in such areas as quality assurance, through the creation of a European network of national and regional quality agencies, and can now be perceived to enter into the discussions about 'transnational education', by making the first steps in the direction of a European accreditation mechanism. These latter examples show how the Union is trying to gain new ground (not covered by the European treaties).

By and large, however, the Union's strength is also its weakness: its mandate in (higher) education is exactly the promotion of cooperation, but the Treaty also largely limits the Union's field of action to this aspect. The 'structure and content' of education remains the prerogative of the individual nation states. 'Internationalisation at home' has a lot to do with exactly these structural issues, especially in the field of degrees and in the area of curriculum reform.

Given the contractual limitations of the Union with regard to systemic measures, it is the national government level (and the regional one in a number of countries) which is in the best position to stimulate internationalisation. In many countries of Europe, the state has entrusted the task of promoting international relations and internationalisation to specialist agencies, such as Nuffic in The Netherlands, the British Council in the UK, or DAAD in Germany, to name but a few. Where this is not the case (especially in Southern Europe), the ministries of education themselves administer the respective programmes.

By generalising perhaps more than is legitimate, a number of trends can be observed with regard to national policies for the stimulation of internationalisation:

- First, not every country has an explicit internationalisation policy. In many cases, there is simply funded activity, from which a 'policy' can perhaps be deduced which is not apparent at the outset [*cf* Kälvemark and van der Wende 1987 (especially the introduction by Marijk van der Wende)]. However, over time, a trend towards more explicit policy can be observed.
- Second, from a historical perspective, the earlier heavy concentration of most governments and their respective agencies on the mobility of persons (students in the first place, scholars in the second) is gradually giving way to the funding of systemic internationalisation. This

does not mean that mobility has not remained the number one priority, but its lead over other activity forms has probably weakened.

- Third, funding programmes are now sometimes even used for the transformation of whole tertiary systems, as a result of the Bologna Declaration and of pressures originating from the process of globalisation. More or less all the Nordic countries have, in some way or another, supported the creation of programmes taught in a foreign language, in the majority of cases in English. This is also a strong trend in The Netherlands and, more recently, in Germany. Even France, traditionally a staunch defender of its own language, has embarked on this project now.

Many of these latter courses are designed to attract foreign students and thus to internationalise the composition of the student body, but they are equally available for the famous '90% plus' of domestic students who do not benefit from international mobility. Likewise, many of them are international beyond the language of tuition: international politics, international law, international business and management, as well as various types of area studies, are examples of curriculum-based internationalisation, which are treated in more depth in Bengt Nilsson's chapter. In some countries, and notably in Germany, where a transformation of the degree structure (towards a system of Bachelors and Masters) is underway, funding programmes underpin this form of structural internationalisation, in that new Bachelors and Masters programmes with particular international traits (such as those mentioned above) can attract additional funding in the set-up phase.

Occasionally, mechanisms go beyond the encouragement model of support programmes, and are part of the core funding of institutions, through an incentive mechanism. This has been the case in Finland, where a small part of institutions' basic funding is determined by their record in student mobility. Such a system effectively forces higher education institutions into internationalisation. However, examples of this sort are extremely rare. And it is telling that the indicator used is in the above case is mobility, and not structural internationalisation of the 'at home' type.

To put it in a nutshell: governmental policies, be it through legislation or through funding programmes, are a determining factor of internationalisation in general, and thus of 'internationalisation at home'. The level of development in the various countries of Europe is by no means identical but, in a historical perspective, a more supportive attitude of national governments than hitherto appears to be emerging in most countries. Rather than limiting internationalisation, more and more governments are supporting it. There are, however, also undercurrents in the opposite direction, mostly through strong regional orientations. The European Union has in most countries been the strongest single promoter of internationalisation, but its mandate is limited, and further steps from this side will probably not come about without changes in the treaties. Further, there are also a few 'isolationist' tendencies, which mainly result from a defence of and fight for regional autonomy.

Globalisation

It has so far been argued that the main framework conditions impacting on internationalisation are legislation and funding programmes. In both cases, government, at a national, European and sometimes regional level, is the decisive actor. As becomes apparent in Paul Crowther's essay, a wider set of societal stakeholders and their expectations and demands impact on higher education as well. The commodification of higher education, the expectations on value for money and on accountability leave their mark on higher education in general, and also on internationalisation. Since the 1990s, a third influence (which has of course much to do with the phenomena discussed by Paul Crowther) has made itself felt on the scene. This influence is a process rather than an actor. It is commonly referred to as 'globalisation'. The effects of globalisation are starting to gradually reduce the *marge de maneouvre* of governments, thus *de facto* reducing their power. Globalisation has already started to act as a major determining factor for internationalisation, and its influence is likely to increase.

One might of course expect that a process the very name of which implies a radical moving together of all parts of the globe would act as a big boost for internationalisation. By and large, I am convinced that exactly this will happen. However, it is important to stress that internationalisation and globalisation are not synonymous, and it is worthwhile to differentiate clearly between them. Globalisation refers to "forceful changes in the economic, social, political and cultural environment, brought about by global competition, the integration of markets, increasingly dense communication networks, information flows and mobility" (Reichert and Wächter 2000). It is a relatively uncontrolled process, determined mainly by fierce economic competition on a global scale, and by rapid advances in information and communication technology. Internationalisation, on the other hand, is based on conscious action. Today, and this is important, it is mostly also a response to the challenges brought about by globalisation. For globalisation has changed the world-wide higher education landscape.

Although essentially an economic process focused on the corporate world, one of its decisive features, competition, has spilled over to the educational field. As a consequence, world-wide competition has started between higher education systems, and between individual institutions. Even countries which have not so far known competition between their own institutions will not escape from this influence. Competition over foreign students has set in, but also over the best professors and researchers, and particularly over good young scientists, who are becoming increasingly rare. In some highly lucrative disciplines (biotechnology, computer science) non-academic practices such as head hunting are beginning to be observed. The objects of these exercises are not only star researchers, but also PhD students. These are traits of what has been labelled the 'commodification of higher education', or, slightly misleadingly, the 'export of higher education' (since we are here dealing with the *import* of people), and which follow an essentially mercantile motivation. But this is by no means the only motivation: there are countries which do not derive any direct financial benefits from the attraction of foreign nationals but which, for reasons of competitiveness and foreign cultural policy interests, find it less than acceptable that they be left behind by others. One outcome of global competition has been increased marketing of higher education systems and institutions.

What has all of this to do with 'internationalisation at home'? The simple answer is that a globalised world is changing the rules of the game of internationalisation.

First, there is the obvious conclusion that in a global economy it makes less sense than ever before to orient the qualifications passed on to students towards the needs of national labour markets. Universities must prepare for international requirements. This will have an obvious bearing on curricula and syllabi, which will need to become 'internationalised', in one or another of the ways delineated in Bengt Nilsson's chapter. Part of the qualifications and skills passed by universities to the next generation will not only be 'international', but also 'intercultural'. Not only will classrooms (physical or virtual) be characterised by a multiplicity of cultural styles, with concomitant demands on teaching and learning strategies, as outlined elsewhere in this volume by Hanneke Teekens and, in a theory-based approach, by Matthias Otten. High on the list of the very skills that graduates will need to perform successfully in an international arena will be those intercultural ones.

Second, as a result of increased competition among them, higher education institutions will need to attract 'customers' not only from the traditional reservoir of domestic students, but from the global 'pool'. In Europe, this need will be further supported by the declining demographic curve of domestic students, and the need to recruit students elsewhere, lest a number of degrees, faculties and sometimes even whole institutions will be in danger of being closed down. If nothing else, the survival instinct of institutions should motivate them into recruitment measures outside of their own countries and continents. But of equal importance is likely to be that a future quality criterion of courses and institutions is going to be an international composition of its student and staff body.

Third, the demands emanating from a potentially international and intercultural student clientele require structural internationalisation, that is, 'internationalisation at home'. Successful programmes will be taught in an internationally frequently spoken foreign language, in most cases in English. This puts the English-speaking countries at a natural advantage and is a major challenge which their competitors must meet. Additional courses for foreign students in the host country's

language need to be offered as a support service, since students need at some stage to be enabled to communicate in their wider (non-academic) environment as well. As stated above, curricula must be adapted to international use and needs, and they must provide graduates with intercultural skills.

Fourth, support services for the particular group of foreign students must be developed, in Europe more than anywhere else. The non-service attitude of so many of continental Europe's universities must become a thing of the past. It is an anachronism already with regard to the domestic student body, which might after all opt to study in a more service-friendly country. But it will increasingly become an important obstacle in attempts to attract foreign students. The growth and increased professionalism of international relations offices at Europe's universities can only be a first step in this direction. To leave the task of service provision entirely to these units will more or less result in a ghettoisation of the challenge, if not of the students themselves, and avoid the speed of attitudinal change required in European universities' administration and service units. It is high time that the administrative staff of Europe's higher education institutions begin to think of students, domestic or foreign, as their *raison d'être*, and not as their favourite enemies.

Fifth, I am afraid that the present jungle of Europe's degrees and diplomas must be abolished in order for European higher education to survive and succeed in international competition. Admittedly, this is not something that is in the hands of the individual higher education institutions. But efforts at 'internationalisation at home' are likely to lose much of their impact if the educational product is not delivered in an internationally compatible or 'readable' format. In my analysis, which some might find too radical, this simply calls for the introduction of a Bachelor/Master degree architecture across Europe. I am afraid that even the terminology matters, and that creations such as, for example, a 'baccalaureus', which reminds one of a bug rather than an academic degree, will keep customers at bay rather than inspire confidence. A start has been made in many European countries, and one can only hope that the Bologna process will finally achieve the much-needed overhaul of Europe's degrees.

There can be little doubt that institutions not living up to the above challenges will not only *de facto* soon lose out in the competitive race which is under way and the pace of which is accelerating every day. They are most likely going to be stigmatised in a more visible way, by their conspicuous absence from the lists of international accreditation and evaluation boards and agencies. Such organisms are to be found only *in statu nascendi* today, but one can expect them to be a standard feature of the global higher education picture in a few years from now.

A last feature needs to be mentioned, which is greatly boosted by the process of globalisation, and that is the massive advances made in information and communication technologies (ICT), and their landslide entry into teaching and learning at higher education institutions. However, the relationship of this phenomenon to internationalisation as such, and especially to internationalisation at home, appears to be ambiguous at best. In the worst scenario, such a development could result in the end of, or anyway substantial transformation of, the university as we know it. This would also take away any meaning from 'internationalisation at home'. In this scenario, a computer with Internet access would become the 'functional equivalent' of, *ie* a substitute for, the present-day higher education institution. The 'international' dimension of the learning process of such an e-student would be reduced to the fact that education is consumed in a country different to that in which it was produced. Such a development is unlikely: distance learning which is not underpinned by phases of 'classical' presence-type education has high drop-out rates. It is often a very lonely learning experience.

At the other end of the spectrum, intelligent use of ICT can and will support and boost 'internationalisation at home'. If strong and mutually complementary higher education institutions enter into networking structures, a phenomenon already to be observed, if they pool their expertise and strengths, and if they thus feed into the curricula offered at the individual institutions the teaching and learning components which would otherwise not be available, ICT will greatly enhance the quality of higher education, through an import of international (foreign) elements. Some such networks already exist, many also with non-academic (corporate) providers as members. Their numbers will grow.

Summary

'Internationalisation at home' is very much a matter for the individual higher education institution. However, a university does not exist in a vacuum. The extent to which it can hope to internationalise itself is therefore also influenced by forces which originate from outside of its walls.

One set of the framework conditions referred to above is set by government (European, national and regional). Government sets limiting or liberating conditions for a higher education institution's attempts at internationalisation through the creation of legislative and regulatory frameworks, as well as through incentive policies in the form of programmes which fund internationalisation. By and large, a quite supportive attitude of national and regional government, but particularly of the European Union, has emerged in both respects. There are, of course, vast differences between the countries of Europe, but the general trend is that regulatory and legislative frameworks pay more attention to the needs of internationalisation than hitherto, and encouragement is being provided in the form of internationalisation programmes which did not exist in the past, or not to the present extent. While early policies focused on student mobility, priorities have partially shifted towards the encouragement of internationalised curricula, and programmes taught in foreign languages, to name only two examples. There are, however, also some 'isolationist' undercurrents in parts of Europe, which are mainly due to sub-national regions and their governments who, in an attempt to foster regional identity, limit their institutions' *marges de maneouvre*, for example through restrictive language policies.

A second set of framework conditions is increasingly making itself felt. The 'actor' setting these rules is anonymous and usually referred to as 'globalisation'. Most of the forces emanating from the globalisation process – and one of its main features, world-wide competition – tend to increase the pressure on institutions to develop an international profile. But the relationship between internationalisation and globalisation is not unambiguous. One of globalisation's other features, the ICT revolution, does not only increase possibilities for internationalisation, for example through heightened networking. It also bears a danger for the present-day higher education institution and might lead to 'university-free' forms of higher learning, in which case it would make no sense to talk any more about internationalising a university. Generally, however, globalisation can be expected to exert pressures for an increased international nature of course content, for a need to recruit foreign students on a global scale, for a widespread introduction of programmes taught in major world languages, for the introduction of a service culture conducive to the needs of foreign students and scholars, and for a harmonisation and, as part of this, an enhanced 'readability' of degrees conferred by Europe's universities.

Bernd Wächter is Director of the Academic Cooperation Association (ACA), based in Brussels, Belgium

Notes

1 In the field of recognition of diplomas and degrees, national governments have yielded some sovereignty to UNESCO. Present discussions within the World Trade Organization (WTO) on whether to make education part of its brief in the future, and thus give it the status of a 'tradable good', might turn this organisation into a powerful player in the future.

2 At any rate if one regards Europeanisation as a part of internationalisation, which I do.

3 There are signs that this might change, though. The recent (1998) German Higher Education Framework Act (*Hochschulrahmengesetz*) is one example.

4 The Union's declared objective has of course been to 'Europeanise' the continent's institutions, not to 'internationalise' them. As Ulrich Teichler and Andris Barblan showed in their evaluation of the first SOCRATES Institutional Contract applications, this distinction is

rarely made at the institutional level. Europe's universities regard Europeanisation as an integral part of internationalisation.

Bibliography

Knight, J. (1993) Internationalization: Management Strategies and Issues, *International Education Magazine*, CBIE, Ottawa.

Kälvemark, T. and Van der Wende, M. (1987) *National Policies for the Internationalisation of Higher Education*, HsV (for ACA), Stockholm .

Reichert, S. and Wächter, B. (2000) *The Globalisation of Education and Training. Recommendations for a Coherent Response of the European Union*, ACA, Brussels (to be published).

2

Impacts of cultural diversity at home

Matthias Otten

Introduction

Cultural diversity is increasingly becoming a fundamental challenge for European universities and schools. The **internationalisation of higher education** and a **growing multiculturalism in societies** are two main reasons for this aspect of social change in the academic field. The process of internationalisation in higher education has been explored in various recent publications of the EAIE and others. Changing **cultural patterns** of the **domestic** institution are a dimension of internationalisation which is often subordinated to the organisational, managerial and formal aspects of institutional policy.

A second reason to focus on cultural issues in higher education is globalisation and the integration of European societies, which are stimulating world-wide **migration and demographic changes**. Without detailing the various reasons and models of multiculturalism in western societies (Mintzel 1997), we can assume that global migration affects all social institutions and especially education. This chapter aims to explore some of the intercultural impacts of internationalisation and multiculturalism 'at home'. The objective is to describe cultural diversity at home with a conceptual approach, rather than giving examples of best practice or a checklist of 'things to do'.

According to the diversity approach (Adler 1991, Henderson 1994, Jackson 1996) which highlights the importance of differences as a fundamental issue in modern society and in organisations, culture is not limited to nationality or ethnicity. It includes also other distinctions of social differences such as gender, profession or age. In this notion, cultural diversity refers to social differentiation in a wider sense. When variations in social interaction such as learning and teaching are exam-

ined, ethnicity, nationality and language, gender or profession have to be considered as relevant 'cultural variables'.

Culture is an invisible, shared design that unconsciously patterns the action of people so that they can interact successfully. This design is learned through socialisation and some researchers state that it is mentally embedded in a 'cultural script' or 'map' that guides us through life. "Our daily lives are governed by shared, implicit and unconscious expectations of behaviour of ourselves and others of which we may be dimly aware." (Kikoshi and Kikoshi 1996 p.19) We can define culture as a learned system of symbols, knowledge, norms and beliefs that give a relatively stable but modifiable framework for our interpretation of the world and for our orientation and social behaviour. Cultural differences are social constructions that 'come into action' in social interaction between individuals. They are enshrined in institutions.

In their function as transmitters of cultural values and at the same time as 'cultural products', educational systems show the variety of underlying ideas and ideals in their historical development. National educational systems, their institutions and even the individuals involved in them are constantly in a dilemma between maintaining cultural traditions and stability on the one hand, and on the other facing the necessity to adapt and change according to global cultural change. Underestimation of this dilemma and/or pure surrender to the overwhelming pressure from 'outside' are two common reactions to cultural changes such as internationalisation or multiculturalism. Here, a more constructive approach will be adopted by exploring the challenges, opportunities and benefits that are inherent to the internationalisation of a domestic educational system. One of the objectives of international education is the development of intercultural competence or of intercultural sensitivity. Taking into account the current status of intercultural competence research (Bennett 1993, Dignes and Baldwin 1996, Yershova *et al.* 2000), intercultural competence, as an objective of academic learning and life, describes changes of an individual's knowledge (cognition), attitudes (emotions) and skills (behaviour) in order to enable a positive and effective interaction with members of other cultures, both abroad and at home.

Cultural diversity – challenges and opportunities at home

Internationalisation of the structures and processes of education is characterised by a coming together of people with differing cultural orientations, thinking patterns, perceptions and emotions. It is most likely that these differing cultural world-views – and to some extent related problems and misunderstandings – will shape all social interaction and that people have to adapt their skills, attitudes and behaviour to function in an intercultural context. Owing to the variety of perspectives on adaptation to an intercultural setting, it is necessary to differentiate between the groups that are involved:

- Foreign students visiting a foreign country to spend several years in a different educational system and other students with a culturally different background due to earlier migration.
- Local students who come into contact with international students and who might benefit personally from an intercultural encounter in their home country.
- Local lecturers and university staff who interact with foreigners in their professional work.

So far, intercultural encounters in higher education are mainly considered within the context of study abroad. Obviously, the outgoing student can improve his or her professional and/or academic skills, but also personal and intercultural competencies, through the experience abroad. But what happens to the host culture? Do domestic students benefit from internationalisation? Can we expect initiatives in favour of an increasingly intercultural academic climate at the host university?

International programmes, regardless of their disciplinary, regional or institutional focus, should offer a maximum of intercultural learning opportunities to foreign and domestic students as well as to the staff involved.

Christensen and Thielen (1983 p.210) state that contributions of students and scholars from other countries "can be organised to provide an intercultural component in the educational activities of the institution, both in its formal academic programmes and in its outreach to the surrounding community". Through internationalisation, more and more individuals can enjoy learning experiences that may raise their acceptance of social variety and their ability to tolerate diversity without feeling that it is a major threat to their own shared cultural identity. What can an institution of higher education do to promote this?

Organisations such as universities are often characterised by initial ethnocentrism. This idea of an ethnocentric orientation in organisations has been proposed by Adler (1991). It has its foundations in earlier psychosociological models of the cultural orientation of individuals (Hoopes 1979, Bennett 1986). The underlying general idea is that individual behaviour and organisational structures are not cultural universals. They usually have the bias of a dominant majority culture. Intercultural problems are likely to occur if the social context is culturally asymmetric and one cultural position is more favoured than others. A high level of formalisation of the institutional setting might enforce the ethnocentrism of the hosting culture and maintains asymmetric intercultural communication (Liedke 1997). It can be overcome if intercultural encounters, which inevitably will lead to misunderstandings, conflicts and frustration, are not rejected or suppressed.

Sustainable internationalisation requires the development of intercultural sensitivity on both the individual and organisational levels in order to meet both the needs of the international student body and the institution's requirements. Only if the university regards cultural variety as a potential for mutual intellectual growth and if all perspectives are considered openly can internationalisation lead to added value.

The perspective of the international student

It is evident that students need to adjust when they experience a foreign culture abroad. Research over the last 40 years has helped to investigate the phenomenon of culture shock and problems of adaptation to new cultural environments (Oberg 1960, Furnham and Bochner 1986). If students do not develop close social relationships after a certain period of time, negative effects on their readiness for learning, their consciousness of relevant learning tasks and on their academic performance may occur. Foreign students often purely rely on the social network of members of their own cultural background, almost without contact with either other foreigners or host culture members. If early ties are not made, there is the danger of an irreversible isolated retreat into students' own cultural colonies. In order to develop stable social networks with different groups, the institution must offer social support on the informal and the formal level.

Social support for (temporary) integration is required on the following levels:

- fundamental daily needs have to be covered (financial means, adequate accommodation and food, transportation);
- students have to learn to cope with institutional problems (climate at the university and in classes, formal requirements, *eg* for attendance, examinations, *etc*);
- demands specific to the content and curriculum of the study programme have to be met.

After finishing the programme, students will return home and will have to cope with the reverse culture shock.

The perspective of host culture representatives

Little attention has been paid to the students and lecturers of the host culture. They can be regarded as key representatives of their culture. Local students and student associations are important direct partners for international students seeking social support abroad. A survey among German students has shown that even if a considerable number of international students is enrolled, more than 60%

of the German students have no or hardly any contact with a foreign student (Bargel 1998). The degree and the intensity of social contacts with foreign students correlates with home students' own previous experiences abroad and involvement in student associations.

Owing to the European mobility programmes, there seems to be a tendency towards 'Eurocentrism': Germans have more contacts with other European students than with students from countries outside Europe. In other European countries, we may well find a similar situation. Nevertheless, the motivation to meet international students is high: 60% of students surveyed mentioned that they would like to have more contacts with the international student population at their university. These results show that considerable potential for intercultural learning at home through internationalisation exists, but has not yet been fully exploited.

Intercultural learning at home through encounters with international students aims to create personal sensitivity for one's *own* cultural background and values. Furthermore it can initiate the development of positive attitudes towards other cultures, and behavioural skills to act efficiently and adequately in an intercultural context.

Intercultural learning as a process of personal growth has cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions. The 'real life' experience of cultural diversity is without doubt the most involving form of learning. On the other hand the contact-hypothesis (intercultural learning will occur automatically whenever people meet long and intensely enough) has been proved to be wrong in many cases. The personal experience of an intercultural encounter does not automatically initiate intercultural learning effects. It becomes a substantial learning experience only if it is reflected on. Reflection does not necessarily mean setting up formal classroom activities, although the classroom provides a major arena for intercultural education.

In addition, it seems important to initiate informal but facilitated group activities parallel to the formal academic setting. Here people can express and share their own intercultural experience with others. As a consequence, the university should take care that individuals from different cultures get into contact as soon as possible. Secondly, an open social climate, and formal and informal resources for a reflection on cultural issues, should be implemented in all international academic programmes.

Also the lecturers and the staff of the educational institution need to cope with cultural diversity, mainly in the context of their professional duties. So far, very few universities in Europe are undertaking serious efforts to institutionalise systematic intercultural counselling and preparation for intercultural encounters.

Most activities that foster intercultural sensitivity and understanding rely on the personal interest of some highly motivated lecturers, on volunteers and on student initiatives. Powell and Anderson (1994 p.322) argue that in many cases the entire educational system, together with the rules and procedures for effective classroom interaction, "reflect a cultural dictate rather than a universal mandate".

Teaching in intercultural environments should be sensitive to different cultural styles of learning and teaching. This sensitivity is essential, whether the subject is a 'universal' scientific phenomenon such as physics or mathematics or not.

At least four situations can be identified in which lecturers should be aware of possible intercultural problems (Hofstede 1986):

- the different meaning of the relative social positions of lecturers and students in various cultures;
- the relevance of curriculum content;
- the profiles of cognitive abilities;
- the expected patterns of student–lecturer and student–student interaction. Sensitivity to cultural diversity at home requires reflection upon the implicit cultural patterns of the entire context of educational and social interaction.

Conclusion

Theory and results from research on intercultural communication in higher education demonstrate that the interest and openness for intercultural encounters should be encouraged on the side of the international students as well as for the local students and the institution. The main task of a university in this respect is to involve local students in the internationalisation process in order to create more sensitivity and awareness for the various opportunities for personal development afforded by internationalisation. The need for intercultural learning can be explained from two perspectives:

- The first perspective was a leading paradigm for migration policy and even organisational development for many years. It describes intercultural learning as an approach to addressing conflict, encouraging awareness of conflicts and their cultural dimensions and origin. The main problem with this approach is that it becomes an important parameter of institutional management only when things fail: students do not achieve their learning objectives, psychological problems increase, lecturers fail with their teaching and feel frustrated, and communication breaks down.
- Although the concerns for these challenges, and sometimes difficulties, of internationalisation must be taken into account early enough, the conflict approach to cultural diversity seems to be a misleading track for institutional development. The fundamental and more cooperative assumption of 'internationalisation at home' as a means for mutual intercultural learning is to consider **cultural diversity as a general resource and potential enrichment**. Intercultural learning, although a process of individual development, cannot be left to the initiative of individuals alone. Rather, it should be inherent to education and educational institutions. A valuing approach to cultural differences should be an integrated dimension in curriculum development, teaching and all other social and organisational activities of educational programmes. With this notion, intercultural learning is *both* continuous effort *and* educational outcome of internationalisation at home.

Matthias Otten is Researcher and Doctoral Fellow at the Institute for Applied Cultural Science of the Universität Karlsruhe, Germany

Bibliography

Adler, N.J. (1991) *International Dimensions of Organizational Behaviour*, 2nd edition, PWS-Kent, Boston.

Bargel, T. (1998) Deutsche Studierende und Ausländer: Kontakte und Haltungen, in Hosseinizadeh, A. (ed.) *Studium Internationale. Handbuch zum Ausländerstudium*, Schüren, Marburg, pp.195-222.

Bennett, M.J. (1993) Toward Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, in Paige, M.R. (ed.) *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, 2nd edition, Intercultural Press, Yarmouth, pp.21-72.

Boege, G. (1998) Hochschule und Ausländerstudium – Problem erkannt, Problem gebannt?, in Hosseinizadeh, A. (ed.) *Studium Internationale. Handbuch zum Ausländerstudium*, Schüren, Marburg, pp.118-130.

Callan, H. (1999) Internationalisation in Europe, in Scott, P. (ed.) *The Globalisation of Higher Education*, Open University Press, London, pp.44-57.

Christensen, G.C. and Thielen, T.B. (1983) Cross Cultural Activities: Maximizing the Benefits of Educational Interchange, in Jenkins, H.M. (ed.) *Educating Students From Other Nations*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp.210-236.

Dignes, N.G. and Baldwin, K.D. (1996) Intercultural Competence. A Research Perspective, in Landis, D. and Bhaghat, R.S. (eds) *Handbook of Intercultural Training*, 2nd edition, Sage, Thousand Oakes, pp.106-123.

Furnham, A. and Bochner, S. (1986) *Culture Shock*, Routledge, London/New York.
Hofstede, G. (1986) Cultural differences in learning and teaching, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations (IJIR)*, Vol.10, pp.301-308.
Hoopes, D. (1979) Intercultural Communication Concepts and the Psychology of Intercultural Experience, in Pusch, M.D. (ed.) *Multicultural Education: A Cross-Cultural Training Approach*, Intercultural Press, Chicago, pp.9-38.
Jackson, S.E. (1996) The Consequences of Diversity in Multidisciplinary Work Teams, in West, M.A. (ed.) *Handbook of Work Group Psychology*, Wiley, Chichester, pp.53-75.
Kikoshi, J.F. and Kikoshi, C.K. (1996) *Reflexive Communication in the culturally diverse workplace*, Quorum, Westport.
Liedke, M. (1997) Institution und Interkulturalität, in Knapp-Potthoff, A. and Liedke, M. (eds) *Aspekte Interkultureller Kommunikationsfähigkeit*, Iudicium, München, pp.155-180.
Mintzel, A. (1997) *Multikulturelle Gesellschaften in Europa und Nordamerika. Konzepte, Streitfragen, Analysen, Befunde*, Wissenschaftsverlag Rothe, Passau.
Oberg, K. (1960) Cultural Shock: adjustment to new cultural environments, *Practical Anthropology*, 7, pp.177-182.
Paige, M.R. (ed.) (1993) *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, 2nd edition, Intercultural Press, Yarmouth.
Pearce, R. (1998) Developing Cultural Identity in an International School Environment, in Hayden, M. and Thompson, J. (eds) *International Education. Principles and Practices*, Kogan Page, London, pp.44-62.
Powell, R.G. and Andersen, J.F. (1994) Culture and Classroom Communication, in Samovar, L.A. and Porter, R.E. (eds) *Intercultural Communication - A Reader*, 7th edition, Sage, Belmont, pp.322-332.
Robertson-Wensauer, C.Y. and Otten, M. (1999) Ein Modellkonzept für ein interkulturelles Studienbetreuungsprogramm des Interfakultativen Instituts für Angewandte Kulturwissenschaft, in Robertson-Wensauer, C.Y. (ed.) *Campus Internationale? Entwicklung und Perspektiven des Ausländerstudiums am Beispiel der Universität Karlsruhe (TH)*, Karlsruhe, pp.187-200.
Wang, M.M. (1997) Re-entry and Reverse Culture Shock, in Cushner, K. and Brislin, R.W. (eds) *Improving Intercultural Interaction. Modules for Cross-Cultural Training Programmes*, Vol.2, Sage, Thousand Oakes, pp.109-128.
Yershova, Y., DeJaeghere, J. and Mestenhauser, J. (2000) Thinking not as usual: Adding the Intercultural Perspective, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, Vol.4, No.1., Spring.
Yi-Shan, C. (1995) *Ausländische Studierende in der BRD – Anpassung fernostasiatischer Studierender an das Leben in Deutschland*, Waxmann, Münster/New York.

3

Internationalising the curriculum

Bengt Nilsson

Introduction

This chapter will focus on curriculum development and more specifically on the development of an internationally oriented curriculum.

The issue of how to internationalise the curriculum has been discussed for many years, especially within universities in North America. In Europe, this issue has been overshadowed in the last decade by the belief that the mobility of students under exchange programmes is the only or at least the best way to internationalise higher education.

Today, after almost 15 years of student mobility experience within Europe, with the political and financial support of EU-sponsored programmes such as ERASMUS, TEMPUS, SOCRATES, *etc*, most universities have still not reached the stated goal of 10% student mobility. Over the past 15 years, we have somewhat neglected the important question of how to give non-mobile students an international dimension in their university education. Even for mobile students, we have at the present time no sure indication that a programme or course taught in another country really develops the students' awareness of international and intercultural issues (broadmindedness; understanding and respect for other people and their cultures, values and ways of living; understanding of the nature of racism, *etc*) we seek to foster.

The introduction of international and intercultural elements into the curriculum may influence the content (and even goals) of university education over a longer period of time and for a larger number of students and be more effective than mere student mobility. And it is my firm conviction that an internationalised curriculum will strongly encourage our students to study abroad.

Thus, we consider that the process of internationalising the curriculum will be an essential aspect of the "internationalisation at home" project.

I will give below a short description of what I think may be the most important elements in this process. I will use my experience from my own university (the University of Malmö in Sweden) and – as the 'internationalisation at home' project aims to be relevant to practice – give some concrete examples drawn from the situation here.

I will also use my experience from the EAIE Training Course III 'Internationalising the Curriculum in Higher Education' (1999) and refer *inter alia* to the studies of Van der Wende (1996, 1998) and Mestenhauser (Mestenhauser and Ellingboe 1998, Yershova *et al.* 2000).

The reader should remember that I am looking at things through Scandinavian and Swedish eyes, under conditions which may sometimes feel unfamiliar to you.

Objectives and definitions

In 1996, OECD gave the following definition of an internationalised curriculum:

> A curriculum with an international orientation in content and/or form, aimed at preparing students for performing (professionally/socially) in an international and multicultural context, designed for domestic and/or foreign students.
> (OECD 1996, adapted)

I find this a little too passive and propose the following definition instead:

> A curriculum which gives international and intercultural knowledge and abilities, aimed at preparing students for performing (professionally, socially, emotionally) in an international and multicultural context.
> (Nilsson 2000)

In 1996, OECD and its Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI) initiated a survey entitled 'Internationalisation of Higher Education'. Six OECD countries (Australia, Denmark, France, Germany, Japan and The Netherlands) participated in this survey, which involved a general assessment of internationalised curricula and some in-depth case studies. The survey proposed a typology of internationalised curricula:

Type 1 Curricula with international subject matter (*eg* international relations, European law)
Type 2 Curricula in which the traditional/original subject area is broadened by an internationally comparative approach (*eg* international comparative education)
Type 3 Curricula which prepare students for international professions (*eg* international business administration)
Type 4 Curricula in foreign languages or linguistics which explicitly address cross-cultural communication issues and provide training in intercultural skills
Type 5 Interdisciplinary programmes such as area and regional studies (*eg* European, Scandinavian, Asian studies)
Type 6 Curricula leading to internationally recognised professional qualifications
Type 7 Curricula leading to joint or double degrees
Type 8 Curricula of which compulsory parts are offered at institutions abroad, taught by local academics
Type 9 Curricula in which the content is especially designed for foreign students

It is **not surprising** that the great majority of internationalised curricula were found in the area of economics and business studies, mainly in categories 2, 3 and 6. Business is by definition an 'international' subject and the global economic transformation has proved to be the most powerful motive for internationalising the curriculum. The key factors determining the internationalisation of the curriculum were found to be related to the discipline itself and to the development of the professional field (technology, medicine, social science, *etc*).

It is **disappointing** that intercultural learning was not found to be a very important or even explicit objective. This is remarkable, as it was expected to be one of the main outcomes of an internationalised curriculum.

For my part, I will use the following terminology to describe the objectives for an internationalised curriculum:

Cognitive objectives aimed at increasing students' *international competence* (*eg* foreign languages, regional and area studies, humanities and subjects such as international law and international business).

Attitude-related objectives aimed at increasing students' *intercultural competence* (*eg* broad-mindedness; understanding and respect for other people and their cultures, values and ways of living; understanding of the nature of racism).

An internationalised curriculum should include both kinds of objectives.

Cognitive skills are relatively easy to identify: language proficiency, international business skills, knowledge of the culture and history of China, *etc*. They are also relatively easy to measure, even if it looks as if most academic curricular models are still based on the supposition that student achievement is measured by number of classroom hours and accumulation of course credits.

As shown in the OECD study, academic subjects are and must be internationalised *per se* – a necessity for quality assurance and for making our graduates attractive on the global labour market. I will therefore not focus any further on the cognitive objectives.

Objectives related to students' intercultural competence are more difficult to define in terms of content and to evaluate. There has been a strong belief that studies of foreign languages, of other countries (*eg* area studies) and of international issues would increase intercultural competence. Several American studies – for example, 'What students know about the world', conducted by the US Council on Learning – have tried to show a relationship between these variables and positive attitudes toward foreign countries. But they found none at all – if anything they showed that US students knew very little about other countries and international issues. "These studies should have shocked the academic community into greater effort to internationalise the curriculum, but instead were greeted with a yawn and a rationalisation that our universities offers sufficient numbers of international courses and programs from which a student can – and should – choose themselves." (Yershova *et al.* 2000)

Thus, the question remains: How do we create a good curriculum for developing intercultural competence in students?

Conditions for an internationalised curriculum

As said above, an internationalised curriculum must aim at both types of objectives, challenging both the intellectual and empathic abilities of students.

If we want to give our students in engineering, teacher education, business administration, nursing *etc* a new 'added value', making them more competent to work in multicultural environments abroad or at home, we must send another message than we have done so far. It is still true that many universities ignore the fact that **many** of their students, after graduation, will work in another part of the world, not as international affairs specialists but as engineers, doctors, businessmen, *etc*. It is also true that **all** our graduates will live and work in a multicultural society and that, as university graduates, (school teachers, doctors, nurses, *etc*), they must be well prepared and educated for their future job.

This means that we need **both** courses which give students good knowledge about international relations and foreign cultures **and** measures to make our students motivated (and not afraid) to work with, understand and even have empathy for people with a different cultural background.

How do we do this in practice? Are there good examples to study and learn from? We have asked members of the 'Internationalisation at Home' (IaH) Special Interest Group to send us such

good examples, but have so far received very few. Maybe I could start by describing what we are doing and planning to do at my own university in Malmö.

Malmö University's strategy for internationalisation

Some of the reasons for my leaving Lund University to start working at the newly opened (1998) Malmö University[1] were that:

- this was a brand-new university (although some faculties were transferred from Lund) with many new programmes and courses to be set up and curricula to be written;
- in the Malmö area, more than 30% of the population are immigrants or have immigrant parents, and the University has a special mission to recruit students from this part of the population;
- a special faculty 'International Migration and Ethnic Relations' (IMER) was to be established;
- multicultural issues were to be a central theme throughout the University.

I felt that this might be a challenge to look for possibilities to create new forms of internationalised curricula.

In 1999, the University Board approved the Strategic Plan for Internationalisation (SPI). As a young university, we must face the fact that even if the mobility of staff and students is a very important element in the internationalisation process, it will still be a long time before we reach the goal of 10% of students exchanged, and an even longer time before we create an international classroom with foreign students. These facts, together with my interpretation of the core of internationalisation, mean that we have to give special attention to the non-mobile students and devise measures to give them international and intercultural competence.

The plan stated that international/intercultural perspectives should be taken into consideration in all educational programmes and visible in the curricula. I think the visibility is important. This makes it possible to evaluate and gives the students the knowledge of what is expected of them (and the possibility to press teachers if the curriculum is not followed!).

The SPI also specified various means for achieving these objectives:

- Recognition of the central role of the teacher (this theme will be developed in chapter 4). Further training, seminars on intercultural issues, allocation of time and resources for faculty exchange are some of the means to be used.
- Introduction of intercultural courses in the different academic programmes and insertion of international/intercultural elements into the curriculum.
- Staffing of faculties with persons from Malmö's international community (*ie* first- or second-generation immigrants). Malmö University shall strive for a faculty composition which mirrors the 'international' student population (25% of the total).[2]
- Use of guest researchers and exchange students as well as local immigrant students as resources (not burdens) in the classroom.
- Offering of a range of courses in area and regional studies (North American Studies, European Studies, Chinese Culture, *etc*) for both staff, students and as continuing education.
- Offering of courses taught directly in foreign languages needed for communication (primarily in English), as Swedish is certainly a less-spoken language.
- The use of ICT as an important medium to create a virtual international classroom. By exploring the Internet, teachers and students together may find new and exciting ways for virtual mobility (the new *Wanderstudent*).

From strategic plan to action

How far is it from a plan to implementation and concrete results? The managerial implications of internationalisation will be discussed in the final chapter; I will give some examples here of how far we have gone in Malmö and the solutions and problems we have found.

It has been a great advantage that the **School of IMER** is one of our faculties. The School is unique (at least in Sweden) in giving both undergraduate and graduate education to students on issues concerning migration, ethnicity, integration, globalisation, cultural interaction and human rights. It is a multidisciplinary programme ranging across four traditional disciplines: humanities, social sciences, law and theology. The teachers within IMER are active in promoting intercultural education in other programmes and faculties, supported by both central money and faculty resources.

The **School of Technology and Society** offers five weeks of IMER courses to students in some of the engineering programmes. The courses include topics such as immigrant policy, integration and segregation processes, cultural, linguistic and religious differences, *etc*, and are offered as an elective. They have proved so popular that they had to be doubled, and we are now planning to offer these courses to many more students. This is nothing new; many similar attempts have been carried out at several other universities. At Queensland University of Technology in Australia the first-year engineering students have a compulsory unit designed to help them acquire the generic, life-long skills they will need as globally mobile and interculturally sensitive graduates.

The **School of Health and Society** has continuously revised its curricula in order to render visible and introduce intercultural elements into all courses. It is also offering a special programme in Social Care in a Multicultural Society, which gives the social workers the right competencies for work in the multicultural city of Malmö.

One of the most important ways to diffuse knowledge about multicultural issues and affect new generations is through our school teachers. The **School of Teacher Education** has started an ambitious programme to reorganise its whole educational project, and the IMER perspective will play an important part in this process. All pre-school teachers, many of whom will work in groups with many immigrant children, study a 10-week compulsory course in multicultural issues. An elective course 'Training for Teaching in Multicultural Institutions' is offered in English to both foreign and domestic students.

The **Faculty of Dentistry**, which has based most parts of its curriculum on problem-based learning, is increasingly using multicultural situations in case-study sessions (how to meet and treat patients from different ethnical or religious backgrounds).

For a Swedish university, the question of foreign language skills is an important question. We have accepted that Swedish is a less-spoken language and that we live now in an anglophone country. The English language has been widely taught in Swedish schools for many years and our TV is overflowing with American programmes (subtitled in Swedish). Malmö University does not offer traditional education in foreign languages – this is done at the comprehensive Lund University only 20 km from Malmö and we do not want compete for the same students.

However, we have found that we must improve our students' communication skills, and we are now starting courses in Communicative English.

95% of Swedish universities' contacts and cooperation with foreign universities are carried out with partners in OECD countries (Europe, USA and Australia), and only 5% with the rest of the world. To give students the chance of both an intellectual and emotional experience of the living conditions in countries outside the rich world, we are increasing our contacts with universities in Africa, Latin America and Asia.

This gives us the possibility to let students do their degree project (*ca* 45–60 ECTS credits) as a part of the curriculum in a developing country – with good support from the Swedish Aid Authorities (*ie* SIDA). It is wonderful to meet students that have taken these opportunities, to read their reports, to listen to them telling their stories to their classmates and to realise that something great has happened within their minds and hearts! Students from all our faculties are participating in these programmes.

These examples, together with our clear ambition to inspire faculty to participate in a broad range of seminars on multicultural issues and encourage them to study, teach or do research at other universities (not only in the OECD countries), may well lead to a greater presence of the intercultural dimension in our various educational programmes. This is our hope.

But all that glitters is not gold. "It's a long way to Tipperary", and a long way to go from decisions taken at the central level to implementation in the classroom – even within a young institution like Malmö University. There are considerable differences in interest and commitment between faculties, schools and departments, and their deans. There are also considerable differences within those units among heads, professors and lecturers. The internationalisation of new curricula has to compete with other topics such as geriatrics, fluid mechanics, remedial teaching, oral microbiology *etc.*

"We have no space for this kind of thing in our programme", "How will my students be good engineers/dentists/teachers without 60 hours of my subject?" or "Those are subjects that should be dealt with somewhere else and not here". These are a few examples of attitudes among professors and lecturers that I have met during my many years in Lund and Malmö and they are difficult to change. In spite of the fact that many of the new curricula have recently been written, it is amazing to see how soon a newly developed curriculum becomes rigid and difficult to change.

Conclusions and dreams

Two years of experience at a newly opened university and 15 years at a 330-year-old university have led me to the following reflections:

- Be patient and realistic. These kinds of changes in thinking and attitudes take time and effort.
- Look for good and concrete examples of internationalised curricula. This greatly facilitates the implementation process. "Look what they have done at Sheffield Hallam" is better than "I have an interesting theory about how to increase international elements in your programme".
- Bring together and support faculty and students with a strong interest in internationalising the curriculum.
- Encourage all faculty to visit and work at foreign universities. Remember that there is a world to visit outside the OECD countries which may have an even stronger impact and affect our minds and hearts.
- Make use of the international community (immigrants) in the surrounding society – here lie fantastic resources and cultural treasures just waiting for us.
- Give international offices (or similar central units) new roles: not only administrating student exchanges and/or recruiting paying students but also being the initiator, stimulator and facilitator of international education.
- Encourage teachers and computer staff to collaborate in projects for international cooperation and new ideas for a virtual international classroom. There are many good examples of joint curricula offered by a network of university partners.
- Lobby for the appointment of a Vice Chancellor or a University President with the greatest interest in international and intercultural issues (!).

Of course, I have a dream for Malmö University. I would like to see all our students leaving this university with the added value an internationalised curriculum can give: besides good knowledge in their subject area, they would have an open mind and generosity towards other people, know how to behave in other cultures and how to communicate with people with different religions, values and customs, and not be scared of coping with new and unfamiliar issues. I would like to vaccinate all our students against the dark forces of nationalism and racism.

I have presented above some objectives that we will try to implement, and possible means to do so. There are many more and better, I am sure. The future will show how we will manage, but I think our chances are fairly good.

This is by no means a scientific article – I am today only a bureaucrat, but with a great interest in these issues. There are many books and articles on internationalising the curriculum – the bibliography below features a few examples I have studied.

Bengt Nilsson is Vice-Rector for International Affairs at the International Office of Malmö University, Sweden

Notes

1 Malmö University has around 13 000 students and 700 staff and is organised in six Schools: Technology and Society, Dentistry, Teacher Education, Health and Society, Arts and Communication and IMER.

2 Statistics show that 26% of our immigrants from a broad spectrum of countries (Europe, USA, Russia, Cuba, Mexico, Sudan, China, *etc*) have a university degree, in comparison with 29% for native Swedes. However, very few immigrants have jobs corresponding to their education.

Bibliography

Kelly, P. (2000) Internationalisation of the curriculum, in *Understanding Teaching and Learning*, Series No 1, Queensland University of Technology.

Mestenhauser, J.A. and Ellingboe, B.J. (1998) *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum: Internationalizing the Campus*, American Council on Education/Oryx Press.

Van der Wende, M.C. (1996) Internationalising the Curriculum in Higher Education, in *Internationalisation of Higher Education*, OECD Documents.

Van der Wende, M.C. (1998) Internationalising the Curriculum in Dutch Higher Education: An International Comparative Perspective, *Journal of Studies in International Education.*

Whalley, T. (1997) *Best Practice Guidelines for Internationalising the Curriculum*, http//:ccttsrv2.ctt.bc.ca/curric

Yershova, Y., DeJaeghere, J. and Mestenhauser, J.A. (2000) Thinking Not as Usual: Adding the Intercultural Perspective, *Journal of Studies in International Education.*

4

Teaching and learning in the international classroom

Hanneke Teekens

Introduction

World-wide there is a fast growing awareness of the importance and value of international education. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that higher education, both as a profession and a scholarly activity, is national in orientation and perception because it is (still?) predominantly financed and organised nationally. Most international activity takes place outside mainstream institutional activity. From that perspective we can state that higher education remains national in scope and activity. This in spite of the fact that increasingly students and staff in tertiary education are faced with a situation where 'non-nationals' are part of the daily scene. This is 'measured' by the sight of different faces and the sound of other languages. Sometimes they come from far (the international students) and sometimes they come from just around the corner (students who come from families who have migrated from other parts of the world). Global developments, mainly in the areas of economics and information and communication technology (ICT), are resulting in patterns of living that are becoming increasingly similar in all countries and for all peoples. From this perspective, globalisation and its impact on education would imply that the very notion of 'national education' needs reconsideration. The emergence of world-wide patterns and communication would seem inevitably to create a situation offering incomparable new conditions in education. At the same time, however, there is the threat that a global culture will be imposed on the world, leaving little room for cultural diversity and self-determination, the very values that programmes of international exchanges over the years have aimed to promote. A revised education agenda is needed that responds to the new demands – both opportun-

ities and threats – of globalisation and its implications for national teaching and learning. It means that we have to prepare students for a future where local and global issues are irrevocably intertwined and where internationalisation is not a process far away but takes place at home.

During the last decade the strong increase in international student mobility has been an important factor in the creation of the 'international classroom'. I use this term for teaching settings where foreign students and domestic students are being accommodated in the same classroom. Except for the fact that this constitutes a group of different nationalities and different cultures, the main ingredient of the international classroom is that members of the group do not share a common native language. Most important element of the learning experience in the international classroom is the potential of an added value that the intercultural dimension of the teaching and learning in such a setting can bring: appreciation for other cultures and an improved ability to communicate and interact with persons from different backgrounds.

The development of adequate internationally oriented curricula is seen as the most important instrument to enhance the international and intercultural dimension in higher education. In the previous chapter the content of such a curriculum has been discussed and it has been explained that it must meet two types of objectives:

- **cognitive objectives** in order to increase the student's international competence (*eg* foreign languages, regional and area studies, humanities, and subjects such as international law and international business);
- **objectives related to attitude** in order to increase the student's intercultural competence (*eg* broadmindedness; understanding and respect for other people and their cultures, values and ways of living; understanding of racism).

In this chapter we look at what it means to deliver such a curriculum. In other words: how do we create an international classroom where **the teaching** of an internationalised content indeed leads to **the learning** that creates understanding for cultural differences, and develops an open mind and empathy for other views and ideas. We will look at this question by focusing on the lecturer and the student.

Challenges for the international classroom

Although the claim is commonly made that the presence of 'other' students could provide an important intercultural learning experience for domestic students and is thus a contribution to the overall quality of education at the institution, there are actually few data on this issue. In fact there is growing scepticism about the extent to which the presence of foreign students indeed adds an international dimension to the host institution. In other words, the interaction – as a result of international student mobility – between students from different cultural backgrounds that could enhance intercultural learning, has not been occurring as anticipated. That means that student mobility is not of itself really adding an **integrated** international and intercultural dimension to the activities of the institution. Delivery of the curriculum should actually seek making use of the input of both foreign exchange students, home students and domestic students from different cultural backgrounds to provide an added international and intercultural value. In practice the presence of this last group has hardly been recognised as offering a high potential for the internationalisation of the institution.

Another neglected aspect of further developing the international classroom is the undervalued role of the lecturer. Increasingly it becomes clear that, although it is very important for an institution to have a well-organised and well-financed system for internationalisation in place, it is the lecturer who is the core player in the process. It is her or his teaching that ultimately determines the results in the international classroom and thus the success of policies regarding the internationalisation of the institution. Teaching an internationalised curriculum requires specific knowledge and skills and places extra demands on the lecturer. But even more important, it asks for a specific attitude in lecturers. You cannot expect the lecturer to implement an internationalised curriculum when he or she does not her/himself adhere to the principles that underlie the objectives of such a curriculum. This has important implications. It raises the question of what is required to provide lec-

turers with a context conductive to teaching effectively in the international classroom. Which factors have a positive influence on this context and what are possible negative influences? Which instruments can support the process and overcome, or at least reduce, problems and obstacles. In many institutions the role and position of the lecturer in internationalisation is largely unexplored. The persistent problems with staff mobility in exchange programmes is but one example of the difficult position of the lecturer in international education. Teaching in the international classroom is often a voluntary activity based on personal and professional interests that often stem from earlier international experiences or family background. The lecturers who like it, and have become 'involved' in it, are (usually) ardent supporters. The lecturers who do not teach international groups are (not always, but often) not interested in the issue of international education and may voice the opinion that 'it is complicated, expensive and not necessary'. In teams of lecturers this creates tension, of both a personal and a professional nature. Assuming that further internationalisation will take place and that increased cultural diversity will become an important feature of future academic life, places the position of 'advocates' and 'opponents' in a different perspective. Policies regarding attracting fee paying students will put the voluntary role of the lecturer under further pressure. Increasingly people who do not themselves aspire to take part in international education will be faced with cultural diversity, an internationalised curriculum and the delivery of this curriculum in culturally mixed groups where the language of instruction is not the native language of all parties involved. This requires lecturers to master specific skills which they cannot be expected to possess on the basis of their general 'national' academic background. This means that through formal learning and international exposure individual lecturers must further develop their professional knowledge in order to meet the specific extra demands to teach 'other' students. But also the 'other' students are put in a learning environment that challenges their previous notions about their role as students and the cultural context of their learning capabilities. Teaching and learning conditions in the international classroom pose greatly different demands compared to purely national settings. But what exactly are these demands?

Exploring and discussing this question has led to the idea of drawing a profile of the 'ideal' lecturer. The idea to draw up such a profile was first introduced during a staff development seminar conducted by Nuffic in 1996. An initial list of specific skills and knowledge was later discussed, expanded and further developed into the profile of the 'ideal lecturer', which was put before a larger group of professionals in the form of a Nuffic paper edited by Marijk van der Wende and myself (Teekens and Van der Wende 1997). Again I would like to stress that the profile is not intended as a blueprint. Nor does it have the status of an empirically validated instrument; thus, it has no use in assessing the performance of lecturers. What is intended is to provide a contribution to the discussion on how to improve the conditions to further internationalise higher education and on how to facilitate intercultural learning for all students. The profile for the lecturer in the previous publication was defined in terms of clusters of qualifications. Here, I would like to argue that in principle there is no difference between the qualifications for teachers and students. In the end, both lecturer and student are faced with the same demands. Perhaps one could even say that it is not a matter of knowledge and skills but predominantly a matter of attitude. Within the context of this chapter, this question will not be further explored. For this reason, the profiles of the 'ideal' lecturer and student presented here focus on matters of attitude rather than specific knowledge or skills. They are defined in terms of six clusters of desirable qualifications, which draw on the previously developed profile for the 'ideal lecturer':

1 Members of the international classroom pay attention to good academic standards

A bad student or lecturer never becomes a good one by involvement in international education. It is the other way around. It is necessary to feel secure in your discipline to be able to deviate from a well-trodden path and to look at things in a different way.

2 Students and staff have a good command of the language of instruction, other than the mother language, but pay sufficient attention to individual differences

All educational activity is linked to language and it needs no further explanation that dealing with cultural differences is largely a matter of language, because language expresses so much more than what is said. It is important that all participants in the international classroom acknowledge this aspect and are aware of the fact that the flow of thought and speech depend on it and thus allow for differences in performance and time for expression. Participants in the international classroom take care to express themselves carefully and do not feel offended when others express themselves in a different manner. It is acknowledged that humour is closely related to the expression of language and the group is sensitive to the fact that humour can quickly intrude in culturally defined spheres of personal identity.

3 Members of the international classroom take care to increase their cultural awareness

All group members are aware of their own culture and understand that this greatly colours their own views, and try to make adjustments for cultural differences within the group and to respect the consequences of this situation. All group members try to avoid thinking in terms of stereotypes, and behave and express themselves in such a way that due respect is shown for differences in the group.

4 Members of the international classroom acknowledge that various teaching and learning styles have conditioned people in different traditions of education, both formal and informal education

It is important that the lecturer makes explicit the aims and methods of his or her teaching. Students will react in very different ways to the process of instruction. The role of the lecturer and the student is very different in different traditions and deeply ingrained in the hidden curriculum of various national systems and cultural traditions. Not every 'silent' student is so because he or she has nothing to say! Students make an effort to switch to other forms of instruction and communication in the classroom.

5 Members of the international classroom make use of multimedia in an integrated way in the communication process of teaching and learning to enhance the international component

Increasingly, through the use of ICT, the relationship between teaching and learning will be a multi-relational one. It constitutes links inside and outside the classroom. Both the lecturer and the student are themselves sources in creating new knowledge. It is acknowledged that this knowledge is international in nature through the use of ICT.

6 Both staff and students in the international classroom pay attention to the fact that job qualifications, the recognition of diplomas and possible periods of probation are differently organised and valued in different countries

The status of an academic title, of various professions and the role they play in the socio-economic conditions in a country may vary widely. Students and staff have deeply ingrained notions about these values that are often not explicit, but that play an important role in their self-identification. This is a strong underlying element in their motivation. In a different country or within a different cultural setting, the very different value system may deeply upset notions of personal and professional identity. All group members in the international classroom seek to know the main features of the educational system and the labour market in the situation involved to understand these differences.

The aim of stating the six clusters of qualifications is threefold. First, it should create awareness among the managers of higher education institutions for the specific qualities and skills required to function in an internationalised academic environment. Second, if the profiles of the 'ideal' lecturer and student are compared with the profiles of regular staff and students, it can be used for identifying relevant differences. These differences can be used for planning of staff selection and further training. In the case of students it reveals the added value of an intercultural learning setting. Finally, the profiles provide staff and students themselves with insight into the demanding role they play in constituting the international classroom.

The description of a profile of 'ideal' students and staff is by no means intended as a blueprint. Even so, it might suggest that there are such persons, or that a person can be found to be trained to become 'ideal' and thus provide 'a perfect solution' to the challenges that are associated with the international classroom. This would make the profile into a caricature and persons into stereotypes, and that of course is not the idea. Presenting the clusters of qualifications is meant to spur further discussion and to provide a means for reflection on one's own role and position in the international classroom.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided profiles of the 'ideal' lecturer and student in the international classroom to discuss the specific demands of teaching and learning in such a context. The delivery of an internationalised curriculum calls for specific knowledge, skills and attitude in lecturers and students. These specific demands cannot be taken for granted and it cannot be expected that staff who have been educated in national 'mono-cultural' settings can simply implement an internationalised curriculum without additional training and further professional development. On the side of the students it means that supplementary measures are needed to support their learning in an international and intercultural setting. The profiles are not meant as blueprints, but rather as an invitation to further debate and self-reflection.

The creation of a truly international and intercultural academic community at the institution requires conceiving the idea of the internationalisation of higher education as a pro-active approach to creating conditions that will support intercultural learning for **all** students, domestic and international students. In an institution that aims – within this context – to promote its internationalisation, well-developed policies are necessary conditions. Successful internationalisation will thus include mobility into the wider scope of internationalising the curriculum. It aims to link an international dimension with an intercultural dimension and then to integrate both into the content and delivery of the curriculum as a general component of higher education. To constitute a classroom where intercultural learning really occurs, means blending concepts of 'foreign', 'strange' and 'otherness' into teaching strategies that make an effort to integrate the cultural input of students; to use different backgrounds as a source of learning and to make an effort to see students with 'other-

ness' as resources themselves. Intercultural learning does not 'simply' happen. It requires prearranged settings and clearly defined aims. Of course it is not possible to generalise about conditions that would apply in every intercultural situation. Sharing common values, mapping out relevant differences, and communicating across these differences are the major challenges in the international classroom. To address this challenge is the main task in further developing the quality of international education and intercultural learning. To make use of the potential input of the rich cultural diversity that surrounds us in our direct living situation is an academic endeavour of the first order. It means that all of us will have to cross borders to be 'at home' in the global village. Sometimes these borders are only in our heads, but they may well present the most difficult journey we have to make. In the next chapter it will be explained how cultural diversity can be defined in other terms than directly related policies of internationalisation of the institution and why it is a fundamental precondition to create a truly academic community.

Hanneke Teekens is Senior Adviser in the Department of Educational Studies and Consultancy (DESC) of the Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education (Nuffic), 's-Gravenhage, The Netherlands

Bibliography

Teekens, H.F. and Van der Wende, M. (1997) *Teaching in the international classroom. Profile of the ideal lecturer, and its implications for staffing policy*, Nuffic Papers 8, 's-Gravenhage.

5

Internationalisation at home – institutional implications

Paul Crowther

Introduction

This chapter will attempt to look at the issue of 'internationalisation at home' from the point of view of the educational management practitioner. It is based on my own personal experience and perceptions, the articles of my colleagues in the Special Interest Group and other publications, and some widely used concepts and models in strategic management.

I do not claim to hold any secrets or ready solutions to the dilemmas we all face in the context of increasing internationalisation, nor do I claim to be totally objective in all cases, nor to cover all possible situations. My purpose is to contribute what I can to the debate, and hopefully help readers to ask themselves some of the right questions.

My text makes a number of basic assumptions:

- Globalisation is a feature of our environment, and will increasingly be so.
- Higher education is increasingly oriented towards the needs of the 'downstream market' (employers, and society in general).
- The downstream market is increasingly international and/or multicultural.
- Students have a choice (of area of studies, of university, of country).
- There is competition between universities, and this competition is increasingly international.

I will not attempt, here, to justify these assumptions. My chapter is not meant to be scientific, but to provide a basis for further discussion amongst professionals in international education.

I write also as a European, from a European viewpoint, but hope readers from other continents will find the arguments relevant to their own situation.

In this context, I often use 'internationalisation' to mean 'Europeanisation'. I feel that, for many European institutions of higher education, the 'European dimension' is only the first step towards wider internationalisation. It is thus a question of **degree** rather than **nature** of internationalisation.

I also use 'university' and 'higher education institution' as virtual synonyms, as I feel that the boundary between university and non-university is in many cases becoming blurred.

The past

1960s and 1970s

Those baby-boomers who were undergraduates 30 years ago and more will remember that, at that time, most of the European students who took an interest in international matters were language students. The only study programmes involving study abroad were language degrees. So, 'international' usually meant 'languages' and was the domain of 'specialists': a reality if you were a language student, but not perceived as relevant for many others.

1980s

In the 1980s, the emergence of increased awareness of the importance of an international dimension in higher education was stimulated by EC initiatives such as ERASMUS. As Bernd Wächter points out earlier in this volume, ERASMUS focused mainly on mobility (usually of students).

Thus, internationalisation became a more visible issue, concerning more students and more subject areas. The learning and practice of languages became more relevant for 'non-specialists', and increased international experience shifted the focus from knowledge of other languages and cultures to the development of real-world linguistic and cultural capabilities.

It is also important to remember that ERASMUS was essentially a 'bottom–up' approach, where enterprising and enthusiastic individuals (often faculty members) set up ICPs and got financial support for them from Brussels. Although the scope and scale of internationalisation grew, it remained in many cases marginal to higher education institutions' policies.

1990s

By the early 1990s, many people were conscious of the limits of mobility programmes and of the need to overcome barriers to mobility (ECTS attempted to address the issue of academic recognition and credit transfer by providing a facilitating mechanism): even the modest target of 10% mobility under ERASMUS was not being met.

In 1996, the European Commission published a green paper 'Education, training, research: the obstacles to transnational mobility', which highlighted limited access to information on higher education and to financial support, and non-transferability of academic credits, as the major barriers.

Despite efforts to improve the quality and accessibility of information and facilitate credit transfer (ECTS information packages, credit allocation, learning agreements), it was clear that the vast majority of European students would never have the opportunity to study in another country.

The introduction of SOCRATES in 1996 clearly marked the EU's wish to make internationalisation more central to the agenda of higher education institutions and an element of their institutional strategy. This situation (internationalisation as an institutional issue and the need to provide

an 'international dimension' for many more students than those who were mobile) gives the context in which thinking on 'internationalisation at home' has developed.

Institutional implications

The emergence of international activities in higher education created new situations and needs within institutions. Someone had to find international partners, negotiate with them, apply for funding, then run the exchanges and do the administrative tasks (budget, study plans, credit transfer), as well as looking after incoming exchange students. It was a new profession, and no-one had been trained for it. In many cases, initiatives were taken by individual faculty members, and not necessarily linked to any of their institution's priorities or policies. Thus, internationalisation was initially sporadic, unsystematic and, in many cases, a marginal activity with no basis for credibility, no institutional funding and no prestige, run by enthusiastic amateurs.

The present

As Bernd Wächter explains in chapter 1, the current situation is considerably different from what we knew some years ago. Internationalisation has become central to universities' mission, and the focus is on 'systemic internationalisation' more than on mobility.

SOCRATES encourages this and recent initiatives such as the Bologna Declaration will encourage the kind of structural reforms (degree structure and nomenclature) needed to achieve better comparability between systems.

Naturally, the dismantling of technical barriers to international access will stimulate international comparison and competition, as well as international cooperation. Increased international comparison, as we shall see, creates new needs for international quality certification. Increased international competition creates the need for an international strategy. Both of these phenomena will exert strong pressure for cultural and organisational change within institutions of higher education.

The environment

Chapter 1 of this booklet examines the impact of the regulatory environment (supranational, national, regional) and of the ICT-powered trend toward globalisation on higher education.

For the higher education institution's management, a rapidly-changing environment with heightened competition makes it essential to have a clear picture of what is happening and a realistic strategy for the future, based on analysis of both the environment and the institution itself, the goal being to achieve a 'dynamic fit' between the two over time.

The starting point is understanding the environment. This usually means considering the 'STEP' factors (sociological, technological, economic and political: one could add more).

Bernd Wächter's chapter examines political and technological/economic factors. He highlights both the continuing efforts towards intra-European harmonisation in higher education (degree structures and, like it or not, language of instruction) and their corollary, national and regional defensive attitudes. He indicates that economic globalisation, stimulated by an increasingly free flow of information world-wide thanks to modern technologies, has created a trend towards 'commoditisation' and international competition in the higher education sector. On the whole, his conclusions indicate that, despite some foot-dragging, there is a clear and irreversible trend towards both more internationalisation and more international competition.

In this context, what sociological and economic factors could be taken into account for their strong impact on higher education and its internationalisation? Here are a few suggestions:

- A trend towards accountability ('stakeholders' want a say in what happens, and demand good-quality education and value for money).
- Increasing demand for 'marketable skills' (a more job-market oriented and, some would say, short-term and narrow definition of the social usefulness of university education).
- Willingness to pay for quality and relevance (recognition that quality varies, nationally and internationally, and that higher education is an investment).
- Internationally variable levels of access to higher education (increased access in many developed countries, which 'dilutes' the relative number of international students, and limited access in some populous emerging countries, which creates opportunities for international direct recruitment, if we assume that there are people with the means to pay).
- The increasing need for life-long learning in a rapidly changing environment where the 'shelf life' of one's initial training is getting shorter (this has led, for example, to the development of 'corporate universities', where major organisations organise their own ongoing training for employees: these structures are potential partners, but also competitors, for traditional universities).
- The growth of the higher education sector in many developed countries and the concomitant limits to potential public funding of the sector (which open the door still wider to private initiative).
- The rising demand from 'consumers' (employers, but also students) for international standards and quality certification, in an international environment where accreditation is mainly national.

One could no doubt find many more factors. If we consider only these, there are clearly issues of quality assurance, relevance and international competition to be addressed.

Quality assurance

As an example of what may emerge more widely in the future, we can take the example of management education and training in Europe. This sector is clearly market-oriented, international and competitive. It is also fragmented, with many providers (public, private, corporate) offering a wide variety of supposed 'benefits' to students and employers. It is therefore difficult for the non-initiated to know what quality means, and how to find it. While national accreditation systems gave stakeholders some guarantee (state-recognised degree, for example, or peer recognition within national associations), there was a lack of such assurance at the European level.

In the absence of 'state' recognition at the EU level, the European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD) recently set up a quality initiative (EQUAL), with a peer accreditation system (EQUIS: European Quality Improvement System) for providers of management education and training in Europe (and elsewhere). This involves guided self-assessment and an external peer review. 'EQUIS' accreditation is clearly setting a European quality standard, and this may well become a basic requirement for international credibility with potential students, employers and partners.

For the institution (the Business School, in this case), one consequence is that continuous benchmarking is required (continuous improvement). Another is that this external competitive pressure has major internal consequences (see below). Two key criteria for accreditation are the quality of relations with the corporate world (including taking into account the needs of the 'final customer' in deciding what to teach, how to teach it and what personal and interpersonal – as opposed to cognitive – skills to develop) and the quality and extent of internationalisation. So, internationalisation, customer orientation and quality development are inextricably linked.

Relevance

Recognition that the network of external stakeholders is wider than students, their parents and others (in particular, public bodies) who sponsor the system, but extends to society in general and to the employment market in particular, leads one to the conclusion that higher education must serve the needs of more than just the academic community itself.

For example, if knowledge and skills are to be used in an international and/or intercultural context (and this must surely increasingly be the case), then they should have an international and/or intercultural dimension. They should be adaptable and transferable to different contexts.

In her chapter, Hanneke Teekens addresses precisely these issues, and highlights the 'mismatch' between 'global environment' and 'national education'. She also points out that the hardest borders to cross are mental ones, and emphasises the key role of teaching staff, in terms not only of their knowledge and teaching skills, but also (crucially) of their attitudes.

As we shall see, this has important implications in terms of recruitment, training and career management, not only (incidentally) for teaching staff, but also (in my opinion) for all employees of higher education institutions.

Institutional implications

In the light of this analysis of the environment of higher education, institutions may ask themselves the following questions:

- How international are the governing body, the management, the mission and the culture?
- How international are the sources of finance?
- How international is the student body (whether by direct recruitment or exchange)?
- How international are the curriculum and the learning process?
- How international are the teaching and administrative staff?
- How international are the customers served?

One might argue that institutions may choose whether or not to 'Europeanise' (or internationalise). If one assumes, however (and I think it is a realistic assumption), that funds, academics and students are internationally mobile, then we have a shift in the basic paradigm. Education is no longer nation-based, but globally based. Educational institutions are no longer segmented by country, but increasingly by quality. If one wants to be a major player in this environment, one *must* internationalise.

Taking an analogy with professional sport, how 'English' is a football club if ten of its first-team players are not from the UK, and how 'French' are the World and European Champions, when few of them actually play in France any more? If there are less and less barriers to mobility, then competition is by nature international, or at least European. Can we even *think* in national terms any more?

How, then, can a higher education institution plan to internationalise? I am aware that my suggestions may be viewed as idealistic, unrealistic or simply impossible under existing circumstances. I would reply that, unless one has some ideals, a little imagination and a desire to move ahead, nothing will ever change. Or rather, that change will occur anyway and that we had better anticipate it. Some of our competitors will, and they will have a head start on us in tomorrow's international environment. This is why I believe that internationalisation is not 'later' and 'somewhere else', but 'here' and 'now', and that this is no time to bury our heads in the sand.

Here is a suggested list of questions to ask oneself for the promotion of international development within the higher education institution:

- How much international vision do the people who finance, govern and manage the institution have, and how could this be improved, if necessary?
- How can one best internationalise the student body? Is one in a position to recruit internationally?

- How can one internationalise the curriculum and teaching methods (Matthias Otten, Bengt Nilsson and Hanneke Teekens address these issues in depth in their chapters)?
- How can one promote the institution, its services and its graduates to an international community?

My personal view is that three types of actors are central to the process: educational managers, academics and administrative staff (managers for setting the agenda and implementation, academics for internationalisation of the teaching and learning process, and administrative staff for the provision of support services in line with the needs of 'international students').

The role of educational managers

- They are responsible for keeping a close watch on the environment and making sure that, internally, people are aware of what is going on outside.
- They should be thinking about the internal structures of the institution and asking to what extent they serve the internationalisation effort.
- They need to be promoters of internationalisation through their actions and their rhetoric.
- They must show leadership and pedagogical skills in explaining why internationalisation is important for the institution, and why and how it concerns everyone.
- They should ensure that the international dimension is taken into account in the recruitment, ongoing training, promotion and career development of all categories of staff, particularly academics, whose role in the process is pivotal.

Conclusions

Internationalisation is immediately relevant to higher education institutions, for reasons of quality promotion, competitiveness and their relevance to contemporary society.

Traditional approaches such as mobility are a start, but do not go far enough, in that they have a limited audience and little institutional impact.

The internationalisation agenda has moved to centre stage, and now concerns every level of institutions of higher education.

Internationalisation is thus closely linked to institutional development and strategy, and should be the concern of the institution's governing body and top management.

Paul Crowther is Director of International Relations at the IÉSEG School of Management, Catholic University of Lille, France

European Association for
International Education (EAIE)

PO Box 11189
1001 GD Amsterdam
The Netherlands

tel +31-20-525 49 99
fax +31-20-525 49 98
e-mail eaie@eaie.nl
http://www.eaie.org

Internationalisation at Home (IaH)
EAIE Special Interest Group

Contact person:
Dr Bengt Nilsson
Vice-Rector for International Affairs
International Office
Malmö University
205 06 Malmö
Sweden

tel +46-40-665 71 72
fax +46-40-665 70 49
e-mail bengt.nilsson@mah.se