

*ternationalization of Higher Education: Historical and Conceptual Perspectives* in 1995, Rizvi observes that new realities have emerged, which demand a response within the curriculum. These new realities include increasingly diversified communities; increased cultural exchange; hybridization of peoples, cultures, and practices; new patterns of interconnectivity; “place polygamy;” increased capability to remain connected transnationally; and shifting notions of citizenship. Globalization and digitization have influenced the world in profound and subtle ways, but as yet universities have moved slowly to respond. Today’s international students are not the same as the early pioneers that came before them. Technologies such as Skype are instantly and constantly connecting them with their parents and friends in their homes, villages, and towns. Some have experienced travel or study abroad prior to commencing their university education, but all have had virtual encounters with the broader world. Twitter, Weibo, and Whatsapp, for example, are bringing our world to them in new, exciting, and often perplexing ways.

#### **INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE CURRICULUM: IMAGINING NEW POSSIBILITIES**

In her 2009 article, “Using Formal and Informal Curricula to Improve Interactions Between Home and International Students,” Betty Leask defined “internationalization of the curriculum” as the “the incorporation of an international and intercultural dimension into the preparation, delivery and outcomes of a program of study.” Importantly, this definition frames IoC as an ongoing process, which involves and changes all students through strategies that enable them “to become more aware of their own and others’ cultures.” As such, it represents an open invitation to engage in the domain of the transformative, i.e., the potential of becoming. Moreover, in our 2015 publication, *Critical Reflections on the Internationalisation of the Curriculum: Reflective Narrative Accounts from Business, Education and Health*, we argue that in order for the transformative potential of IoC to be realized, it must involve and change individual faculty (academics), their disciplines, and their institutions. It is now time, we hope, for a new “imagining [of] as yet unrealized possibilities” across all levels of the university as they engage with their curricula.

In the context of the internationalization of the contemporary curriculum it is not so much that normal is becoming worse, as it is in danger of losing relevance. In the new normal, each teacher and each student is both knowledgeable and “ignorant,” and has much to learn from the other. According to Michael Singh, knowledge and ignorance can intermingle productively in our “new normal” classrooms: by acknowledging ignorance, we can stimulate the production of knowledge through intercultural dialogue and de-

bate, and in turn, create new fields of ignorance. To remain relevant, we need to imagine the rich potential that the new, highly mobile, highly interconnected “normal” affords and respond reflexively, with minds open to ignorance and knowledge. ■

---



---

## Faculty and International Engagement: Has Internationalization Changed Academic Work?

**DOUGLAS PROCTOR**

*Douglas Proctor is a PhD candidate in international higher education at the University of Melbourne, Australia, and a member of the International Education Association of Australia Research Committee. E-mail: dproctor@unimelb.edu.au.*

Scholars, practitioners, and professional bodies in international education might not agree on what internationalization is, but they all concur that the involvement of faculty is crucial to its success. Certainly at an institutional level, with the adoption of comprehensive strategies for internationalization, faculty are now actively encouraged to reconsider their work in a new light. However, it remains unclear to what extent the internationalization of higher education has influenced or transformed the work undertaken by academic staff.

#### **CHANGES TO THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION**

Internationalization is considered to be one of the most transformative contemporary influences on higher education, its institutions, and communities, including teaching and research faculty. With faculty lying at the heart of the generation, application, and dissemination of knowledge, it is therefore reasonable to expect that internationalization has influenced the patterns of faculty work in higher education.

Over the last quarter century, two major international surveys of the academic profession—the 1992 Carnegie study and the 2007 Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey—have sought to collect data on the attitudes of faculty toward their work, including some of its international dimensions. By virtue of methodology, these two studies have focused on aspects of internationalization that can be read-

ily measured, such as patterns of faculty mobility. Where feasible, longitudinal comparisons have been sought between the two studies, although the relative lack of focus on international dimensions in the earlier Carnegie study has not facilitated this task.

Looking at the 2007 CAP survey alone, the principal findings in relation to the internationalization of the academy are based on a number of proxy indicators. These include personal characteristics, such as country of birth, current citizenship, and the place of origin of the respondent's highest degree level qualification. While analysis of these proxy indicators has enabled conclusions to be drawn in relation to the mobility and migration of faculty, as well as looking for possible patterns of generational change, the indicators provide little insight into faculty opinions about internationalization or their rationales for participating in international activities—let alone the possible effects of internationalization on academic work.

With over half of the available variables relating to academic mobility and migration, the CAP survey did, however, show a marked bias toward the international mobility of faculty as a vector for internationalization. This presupposes that the internationalization of faculty can be described by their mobility, and likewise that the cross-border movement of faculty is a significant component of their internationalization.

#### FACULTY RESPONSES TO INTERNATIONALIZATION

Moving beyond the international mobility of faculty (which has been a generally accepted practice in academia for centuries), various empirical studies have sought to confirm key drivers and barriers to faculty engagement with internationalization. Principally conducted in North America, these studies have outlined a range of motivating and resistance factors for faculty and have shown that institutional and disciplinary contexts are key determinants in shaping academic behavior in this area.

While senior leadership has been distinguished as an influencing factor on the internationalization of faculty (for example, in providing clarity for faculty on the nature of their involvement), many of the direct motivating factors for faculty to engage with the international dimensions of academic work relate to personal or intrinsic characteristics, such as prior personal or professional experience in an international context. Faculty appear to be motivated by rationales for internationalization focused on the “greater good,” rather than by economic factors. Current involvement with international activities also leads to a greater perception of the importance and benefit of those activities.

Nevertheless, a wide range of individual resistance factors and obstacles to faculty international engagement has

also been identified. Many of these can be framed in terms of institutional support for the international engagement of faculty, with barriers including the nature of academic employment policies, incentives for staff involvement, workload and time management issues, limited funding, lack of support personnel, and the availability of relevant professional development. Other resistance factors derive from personal rather than institutional barriers, such as fear of the future, a hesitancy to collaborate internationally, or an unwillingness to question the dominant international paradigms of a particular discipline for fear of censorship by colleagues.

However, the most common barrier to the active engagement of faculty with internationalization derives from the variable understandings and multiple definitions of internationalization which are in use. This fluidity in the ways in which individuals understand and make sense of internationalization, both among faculty and between faculty and their institutions, has been found to be a significant impediment to the international engagement of faculty.

---

**However, the most common barrier to the active engagement of faculty with internationalization derives from the variable understandings and multiple definitions of internationalization which are in use.**

---

Interestingly, but perhaps unsurprisingly, earlier studies into faculty engagement with internationalization have focused almost uniquely on the internationalization of teaching and learning, rather than on the internationalization of research or other aspects of academic work. Although growing sophistication in the analysis of citation data is now able to provide a measure of the changing exposure of faculty to international research collaboration, little macro-analysis of these data is currently available. Similarly, it is unclear how faculty engagement with the international aspects of research is connected to the internationalization of teaching and learning, and whether either aspect of internationalization has actually served to change academic work.

#### INTERNATIONALIZATION AND ACADEMIC WORK

Although analysis of research citation data may highlight changing patterns of faculty work in terms of international collaboration, earlier studies into faculty engagement with

internationalization do not always shed new light on the ways in which internationalization has changed or influenced academic work. Furthermore, analysis of survey data on the academic profession suggests that the internationalization of higher education may have been more rhetoric than reality, given limited changes to demographic patterns and faculty behaviors over the 15 years between 1992 and 2007.

What is clear, however, is that the international strategies of many institutions now envisage a holistic or comprehensive approach to internationalization across all areas of activity. These strategies assume the active involvement of faculty, although it remains to be seen whether faculty are motivated to adjust their work in response, and whether particular levers are likely to influence this next phase of faculty internationalization. ■

---



---

## Building an Inclusive Community for International Students

**RACHAWAN WONGTRIRAT, RAVI AMMIGAN, AND ADRIANA PÉREZ-ENCINAS**

*Rachawan Wongtrirat is Assistant Director for International Education Initiatives in the Office of International Programs at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte, US. E-mail: rwongtri@uncc.edu. Ravi Ammigan is Director of the Office for International Students and Scholars at the University of Delaware, Newark, US. E-mail: rammigan@udel.edu. Adriana Pérez-Encinas is a lecturer and researcher in higher education and business organizations at the School of Business and Economics, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain. E-mail: adriana.perez.encinas@uam.es.*

With the desire to connect campuses to the world, institutions of higher education are enrolling increasing numbers of international students, with a view to enhancing global perspectives and enriching the collegiate environment for the entire campus community. At the same time, the demand from the international student population has also increased. Project Atlas, conducted by the Institute of International Education, indicates that there were 2.1 million international students worldwide in 2001, with international student enrollment doubling to 4.5 million by 2012, representing an annual growth rate of almost 6 percent. Among the competitors for the global market share, the host countries with the highest number of enrolled

international students were the United States (886,052), the United Kingdom (481,050), China (356,499), France (295,092), and Germany (282,201). Although these numbers are good news for higher education at large, at an institutional level, international student enrollment often increases without adequate consideration of how the growth in enrollment will affect the campus capacities to serve and assist these students.

Enrolling international students, from either a degree mobility or credit mobility perspective, comes with institutional responsibilities regarding their development and success. The authors believe that international student support services and a positive international student co-curricular experience are essential for the successful creation of an inclusive community for international students. Although we may assume that a higher number of international enrollments would be better supported with enhanced international student support and services on a particular campus, this is not necessarily the case. The challenge to providing suitable services is that, although the international student population is conflated under the label “international students,” there is great diversity among the students, who come from various countries around the world, and this needs to be taken into account.

### INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Provision of student support services is of primary interest in the development of a strong international student program. With the number of internationally mobile students rapidly increasing, it is important that support services for these students grow similarly.

Successful management and operation of support services for international students can validate an institution's commitment to campus internationalization and to providing quality services. Internationalization itself is one indicator of quality in higher education, as Hans de Wit points out in the 2011 book, *Trends, Issues and Challenges in Internationalization of Higher Education*, but it is not the only one. An institution that recognizes the value of enrolling international students on its campus must also recognize that it has an ethical responsibility to provide a range of support services that enhance international students' well-being and ensure their success. According to the European Union's Erasmus Impact Study (2014), the increase in the number of incoming and outgoing students through Erasmus has led to an increased awareness of the necessity of providing support services and streamlining administrative procedures. At many universities, this has led to the establishment and/or further strengthening of support services for outgoing and incoming students.

There is a variety of organizational structures for international student support services and there is no one