


Changing Landscapes of Internationalisation of Higher Education

The Needs of Associate Degree Programs

Robert J. Coelen



Research Group
Innovation in Education & Research



FOREWORD

This reader is designed to give you some background information before embarking on the learning track for internationalisation of associate degree programs. It provides an overview of recent trends in Internationalisation of Higher Education (IoHE). It also focuses on international mobility (Study Abroad) and internationalisation at home (IaH), since these aspects are of particular importance for the contextualisation of IoHE in Associate Degree Programs. I look forward to working with you in this short course.

December 2018

Dr Robert Coelen

Professor of Internationalisation of Higher Education

Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
GLOBAL TRENDS	4
Accountability	4
Learner-centred education	5
Transition to the workplace	5
Staff development	6
Technological advances	7
INTERNATIONALISATION AT HOME AND STUDENT MOBILITY	8
Learning Outcomes	10
Benefits of IaH	12
Difference between Study Abroad and IaH	14
REFERENCES	15

Introduction

As internationalisation of higher education around the world moves from an activity on the margins to the core of academic life, the likelihood that it is affected by other developments in higher education increases. Nowadays universities undertake a plethora of activities under the umbrella of internationalisation of higher education (IoHE), including student and staff international mobility, Internationalisation at Home (IaH), Internationalisation of the Curriculum (IoC), the international mobility of programs in the form of transnational education (TNE). TNE ranges from a single program (or parts thereof) being taught by a university across its national borders to the setting up of a fully-fledged campus in a host country. In a study for the European Parliament (De Wit, Hunter, and Coelen, 2015) experts predicted in a Delphi study that the attention towards IoHE in Europe would increase in the foreseeable future (10 years). Indeed, the experts predicted that the increased attention to IoHE would be not only at the level of institutions, but also at regional, national, and supra-national levels (De Wit, Hunter, Coelen, 2015). Despite recent political turmoil in some countries about IoHE, the predicted increases seem to be holding up. Erasmus funding for internationalisation activities has increased compared to the earlier versions of the program and the European Commission is proposing to double its funding for the next budget period ((European Commission, 2018). National governments increasingly seek to drive internationalisation (University of Oxford, 2017), ranging from an increased focus on international research collaboration (UK), to enhancing TNE (France), and increased student mobility (inward bound Japan, and China) and more recently institutional internationalisation (Brazil). The expert prediction in the Delphi study would see more universities engage IoHE in the conduct of their core functions of education, research, and engagement with the community. For example, making programs more accessible to international students is high on the agenda of institutions. A recent study showed a more than 10-fold increase in programmes that use English as a medium of instruction across Europe's non-Anglophone countries from 2001 to 2013 (Lam and Wächter, 2014).

This contribution discusses several major changes that affect higher education to varying extents, depending on the national environment, institution, or even program, under consideration. Education is traditionally conservative, nevertheless good ideas and developments tend to spread, albeit slowly. Part of the reason for this probably is the time it takes to contextualise these advances into local situations. Another might be the level of evidence that is available to ascertain that these developments are indeed advances. The developments discussed in this chapter are by no means universal in their adoption, but are, at least to the author, significant in their extent that they warrant treatise. It should be noted that the advent of Associate Degrees presents another one of these environments where contextualisation and actualisation of internationalisation activities are essential. Simple adoption of what is being practiced in full degree programs is not really possible.

As for any development in higher education, the motive for its introduction is an important consideration and should drive the development of such changes. The motives for internationalisation of higher education have been variously categorised as serving academic, economic, political, and/or sociocultural purposes (De Wit, 2008; Knight, 2012).

An institution of higher learning should therefore, at the outset determine its rationales for internationalisation as they are important to define policy and strategy.

It is important to note that policy and strategy must be written in such a way that they allow for significant variation of implementation of internationalisation. This is so that its meaning can be contextualised to the needs of graduates of the various programs and environments within which graduates are going to apply their knowledge and skills. Thus, graduates have different needs depending on their discipline. A physics graduate's application of knowledge and skills is substantially different to that of graduates of psychology programs or medical studies for example. Graduates of physics may need to interact with cultural others for the purpose of creating new knowledge or solving problems, but doctors or psychologists may have cultural others as the object of their application of knowledge. The presence or absence of cultural others in the society where these graduates work has of course further impact on this situation. Equally, an awareness of the global environment of a discipline is important for graduates. To what extent are advances, made elsewhere applicable to the local environment? Internationalisation of higher education does not necessarily have the same meaning in different disciplines and the implementation needs to be adjusted accordingly.

Global Trends

Accountability

A major trend globally is the increased extent to which higher education institutions need to account for their actions (Lahey and Griffith, 2002; Guena and Martin, 2003; Hoecht, A., 2006; Ramirez and Tejada, 2018). It follows that also their attempts at internationalisation of higher education (IoHE) will undergo increased scrutiny. Outcome assessment for IoHE operates at different levels and should be dependent on the motivation for its introduction. For example, a university with an economic motive for IoHE, is not likely to assess their success in this regard at the individual level for outcomes. Rationales for IoHE affect the level(s) at which measurements should take place. Equally, where IoHE is introduced to produce learning outcomes such as international awareness and intercultural competence (Coelen, 2016), measurement should take place at the individual student level as to their progress in achieving these two learning outcomes, however they may be specified in particular programs. Thus, universities must declare their purpose for IoHE and this must be carried by the entire university community as well as external stakeholders. Measurement of progress towards the stated goals for IoHE, provided there is appropriate attention and budget, can then be met with confidence. The extent of university autonomy is an important factor in determining what achievements might be feasible.

The need for measuring the state of IoHE at institutions in Europe has resulted in the development of the Certificate of Quality in Internationalisation (CeQuInt). It arose out of an initiative taken by the Dutch Flemish Accreditation Organisation to create a special certificate for awarding good efforts in internationalisation. This was then taken up by the European Consortium for Accreditation and made suitable for Europe-wide application. The CeQuInt certificate aims to assess, enhance, and reward internationalisation (European Consortium for Accreditation, 2015). A plethora of measuring instruments and methods have preceded this (Deardorff, et al., 2009; Spinelli, G., 2009; Olsen, 2009, Del Carmen Bas, M., et al., 2017) and more are likely to follow. Global ranking of universities regularly includes some

metrics related to internationalisation and are a factor in attracting international students and staff (Hazelkorn, 2008; Coelen, 2009). Nevertheless, they are not a proxy for the assessment of IoHE and should not be used as such. Just like the CeQuInt Award was adapted for European use, any other system seeking to create a similar effort should ensure, if it is based on another instrument, that it is contextualised appropriately.

Learner-centred education

If the IoHE is defined in a learner-centred way (Coelen, 2016) one could also rephrase part of its purpose as learning to work with diversity based on ethnic, cultural, and/or national backgrounds. This is a second trend that is observable, to consider such local diversity as a variant of its international counterpart. In societies that are multicultural and have classrooms composed of students of such different backgrounds the opportunity arises to make use of these different cultural others without, from a local perspective, ever crossing a border. Indeed, Bennett and Bennett (2004) have argued that both global and local cultural diversity can be integrated into programs that develop intercultural sensitivity. This is, especially in environments with low international mobility of students, a worthy approach to developing an important learning outcome of IoHE. More generally, student experience with various forms of diversity in addition to that related to culture, was shown to have a variable, but positive, impact on a range of desirable graduate attributes (Denson and Zhang, 2010). This opens the door towards a wider view of the usefulness of diversity in the classroom and should be explored. It may just be that learning to take advantage of any form of both inherent and acquired diversities to solve problems may enhance the ability to utilise any singular diversity as well. In other words, such experiences may sharpen the mind for opportunities borne out of diversity in general. Whilst they have not shown a causal relationship, nevertheless work by Hunt and associates (2005, 2018) has shown that embracing diversity positively correlates with economic performance of companies. Depending on the type of industry and national context different diversities played a major role. Thus, students stand to gain much from pedagogies that offer the opportunity to interact with diverse others, whatever that diversity might be.

Transition to the workplace

The working life of university graduates is increasingly a point of focus for higher education institutions, particularly when in many countries graduate unemployment (2-6 months following graduation) is reaching epidemic proportions, such as in France (21%), Russia (30%), India (33%), and Nigeria with 47% (University of Oxford, 2017). The impact of internationalisation activities on employability has been the subject of a number of investigations (Wiers-Jenssen and Try, 2005; Bracht, et al., 2006; Franklin, 2010; Brandenburg et al., 2014; CIMO, 2014; Farrugia and Sanger, 2017). Whilst generally there appears to be a positive outcome on graduate attributes enhanced by international study mobility, this does not always translate in higher rates of employment (CIMO, 2014; The Gallup Organization, 2010). Part of the problem may lie in the awareness of employers of the impact of mobility on graduate attributes. Whilst Waters (2007) showed that Hong Kong residents with a foreign degree had advantages over their local counterparts, in mainland China a new phenomenon is taking place in respect of employers' attitudes towards graduates with a foreign degree (Hao and Welch, 2012; Hao, Wen, and Welch, 2016). These graduates are less likely to be employed than their local graduated counterparts. Rizvi (2000) argued that

Malaysian employers on the other hand greatly appreciated foreign-degree holders. Thus, the situation for graduate employment varies in different countries as a result of a variety of factors and an overarching theme appears to be lacking.

Staff development

The fourth trend relates to a focus on staff and their needs and development to be able to give meaning to IoHE within their discipline. If one considers the development of internationalisation activities, it is possible to note with respect to international mobility that this was initially arranged, under the auspices of the Erasmus program for example, by academics. As this effort grew, it universities created dedicated international mobility offices to take care of the increased work load. This had the unintended consequence of academics losing touch with where their students were going for their international mobile periods. The bureaucratisation of the student international mobility process took away the attention that academics needed to pay to this part. At the same time, it created the impression that the international mobility was a generalisable activity with similar outcomes irrespective of the discipline studied. It may have even be part of the cause that the quality of internationalisation was measured by the number of internationally mobile students (both inward and outward), the number of international institutional agreements, and other non-discipline bound characteristics. In the rush to enhance international student mobility, academic staff were initially the forgotten group in terms of their involvement.

Since the early work of Leask (2009) and others (Green and Whitsed, 2013) on internationalisation of the curriculum (IoC) there has been increased attention to internationalising at home (IaH). The call for IaH was already made in 2001 by Crowther and associates in a position paper for the EAIE. It took almost a decade for this call to be answered and even now this is progressing slowly.

The relatively slow advances in this aspect, apart from the generally conservative nature of higher education development, are possibly related to a lack of understanding of the meaning of IoHE in respect of graduate needs. In addition, the effects of IoHE on graduate attributes other than language acquisition, developing intercultural competence, and general international awareness (the traditional outcomes of international mobility, see Centre for International Mobility, 2014), and a clear focus on learning outcomes that result from IoHE, were poorly understood.

This was all compounded by a reticence in engaging internationalisation experts in the development of embedded IoHE (Beelen, 2016). When such dialogues are undertaken they are often impeded initially from the lack of mutual trust. The argument from disciplinary experts was that their colleagues from the international office knew little about the discipline, so how could they be of use? The reverse was also regularly true, that the internationalisation experts did not feel their disciplinary counterparts had sufficient knowledge of the potential effects of IoHE activities.

It has also become clear that one size does not fit all (Green and Whitsed, 2015). Individual attention to a particular discipline or program in a collaborative process involving disciplinary experts, educationalists, and internationalisation specialists is required to ensure that IoC happens in a sustainable way. This is the fourth important trend in IoHE. We can no longer think of implementing IoHE by way of general attention to the whole institution, it requires focused efforts for each discipline or even program. Thus, a program of

comprehensively internationalising an institution is not something achieved in a year, or even a few short years. It requires a dedication of well over 5 years depending on the level of resources applied to this process. The University of Groningen in the Netherlands, by way of example, recently announced a second 5-year period of just such a process. A long-term undertaking in which disciplines attach their own contextualised meaning to IoHE to ensure maximum benefit for their graduates.

Technological advances

One of the major disrupting global forces and the fifth trend that needs to be borne in mind is that of the advancement of technology. Despite much enthusiasm of educational technologists and large amounts of money spent on ICT at universities, there is a dichotomy between the enthusiasm and budget on the one hand and the actual usage on the other (Selwyn, 2007). Notwithstanding notions of deficiency in terms of abilities, motivation, or simple know-how of stakeholders, Selwyn argues that "computer technology use is constructed in limited, linear, and rigid terms far removed from the creative, productive, and empowering uses which are often celebrated by educational technologists". Significantly for IoHE, he continues that educational technologists need to reshape computer-based learning from a delivery system of information to one that offers opportunities for social interaction for those temporally separated and for students who are geographically distant (across borders).

Along these lines, one development that has gained ground is the transnational delivery of technologically supported distance education (Van Damme, 2001). Another one is that of virtual mobility, in which students in geographically distant locations (across borders) collaborate online in international learning (COIL; Rubin, 2016). Equally valid in this sense would be collaboration between cultural others in the same country for that matter. Early experiences with international collaborative learning warn of unforeseen issues that should be used to improve subsequent use (Solem et al., 2003; Popov et al., 2014). Nevertheless, the use of collaborative online work is experiencing a strong increase (RW³ CultureWizard, 2016). The use of online collaboration across borders in the classroom would at once enhance graduates' employability and, if properly executed, also assist in enhancing opportunities for intercultural learning and collaboration.

The five trends discussed in this article would all benefit from increased research. Presently, the extent of research into internationalisation of higher education mirrors that of online learning and the total peer-reviewed paper output in IoHE is about 0.3% of all papers in education (Yemini and Sagie, 2016). This is in no way enough to advance the conduct of educational interventions under the banner of IoHE. There are plenty theories and models, but not enough empirical data. We have to work with what we have now and move beyond theories to implement what we can figure to be good and work harder to develop our knowledge about the way in which IoHE is transforming the lives of our students, staff, and the conduct of education at our institutions.

Of particular interest to those of us concerned with the associate degree curricula is the general inability for a variety of reasons of students of these programs to participate in Study Abroad for any length of time beyond a week or so. So, what are the benefits of study abroad and how can they be emulated in programs where international mobility is not really an option?

Internationalisation at Home and Student Mobility

Institutional quality development relies on the actions of engaged, motivated, and enabled individuals. Whilst there is no shortage globally of potential talent, the global variations in opportunities to learn has stymied the development of mankind's full potential. This often plays itself out at the national level, although increasingly the global hunt for talent to create knowledge-based economies is seeking to re-distribute and concentrate talent in the most advanced areas. At the same time, the so-called transversal skills, are increasingly the focus of companies when attracting new recruits. Whilst disciplinary knowledge often remains a basic necessity, when this is present in the absence of transversal skills, companies and peak bodies are becoming increasingly vocal about their needs in this regard. Surveys published by the American Association of Colleges & Universities (2007, 2018) attest to this fact. The 'Employer Skill Survey: Case Study Engineering' by Davis et al. (2000) makes the same case for transversal skills, albeit in the presence of high-level technical skills. A decade later, the case for team working skills, for example, was made by Lingard (2010), and others (Zhu et al., 2011; Australian Association of Graduate Employers, 2011).

Internationalisation activities have been, for some time now, divided into activities relating to international mobility (study abroad) and those occurring at home (Internationalisation at Home - IaH) This section looks at the development of learning outcomes in relation to internationalisation activities, but also makes the case for separate treatise of development of transversal skills for non-mobile students.

Already for a long time and continuing until today, international student mobility has been the principal activity of university strategies in Internationalisation of Higher Education (IoHE). The mobility function is as old as universities. Already in the 12th century, the safe passage and housing of international students (and scholars) was an issue subject to a decree by Frederick Barbarossa, roman emperor of the time (Otterspeer, 2018). From the middle ages onwards, and in increasing intensity young men went on a so-called 'Grand Tour' to complete their education. They went on voyages throughout Europe as reported variously (Green, 2014; Zaretsky, 2014; Brodsky-Porges, 1981).

It is interesting to look at the drivers put forward for study abroad by Hoffa and DePaul (2010, p. 8) as belonging to the curricular argument (going abroad to receive education not available at home), the cross-cultural argument (to learn about your own culture to understand that of others), the career argument (skills developed during study abroad enhance employability), and the development argument (relating to a student's social, emotional, and intellectual development). The impetus for studying abroad came from one or more of these arguments depending on the context. Crowther and associates (2000) wrote a position paper in response to Bengt Nilsson's questions about the non-mobile majority (at that time 90% of European students). Nilsson had asked how these non-mobile students were to have an international dimension to their education. The definition of Internationalisation of Higher Education (IoHE), as used at the time called or an international dimension to be added to the functions of a university (Knight, 1994).

As pointed out in the position paper by Crowther et al. the definition of Jane Knight did not reveal what this international dimension was to consist of, nor what an institution's motive ought to be. It was deliberate kept open so as to permit many interpretations of exactly what this entailed. Since Jane Knight's original definition, there have been many updates to this

definition and other aspects of IoHE have been defined. Thus, the original definition by Jane Knight was updated by herself (Knight, 2003, 2004) when she introduced national and sector levels beyond that of the institution to embrace the point that the international dimension related to all aspects of education and the role that institutions played in society:

Internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education.

Others have defined specific aspects of IoHE. Betty Leask for example, defined the concept of Internationalisation of the Curriculum (IoC; Leask, 2015, p. 9) as:

Internationalisation of the curriculum is the process of incorporating international, intercultural and global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods, and support services of a program of study.

Whilst Beelen and Jones (2015) redefined the concept internationalisation at home (IaH):

Internationalization at Home is the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments.

De Wit, Hunter & Coelen (2015) gave purpose to the process of IoHE as defined by Knight. They contended that IoHE should be for all students and staff and that it was to improve the quality of education and research. Thus, their redefinition of the working definition was:

"The intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society."

Finally, Coelen (2016) tackled the issue of internationalisation from the perspective of the learner and proposed a learner-centred definition of IoHE:

Internationalisation of Higher Education constitutes the provision of an environment containing such elements that a learner is given the opportunity to attain the achieved learning outcomes associated with international awareness and intercultural competence.

The initial practice of IoHE relied principally on a period of study abroad as part of the curriculum to ensure that the sojourner received an internationalised education. What this exactly consisted of was not very clear, although the drivers of Hoffa and DePaul (2010) gave some direction to this. The definitions of Beelen and Jones (2015) on IaH, of Leask (2015) on IoC, and of Coelen (2016) on a learner-centred IoHE together formed a clear focus on what should happen with any student at a tertiary institution, not just the internationally mobile

ones. Indeed, globally the vast majority of students does not participate in international mobility, although this is far from an even landscape. In some programs or institutions, all students are required or at least encouraged to have an internationally mobile period, whilst in the same type of programs in other countries there are no students who go abroad. It is not just a matter of disciplinary context, but also one of socio-economic barriers, as well as a general lack of effort on behalf of the institution to make this happen. The advent of the internet has made significant inroads in terms of opportunities for international student collaboration without the cost of international travel. However, this assumes that such collaboration delivers the learning environment that yields the learning outcomes associated with IoHE. This may not always be so, as experience has demonstrated that significant preparation is required to make intercultural collaboration work in a virtual environment or difficulties may ensue (Huisman et al., 2017).

Learning Outcomes

The first decade of this century saw in the US an increased demand for more learner-centred, outcome-based learning (Bennett, 2008 pp. 15-16, 25; Huba and Freed, 2000, pp. 17,22). Also, in Europe considerable effort has been spent on the introduction of learning outcomes starting with the process of defining what they are (Tuning, 2000), producing a guide to writing them (Kennedy, 2007), refining this (Kennedy, Hyland, and Ryan, 2009), and concluding with the Yerevan Communiqué of Ministers of Education (Bologna Process, 2015). This communiqué expressed the ambition that the quality and relevance of learning and teaching was to be enhanced:

"We will encourage and support higher education institutions and staff in promoting pedagogical innovation in student-centred learning environments and in fully exploiting the potential benefits of digital technologies for learning and teaching"

"Study programmes should enable students to develop the competences that can best satisfy personal aspirations and societal needs, through effective learning activities. These should be supported by transparent descriptions of learning outcomes and workload, flexible learning paths and appropriate teaching and assessment methods"

The Yerevan Communiqué promulgated the revised Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). These contained a standard that specifically addressed the use of learning outcomes for university programmes:

"Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area"

The guidelines for this aspect were as shown (in part) below:

Study programmes are at the core of the higher education institutions' teaching mission. They provide students with both academic knowledge and skills including those that are transferable, which may influence their personal development and may be applied in their future careers.

Programmes

- *are designed with overall programme objectives that are in line with the institutional strategy and have explicit intended learning outcomes;*
- *are designed by involving students and other stakeholders in the work;*
- *benefit from external expertise and reference points;*
- *include well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate;*

Of note in these guidelines was that students were also expected to receive transferable skills that might influence their personal development and that might be applicable to their future careers. This is notable since the learning outcomes of internationalisation are generally grouped under the transferable skills (along with other so-called 21st century skills).

The definition of Coelen (2016) was further underlined by Standard 1.3 of the guide (ESG, 2015) on student-centred learning, teaching and assessment:

Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach.

Important aspects in the context of this paper of the relevant guidelines for this standard included:

The implementation of student-centred learning and teaching:

- *respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths;*
- *considers and uses different modes of delivery, where appropriate;*
- *encourages a sense of autonomy in the learner, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher;*

Considering the importance of assessment for the students' progression and their future careers, quality assurance processes for assessment take into account the following:

- *The assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved*

All in all, the ESG foresees a greater extent of student participation in developing the teaching and learning process and for the institution to work with intended (and achieved)

learning outcomes with pedagogies that stimulate active learning. At the same time the ESG asks institutions to make curricular space for transferable (transversal) learning outcomes and to demonstrate that these learning outcomes have been achieved. The adoption of a learner-centred approach therefore to embedding IaH into the curriculum is well-supported by the ESG and the Yerevan Communiqué.

In terms of achieving the 2 learning outcomes as defined by Coelen (2016), it is very much the question whether this requires some form of international contact. There is little doubt that this would be helpful but having international contact per se does not necessarily confer intercultural competence. Indeed, Janet Bennett (2008, pp. 16-17) wrote:

"cultural knowledge does not equate cultural competence, language learning may not be sufficient for culture learning, cultural contact does not necessarily lead to competence, cultural contact does not always lead to significant reduction of stereotypes..."

Benefits of IaH

So, what then is the most significant benefit of Internationalisation at Home? First, and foremost, it is a way to addressing the needs of the non-mobile students. It is an effort, that ensures that the effects of internationalisation learning outcomes are not beholden to only the internationally mobile students. There are of course many reasons why students might not be internationally mobile. These include:

- inability to finance a period abroad;
- concern for loss of contact with the local environment in terms of personal relationships, a network for future employment, loss of (part-time) work;
- already established family environment;
- trepidation about ability to cope with another cultural environment;
- no mobility window in home program of study and consequent loss of time;
- problems with credit transfer towards home degree.

The global picture on credit mobility is not very clear. Nevertheless, if the European ambitious target of 20% mobility were to be reached by 2020, that leaves in Europe 80% of students non-mobile for all of the reasons mentioned above. In many other parts of the world the credit mobility concerns even fewer students. The major benefit of IaH is therefore substantial and affects the majority of students. Indeed, if carried out well, it also affects the mobile students, since an often-espoused value of IaH is the preparation of students for a mobile period. This in fact constitutes the second major benefit for IaH.

How could the 2 learning outcomes international awareness and intercultural competence be given time on campus? It is clear that this requires specific time and opportunities dedicated to these aspects (Lee et al., 2012). These components should also be taught and learnt in a holistic way recognising attention to the cognitive, affective, and conative domains (Lee et al., 2012; Deardorff, 2006). The pedagogy required for this also includes an interactive perspective as put forward by Allport (1954), who hypothesised that frequent and in-depth interaction with members of different social out-groups would enhance intergroup harmony. This was later in a meta-analysis by Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) shown to hold true. In a study by Soria and Troisi (2014) evidence was presented for a superior result in

terms of international awareness and intercultural competence compared to a period of study abroad. It should be noted that these outcomes were obtained with self-reported skills, and not the broader assessment as more generally preferred (Deardorff, 2006). In addition, in an immersive situation such as might occur during an international conference, students might be overwhelmed with what they appear not to know and develop a sense of humility or self-effacement (and thereby affect their self-reported status; Soria and Troisi, 2014).

Allport (1954) had specified conditions under which intergroup contact would lead to success in bridging differences. These included:

- *firm enforcement*, where the educators consistently enforced initiatives;
- *meaningful interactions*, where in-depth contact was required with sufficient frequency;
- *equal status* be afforded to all participants, avoiding the potential stereotypic prejudices that might exist;
- *cooperative interactions*, as distinct from competitive (e.g. cooperative group learning).

Subsequent work on this by Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) suggested that these conditions were such that they were more likely to achieve positive outcomes. In other words, in the absence of these conditions positive outcomes could also occur but were less likely to occur. Other conditions that have since been shown (Wagner and Machleit, 1986) to enhance the positive outcome include:

- a common language
- voluntary contact
- a prosperous economy

These and other observations explain that it is the learning environment, consisting of both the formal and non-formal curricula that play an important role in creating an opportunity to develop international awareness and intercultural competence learning outcomes.

The conditions that Allport (1954) predicted would be necessary for positive intergroup outcomes have an important predictive value for the importance of and the extent to which the educators at the home institution play a role in creating this environment. It is remarkable therefore, that international mobility took such a flight as the mechanism by which we sought to engender the IoHE associated learning outcomes (however that might have been framed). Maybe this is a testament to the much of the original intention of international mobility, which was that of obtaining cognitive inputs that were not available on the home campus. Thus, for area studies such mobility was considered absolutely essential to develop as a fully-equipped graduate, but for other disciplines it might have been content that was so specialised that it required a foreign sojourn to obtain this elsewhere.

The author experienced this himself, when, as a third-year student, he undertook to travel to Europe (from Australia) to learn how to milk mice, as part of the preparation for a research project that had been halted due to the lack of this ability in Australia. Equipped with this new knowledge, the project was able to continue. A case of technology transfer through international student mobility.

In more recent times, the use of international mobility has been more and more focused on the acquisition of intercultural competence and global awareness. It has since become clear that especially intercultural competence does not really improve unless there are interventions related to this aspect (Vande Berg, Connor-Linton, and Paige, 2009). This makes the more modern interpretation of international student mobility, in the light of having to control the learning environment such that this is able to occur, all the more surprising, since the educators at home relinquish this control to their foreign counterparts who may or may not be trained to deal with this. For institutes that are well advanced in the development of teaching and learning that includes these important transversal skills obtained through IoHE, this is particularly worrisome as their students' development in this regard may be stymied through less than ideal circumstances.

This last remark immediately connects well to the observations of Jos Beelen (2016) who has shown in case studies that staff training and collaboration between discipline specialists, internationalisation experts, and educational specialists are some of the most important obstacles in successfully implementing IaH, in particular internationalisation of the curriculum. However, the traditional learning outcomes of internationalisation, as obtained through appropriate interventions in relation to study abroad, are not enough to unlock the full potential of all graduates.

Difference between Study Abroad and IaH

From a collective view of chapters in a forthcoming book (Coelen and Gribble, 2019) it is important to realise that study abroad (international student mobility) causes development of the so-called transversal skills without specifically requiring interventions. Thus, the ability to work in teams, to be flexible, agile thinking, problems solving capacity, communication, and a host of other aspects are developed through mere participation in study abroad. They apparently require no specific interventions.

One possible mechanism that could account for these developments is the transformation through the experience and resolution of disorienting dilemmas (Mezirow, 1981, 2000) that befall an individual when travelling to another country (culture) whilst trying to cope with the stressors of performing some goal oriented overarching task (such as studying for a degree or credits, or an international internship). A non-mobile student, who is experiencing activities under the banner of IaH, is not really outside their zone of comfort and may not be experiencing much in the way of disorienting dilemmas. If this is the mechanism by which transformation occurs that drives the development of the transversal skills, then it becomes important to ensure that the curriculum at home does pay attention to this development. This may require interventions far removed from anything to do with international or intercultural aspects. Should the trigger for these developments be indeed disorienting dilemmas, then it will be necessary to create these for non-mobile students to ensure that there is equality in development opportunities.

Such developments will be part of the quality spiral that is required for universities to maximise the development of their graduates. It is clear that the majority of tertiary students around the globe, in the foreseeable future, will not be internationally mobile and the concern remains therefore, in the light of an increased need for well-developed transversal skills, that we are not able to avail ourselves of all the talent that may be present in our midst. Thus, whereas there is increased participation in education, including tertiary education, on

a global scale, the time for increased upscaling of participation needs to be tempered with enhanced attention to the learning outcomes for those taking part. It must be clear that disciplinary knowledge alone is not sufficient to ensure that the next generation of graduates are able to conquer the global problems that beset us today. It follows therefore that we cannot continue to claim that the education we received is good enough for the next generation, we must do better. Thus, new developments such as Associate Degree Programs are part of our challenge to do better.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley
- American Association of Colleges and Universities (2007) *How should Colleges Prepare Students to Succeed in Today's Global Economy?* Retrieved on 17 Dec 2018 from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/2007_full_report_leap.pdf
- American Association of Colleges and Universities (2018) *Fulfilling the American Dream: Liberal Education and the Future of Work*. Retrieved on 17 Dec 2018 from <https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/2018EmployerResearchReport.pdf>
- Australian Association of Graduate Employers (2011) *AAGE Employer Survey*. Sydney, Australia: AAGE
- Beelen, J. (2016) *Obstacles and enablers to internationalising learning outcomes in Dutch universities of applied sciences*. PhD Thesis, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan
- Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). *Redefining internationalization at home*. In A. Curaj, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi & P. Scott (Eds.), *The European higher education area: Between critical reflections and future policies* (pp. 67-80). Dordrecht: Springer. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0>
- Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (2004). *Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity*. In D. Landis, J. Bennett, & M. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (pp. 147-165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Bennett, J.M. (2008) *On Becoming a Global Soul: A Path to Engagement During Study Abroad*. In Savicki, S. (Ed.) *Developing Intercultural Competence and Transformation: Theory, Research, and Application in International Education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing
- Bologna Process (2015) *Yerevan Communiqué*. Retrieved on 30 October 2018 from <http://www.ehea.info/cid101764/ministerial-conference-yerevan-2015.html>
- Bracht, O., Engel, C., Janson, K., Over, A., Schomburg, H., and Teichler, U. (2006) *The professional value of ERASMUS mobility*. Brussels: European Commission
- Brandenburg, U., Berghoff, S., and Taboadela, O (2014) *The impact study effects of mobility on the skills and employability of students and the internationalisation of higher education institutions*. Brussels: European Commission
- Brodsky-Porges, E. (1981) *The Grand Tour: Travel as an Educational Device*. *Annals of Tourism Research* VIII (2), 171-186
- Centre for International Mobility (2014) *Faktaa – Hidden Competences*. Helsinki: CIMO

Coelen, R. (2016) *A Learner-Centred Internationalisation of Higher Education*. (pp. 35-42) In Jones, E., Coelen, R., Beelen, J., and De Wit, H. (Eds.) *Global and Local Internationalization* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers

Coelen, R.J. (2009) Ranking and the Measurement of success in internationalisation: Are they related? In (De Wit, H. (ed.) *Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education*. EAIE Occasional Paper 22, Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, pp. 39 – 47

Coelen, R.J. (2016) A learner-centred internationalisation of higher education. In Jones, E., Coelen, R.J., Beelen, J., and De Wit, H. (eds.) *Global and Local Internationalization*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 35-42

Coelen, R.J., and Gribble, C. (2019) *Internationalisation and Employability in Higher Education*. Abington, UK: Routledge (forthcoming)

Crowther, P., Joris, M., Otten, M., Nilsson, B., Teekens, H., and Wächter, B. (2001) *Internationalisation at Home – A position paper*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education

Crowther, P., Joris, M., Otten, M., Nilsson, B., Teekens, H., Wächter, B. (2000) *Internationalisation at Home: A Position Paper*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education

Davis, C., Buckley, T., Hogarth, T, and Shackleton, R. (2000) *Employers Skills Survey: Case Study Engineering*. Nottingham, UK: DIEE Publications

De Wit, H. (2008) *The Internationalization of Higher Education in a Global Context*. In De Wit, H., Agarwal, P., Elmahdy Said, M., Sehoole, M.T., and Sirozi, M. (eds.) *The Dynamics of International Student Circulation in a Global Context*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 1-14

De Wit, H., Hunter, F, and Coelen, R. (2015) *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe: Future Directions*. (pp. 273-288) In De Wit, H, Hunter, F., Howard, L., and Egron-Polak, E. (Eds.) *Internationalisation of Higher Education* Brussels: European Union

Deardorff, D.K., Thorndike Pysarchik, D., Yun, Z-S. (2009) *Towards effective international learning assessment: principles, design and implementation*. In (De Wit, H. (ed.) *Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education*. EAIE Occasional Paper 22, Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, pp. 23-38

Del Carmen Bas, M., Boquera, M., and Carot, J.M., (2017) *Measuring internationalisation performance of higher education institutions through composite indicators*. Proceedings of INTED2017 Conference 6th-8th March 2017, Valencia, Spain, 3149 – 3156

Denson, N. and Zhang, S. (2010) The impact of student experiences with diversity on developing graduate attributes. *Studies in Higher Education* 35(5), 529-543

DePaul, Stephen C. and William W. Hoffa, eds. 2010. *A History of US Study Abroad: 1965—Present*. Carlisle, PA: A Special Publication of Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad and the Forum on Education Abroad.

ESG (2015) *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*. Brussels: EURASHE Retrieved on 30 October from https://enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG_2015.pdf

- European Commission (2018) EU budget: Commission proposes to double funding for Erasmus programme. Retrieved from http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-18-3948_en.htm on 25 July 2018.
- European Consortium for Accreditation (2015) *CeQuInt 2012 – 2015*. Retrieved from <http://ecahe.eu/home/about/projects/cequint/> on 25 July 2018
- Farrugia, C. and Sanger, J. (2017) *Gaining an employment edge: The impact of study abroad on 21st century skills & career prospects in the United States*. New York: Institute of International Education
- Franklin, K. (2010) Long-term career impact and professional applicability of the study abroad experience. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* XIX, 169-191
- Green, M. (2014) Reporting the Grand Tour: the correspondence of Henry Bentinck, Viscount Woodstock, and Pual Rapin-Thoyras with the Earl of Portland, 1701-1703. *Pedagogica Historica* 50(4), 465-478
- Green, W. and Whitsed, C. (2013) Reflections on an alternative approach to continuing professional learning for internationalization across disciplines. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 17, 148-164
- Green, W. and Whitsed, C. (2015) *Introducing critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum*. In Green, W. and Whitsed, C. (eds.) *Critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum in disciplines – Reflective narrative accounts from Business, Education and Health*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 3-22
- Hao, J., and Welch, A.R. (2012) A tale of sea turtles: Job-seeking experiences of Hai Gui (High-skilled returnees) in China. *Higher Education Policy* 25(2), 243-260
- Hao, J., Wen, W., and Welch, A.R. (2016) When sojourners return: Employment opportunities and challenges facing high-skilled Chinese returnees. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 25(1) 22-40
- Hazelkorn, E. (2008) Globalization, internationalization, and rankings. *International Higher Education* 53, 8-10
- Hoecht, A. (2006) Quality assurance in UK higher education: Issues of trust, control, professional autonomy and accountability. *Higher Education* 51(4), 541-563
- Huba, M., and Freed, J. (2000) *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Huisman, J., Wallenius, L., Berazhny, I., and Hierbrink, J. (2017) *Virtual collaborations: Friend or Foe*. (pp. 201-209) In Coelen, R., Van der Hoek, K-W., and Blom, H. (Eds.) *Valorisation of Internationalisation. About Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Leeuwarden: Stenden University Press
- Hunt, V., Layton, S., and Prince, S. (2015) *Why diversity matters*. London: McKinsey & Company
- Hunt, V., Yee, L., and Prince, S. (2018) *Delivering through diversity*. London: McKinsey & Company

- Kennedy, D. (2007): *Writing and Using Learning Outcomes: A Practical Guide*, Cork: Quality Promotion Unit, University College Cork: <http://www.nairtl.ie/>
- Kennedy, D., Hyland, A., and Ryan, N. (2009) *Learning Outcomes and Competences*. In Gaebel, M., Purser, L., Wächter, B., and Wilson, L. (eds.) *Internationalisation of European Higher Education* Berlin: Raabe Verlag
- Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints* (Research Monograph, No. 7). Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Knight, J. (2003) Updated definition of Internationalization. *International Higher Education* 33, 2-3
- Knight, J. (2004) Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 8(1), 5-31
- Knight, J. (2012) *Concepts, Rationales, and Interpretive Frameworks in Internationalization of Higher Education* in (Deardorff, D.K., De Wit, H., Heyl, J.D. and Adams, T. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*. Los Angeles: Sage, pp. 27-42
- Lahey, J.L. and Griffith, J.C. (2002) Recent trends in higher education: Accountability, Efficiency, Technology, and Governance. *Journal of Legal Education* 52 (4), 528 – 539
- Lam, Q.K.H. and Wächter, B. (2014) *Executive Summary*. in Wächter, B. and Maiworm, F. (eds.) *English-taught programmes in European higher education. The state of play in 2014*. Bonn: Lemmens Medien GmbH, pp. 15-24
- Leask, B. (2009) Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 13, 205-221
- Leask, B. (2015) *Internationalizing the curriculum*. Abingdon, England, Routledge
- Lee, A., Poch, R., Shaw, M., & Williams, R. (2012). Engaging diversity in undergraduate classrooms: A pedagogy for developing intercultural competence (ASHE Higher Education Report, 38(2)). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lingard, R.W. (2010) Improving the Teaching of Teamwork Skills in Engineering and Computer Science. *Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics* 8(6), 20-23
- Mezirow, J. (1981) A critical theory of adult learning and education. *Adult Education* 32(1), 3-24
- Mezirow, J. (2000) *Learning to think like an adult – Core concepts of transformation theory*. In Mezirow, J. and Associates (Eds.) *Learning as Transformation. Critical Perspectives in a Theory in Progress*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 3-33
- Olsen, A. (2009) *Outcomes and impacts of international education on students*. In (De Wit, H. (ed.) *Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education*. EAIE Occasional Paper 22, Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, pp. 93-108
- Otterspeer, W, (2008) *Het Bolwerk van de Vrijheid*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751-783
- Popov, V., Noroozi, O., Barrett, J.B., Biemans, H.J.A., Teasley, S.D., Slof, B. and Mulder, M. (2014) Perceptions and experiences of, and outcomes for, university students in culturally

- diversified dyads in a computer-supported collaborative learning environment. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 32, 186-200
- Ramirez, Y. and Tejada, Á. (2018) Corporate governance of universities: improving transparency and accountability. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, 15(1), 29-39
- Rizvi, F. (2000) International education and the production of global imagination. In Burbules, N and Torres, C. (eds.) *Globalisation and education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge pp. 205-255
- RW³ CultureWizard (2016) Trends in global virtual teams – Virtual teams Survey Report – 2016. New York: RW³ CultureWizard.
- Selwyn, N. (2007) The use of computer technology in university teaching and learning: A critical perspective. *Journal of computer assisted learning* 23, 83-94
- Solem, M.N., Bell, S., Fournier, E., Gillespie, C., Lewitsky, M., and Lockton, H. (2003) Using the internet to support international collaborations for global geography education. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 27(3), 239-253
- Soria, K.M., and Troisi, J. (2014) Internationalization at Home Alternatives to Study Abroad: Implications for Students' Development of Global, International, and Intercultural Competencies. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 18(3), 261-280
- Spinelli, G. (2009) *Measuring the success of internationalisation: the case for joint and double degrees*. In (De Wit, H. (ed.) *Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education*. EAIE Occasional Paper 22, Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, pp. 49-56
- The Gallup Organization (2010) Flash Eurobarometer 304 – Employers' perception of graduate employability. Brussels: European Commission
- Tuning Educational Structures in Europe (2000) <http://tuning.unideusto.org/tuningeu/>
- Una, A. and Martin, B.R. (2003) University research evaluation and funding: An international comparison. *Minerva* 41, 277-304
- University of Oxford, International Strategy Office (2017) *International Trends in Higher Education 2016 – 17* Oxford: The University of Oxford
- Van Damme, D. (2001) Quality issues in the internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*, 41(4), 415-441
- Vande Berg, M., Connor-Linton, J., and Paige, M.R. (2009) The Georgetown Consortium Project: Interventions for Student Learning Abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* 18, 1-75
- Wagner, U., & Machleit, U. (1986). Contact and prejudice between Germans and Turks. *Human Relations*, 42, 561-574
- Waters, J. L. (2007) Roundabout routes and sanctuary schools: the role of situated educational practices and habitus in the creation of transnational professionals, *Global Networks*, 7(4), 477-497

Wiers-Jenssen, J. and Try, S. (2005) Labour market outcomes of higher education undertaken abroad. *Studies in Higher Education* 30(6), 681-705

Zaretsky, R. (2014) A Grand Tour *Virginia Quarterly Review* Winter:197-202

Zhu, X., Iles, P., and Shutt, J. (2011) Employability, skills and talent management in Zhejiang province. *Journal of Chinese Entrepreneurship*, 3(1), 24-35