Internationalisation in Associate degrees Level 5 / SCHE

Dr Robert Coelen
Professor of Internationalisation of Higher Education
NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences

FOREWORD

This reader is designed to give you background information before embarking on creating a learning track for internationalisation of associate degree programs. I am aware that such a track may compete with other priorities for space and time in the program, but I would like to stress the value of internationalisation learning outcomes. Not only do they just enhance students' abilities to work with individuals from other nations or ethnic backgrounds, but more generally it equips them to collaborate with diverse others regardless of the source of diversity. Indeed, for educators, the flip side of this coin is that other sources of diversity may also be used to engender the same skills, attitudes, values, and ethics. Notwithstanding this consideration, this reader also provides you with an impetus as to why international collaboration is gaining in importance more generally. This document also supplies an overview of current trends in Internationalisation of Higher Education (IoHE). It 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. Needless to say the recent developments as a result of the SARS-COV-2 pandemic have further enhanced the use of IaH as a mainstay of internationalisation activities. This may well have brought about a re-balancing of the two most frequently used components of such activities.

January 2022

Dr Robert Coelen
Professor of Internationalisation of Higher Education
NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences

Contents

Introduction

Background

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 near 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 in launching its 2021 – 2027 program has allocated B€ 26.2, which makes up almost 80% increase in funding (European Commission, 2021). 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 innovative 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 learn 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 call for 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 bachelor's degree programs is not 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 motivation for internationalisation of higher education have been variously categorised as serving academic, economic, political, and/or sociocultural purposes (De Wit, 2008; Knight, 2012), as well as the humanitarian rationale (Streitwieser et al., 2019). An institution of higher learning should therefore, at the outset figure out its rationales for internationalisation as they are important to define policy and strategy. These rationales may even differ depending on a program of study or discipline.

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 diverse needs depending on their discipline. A physics graduate's application of knowledge and skills is 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 of 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.

Competing priorities and multiculturalism

Another point to take into consideration is the effect of competing priorities that may affect the implementation of internationalisation activities. These maybe substantially different depending on the discipline and not really up for discussion here, save maybe for some priorities that involve collaboration with diverse others, where the source of diversity is not based on ethnicity or nationality. Such collaborations could involve other disciplines, or may be related to other diversities such as sexual orientation, religion, etc. One step towards understanding this is to view multiculturalism in a slightly different light.

When we discuss multiculturalism, the thoughts go out to ethnic or national diversity. However, if we work with the definition of Hofstede (2001, p. 9):

> *"...the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another."*

It becomes clear, that any grouping or categorising can lead to a different culture. Indeed, we speak of institutional culture, company culture, or on cultures based on religion, discipline, and a whole host of other diversity sources. Thus, competing priorities can at times be immensely helpful in developing skills, attitudes, values, and ethics that relate to collaborating with diverse others. Van der Zee and Van Oudenhoven (2001) for example developed a survey instrument (the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire or MPQ) that has survived many meta study analyses and most recently was confirmed in a short form for use with students (Hofhuis et al., 2020) to measure intercultural competence. This instrument investigates 5 factors, namely cultural empathy, open-mindedness, emotional stability, social initiative, and flexibility. An interesting observation is that the items in the short form that are associated with cultural empathy do not mention culture at all, but are more concerned with the empathic trait. This coupled with a new perspective on multiculturalism, as explained above, opens the door to the assumption that collaboration with diverse others regardless of the source of diversity may well require the same attitudes as those needed for intercultural collaboration, where intercultural is based on ethnicity and/or nationality as was intended by the MPQ. The flip side of this is that other sources of diversity may therefore also be used to engender attitudes as defined by the MPQ. This gives educators a greater range of options to develop collaboration skills.

Internationalisation of Level 5 education, why?

The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) is a statistical framework for organising information on education. This is maintained by UNESCO and the version adopted in 2011 has 8 levels of education. The 5th level is referred to as short-cycle tertiary education. In the European Qualifications Framework (EQF), this is also known as Level 5. Member states of the European Union are encouraged to develop their own National Qualifications Frameworks (NQFs) with reference to the EQF. One of the aims of this is to ease understanding of educational qualifications across the EU and so facilitate cross-border labour movement.

On 1 January 2020, twenty-three million non-EU citizens were living in the EU as part of a total population of 447.3 million (5.1%). In 2019, there were thirteen million working age intra-EU long-term movers, of which 9.9 million were employed or looking for work. In the same year there were another 1.5 million cross-border workers, who lived in their country of residence, but worked in another EU-country. Notwithstanding the departure of the UK from the EU, the growth in number of internationally mobile workers is likely to continue in the EU-27 area and national workforces are experiencing increased multi-national participation. This makes the ability to effectively communicate and collaborate with individuals from other cultures an indispensable skill in the workplace of today and tomorrow.

Germany for example, has an estimated labour force shortage of 400,000 people, and most of the vacancies require highly skilled persons (United Nations, 2021). Lifelong learning, already promoted for many decades takes on a new meaning in a world of work where change is increasing in pace. Indeed, it has been predicted (Illanes et al., 2018) that about 14% of the global workforce by 2030 may need to switch occupations because of the digital technical disruption of the fourth industrial revolution. Accelerated skills enhancement would ensure that people will be able to fill vacancies of newly created jobs that are complemented and augmented by technology. A report by Binvel et al. (2018) predicts a global talent deficit of more than eighty-five million workers across the twenty countries (both developed and developing) in major knowledge-intensive industries, with no less than 21% of this shortfall being persons who have completed post-secondary education. The advent of EQF level 5 programs in a number of countries is allowing increasingly employed individuals to upskill and for young people to aspire to further education without the commitment needed for a bachelor's degree. Indeed, many of the programs developed to date also allow the dual combination of work and study. This goes some way towards addressing the need to upskill. The development of EQF Level 5 allows educational institutes to learn how best to create programs that supply access to, and advancement in, the labour market.

The combination of labour market focussed programs and the developments in the labour market with respect to multinational participation make internationalisation of these programs an essential part. Internationalisation of programs by simply adding an international, intercultural, or global components, such as promulgated by early definitions (e.g., Knight, 2004), without declaring purpose has caused many educational institutions to be insufficiently focussed on the impact of such interventions on the individual student and has led to repetitions of similar activities at many levels of education. Only more recently, have higher education institutions begun to examine the learning outcomes of internationalisation activities. Indeed, in 2016 a learner-centred definition of internationalisation was coined (Coelen, 2016) that aimed to supply a learning environment in which learners could achieve the outcomes of intercultural competence and international awareness. Learning outcomes are statements about the skills and knowledge a students should have on completion successful completion of a course of study. Assessment stands between an intended learning outcome and one that has been achieved by a student (Biggs and Tang, 2011).

Using program learning outcomes enhances the chance that a full integration of the internationalisation intended learning outcomes and proper assessment occurs. It does however require that those educators responsible for the curriculum accord internationalisation a suitable place amongst the learning activities of the program.

Important 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 distinct 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 programs. Thus, universities must declare their purpose for IoHE, and this must be carried by the entire university community as well as external stakeholders. In effect this means that the potentially varied implementation of internationalisation in different disciplines must be given the space to be able to do this. Measurement of progress towards the stated goals for IoHE, provided there is proper attention and budget, can then be met with confidence. The extent of university autonomy is a crucial factor in deciding what achievements might be possible.

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 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 looking to create a similar effort should ensure, if it is based on another instrument, that it is contextualised appropriately.

Learner-centred Education and IoHE

Whilst learner-centred education is not an approach that works under all circumstances (Schweisfurth, 2019), it has in many situations been adopted as a modern and progressive pedagogy, often related to specific methods such as activity-based, problem-based, or inquiry-based learning. These would seem also appropriate methods for Level 5 programs, given the diversity of modes of delivery and participants in these programs.

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 diverse backgrounds the opportunity arises to make use of these diverse 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 use 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 (2105, 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 key 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 several 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 because 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, universities created dedicated international mobility offices to take care of the increased workload.

This had the unintended consequence of academicslosing touch with where their students were going for their international mobile periods. Thebureaucratisation of the student international mobility process took away the attention thatacademics 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 ofinternationalisation 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 andassociates 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 internationalisationexperts did not feel their disciplinary counterparts had sufficient knowledge of the potentialeffects 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 ensurethat IoC happens in a sustainable way. This is the fourth important trend in IoHE. We can nolonger 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 evena 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 ofexample, 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 ensuremaximum benefit for their graduates.

Technological advances

One of the major disrupting global forces and the fifth trend that needs to be borne in mindis that of the advancement of technology. Despite much enthusiasm of educational technologists and substantial amounts of money spent on ICT at universities, there is a dichotomybetween 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 expertise 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 to say 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). Indeed, the flight to online learning as experienced during the SARS-COV-2 pandemic at all levels of education have created even greater impetus to examine how ICT can enhance education and support a more flexible participation.

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 later use (Solem et al., 2003; Popov et al., 2014). Nevertheless, the use of collaborative online work is experiencing a strong increase (RW^3 CultureWizard, 2016). The use of online collaboration across borders in the classroom would at once enhance graduates' employability and, if properly executed, also aid in enhancing opportunities for intercultural learning and collaboration. Again, the SARS-COV-2 pandemic has further enhanced the use of online work and collaboration. Many organisations have experienced somewhat of a paradigm shift in the need to be present at the workplace at all times.

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 must 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 take part 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 looking 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 is still 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 to allow 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 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 showed that significant preparation is needed 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 Communique 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 learningenvironments and in fully exploiting the potential benefits of digitaltechnologies 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 published the revised Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). These held 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 andcommunicated, 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 theirpersonal development and may be applied in their future careers.*
>
> *Programmes*
>
> - *are designed with overall programme objectives that are in line with theinstitutional 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 apply 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, enablingflexible 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*

Altogether, 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 ESGasks 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 two 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 conferintercultural 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, whichensures 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 truly clear. Nevertheless, if the Europeanambitious target of 20% mobility were to be reached by 2020, that leaves in Europe 80% ofstudents non-mobile for all the reasons mentioned above. In many other parts of the worldthe credit mobility concerns even fewer students. The major benefit of IaH is therefore large and affects the majority of students. Indeed, if conducted well, it also affects themobile 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 two learning outcomes international awareness and intercultural competence be given time on campus? 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 needed for this also includes an interactive perspective as put forward by Allport (1954), who hypothesised that frequent andin-depth interaction with members of different social out-groups would enhance intergroupharmony. 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 ofhumility 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 needed with sufficientfrequency.

- *equal status* be afforded to all participants, avoiding the potential stereotypicprejudices that might exist.

- *cooperative interactions*, as distinct from competitive (e.g., cooperative grouplearning).

Later 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 a significant role in creating an opportunity todevelop 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 whichthe 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 soughtto engender the IoHE associated learning outcomes (however that might have been framed).Perhaps this is a testament to the much of the original intention of international mobility, whichwas that of obtaining cognitive inputs that were not available on the home campus. Thus, for area studies such mobility was considered 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 toEurope (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 increasingly focused on the acquisition of intercultural competence and global awareness. It has since become clearthat 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 can occur, even more surprising, since the educators at home relinquish

this control to their foreign counterparts who may ormay not be trained to deal with this. For institutes that are well advanced in the developmentof 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 at once connects well to the observations of Jos Beelen (2016) who hasshown 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 proper interventions in relation to study abroad, are not enough to unlock thefull potential of all graduates.

Difference between Study Abroad and IaH

From a collective view of chapters in a book by 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 abilityto work in teams, to be flexible, agile thinking, problems solving ability, communication, and a host of other aspects are developed through mere participation in study abroad. Theyapparently require no specific interventions. It should be noted however that from recent studies that students who participate in study abroad maybe self-selected (mobility is not often a compulsory part of a program, unless students are notified at the outset) as posited by Wiers-Jenssen et al. (2020). Van Mol et al. (2020) demonstrated that when controlling for selection into international student mobility using propensity score matching the apparent labour market advantages (measured as time to transfer from study to work and salary) enjoyed by internationally mobile bachelor's students and to a lesser extent master's degree students disappeared, suggesting the absence of a causal relationship between international mobility and labour market advantage. Netz and Grüttner (2020) used a similar approach of propensity score matching and suggested that graduates from a high social origin benefit more from international mobility. It remains to be researched whether the prior existence of characteristics that are said to be enhanced by a period of study abroad are further developed by this, or whether they would also increase in the absence of study abroad in persons already equipped with higher levels of these characteristics.

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 experiencingactivities under the banner of IaH, is not really outside their zone of comfort and may not beexperiencing 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 becomesimportant 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 needed for universities to maximise the development of their graduates. The majority of tertiary studentsaround the globe, in the near 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, while 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 graduatesare 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 Programsare 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, Universitá Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan

Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). *Redefining internationalization at home.* In A. Curai, 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

Biggs, J. and Tang, C. (2011) *Teaching for Quality Learning at University.* New York: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill.

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 mobilityon the skills and employability of students and the internationalisation of higher education institution*s. 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) InJones, 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 Global and Local Internationalization, Jones, E., Coelen, R.J., Beelen, J. and De Wit, H, Sense Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands

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

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 Dymanics 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,

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.

diversified dyads in a computer-supported collaborative learning environment. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 32, 186-200

E. (Eds.) Internationalisation of Higher Education Brussels: European Union

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

European Commission (2021). The new Erasmus+ programme for 2021-2027 has launched! Retrieved from https://www.eacea.ec.europa.eu/news-events/news/new-erasmus-programme-2021-2027-has-launched-2021-03-25_en on 11 January 2022.

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 abroadon 21st century skills & career prospects in the United States*. New York: Institute ofInternational 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

H. (ed.) Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education. EAIE OccasionalPaper 22, Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, pp. 93-108

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 opportunitiesand 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

Hofhuis, J., Jongerling, J, Van der Zee, K.I., and Jansz, J. (2020) Validation of the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire Short Form (MPQ-SF) for use in the context of international education, Plos One 15(12):e244425, https://doi.org/ 10.1371/journal.pone.0244425

Hofstede, G. (2001) Culture's consequences. Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and organisations across nations. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications

Huba, M., and Freed, J. (2000) Learner-centred 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 trough diversity. London: McKinsey & Company

Illanes, P., Lund, S., Mourshed, M. Rutherford, S., and Tyreman, M (2018) Retraining and reskilling workers in the age of automation. McKinsey and Company

Journal of Studies in International Education 8(1), 5-31

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, ApproaInternationalizationches, 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 Wa4chter, 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.

Netz, N. and Grüttner, M. (2020) Does the effect of studying abroad on labour income vary by graduates' social origin? Evidence from Germany. *Higher Education* https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00579-2

Olsen, A. (2009) *Outcomes and impacts of international education on students*. In (De Wit,

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

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

RW[3] CultureWizard (2016) Trends in global virtual teams – Virtual teams Survey Report – 2016.New York: RW[3] CultureWizard.

Schweisfurth, M. (2019) Is learner-centred education 'best practice'? Education Think Pieces, Unicef. Retrieved from https://www.unicef.org/esa/sites/unicef.org.esa/files/2019-08/ThinkPiece_9_LearnerCentredEducation.pdf on 11 January 2022.

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

Streitwieser, B., Loo, B., Ohorodnik, M., & Jeong, J. (2019). Access for Refugees Into Higher Education: A Review of Interventions in North America and Europe. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *23*(4), 473–496.

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

United Nations (2021) World Economic Situation and Prospects: November 2021 Briefing, No. 155 Retrieved from: https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/publication/world-economic-situation-and-prospects-november-2021-briefing-no-155/

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

Van der Zee, K.I. and Van Oudenhoven, J.P. (2001) The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire: Reliability and Validity of Self- and Other Ratings of Multicultural Effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 35, 278-288.

Van Mol, C, Caarls, K & Souto-Otero, M, 2020, 'International student mobility and labour market outcomes: an investigation of the role of level of study, type of mobility, and international prestige hierarchies', *Higher Education*, doi 10.1007/s10734-020-00532-3.

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

Wiers-Jenssen, J, Tillman, M, & Matherly, C, 2020, *Employability: how education abroad impacts the transition to graduate employment*, In A Ogden, B Streitwieser, & C Van Mol (eds.), Education abroad: bridging scholarship and practice. Routledge, New York

World Economic Forum (2021) Investment in upskilling could boost global GDP by $6.5 trillion by 2030. Retrieved from: https://www.weforum.org/press/2021/01/investment-in-upskilling-could-boost-global-gdp-by-6-5-trillion-by-2030/

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