

WENDY GREEN AND CRAIG WHITSED

1. INTRODUCING CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES ON INTERNATIONALISING THE CURRICULUM

INTRODUCTION

The idea for this book was conceived one fine spring day in a meeting room at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan. An eager and very international group of policy makers, researchers and teaching academics from a range of disciplines had gathered at the University's Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation to discuss the topic 'Internationalisation at Home: 10 years on'. Mindful that the first conference on 'Internationalisation at Home' had taken place in Malmö exactly 10 years earlier a retrospective discussion about its impact seemed particularly timely.

We all agreed that in recognising the untapped potential for learning at home on multicultural campuses, 'internationalisation at home' had heralded a radical departure in the conceptualisation and practice of international education. Originating in North Western Europe, it spread across Europe and connected with similar concepts developed on other continents, such as 'internationalisation of the curriculum' (Australia) and 'comprehensive internationalisation' (USA). All of these concepts concern a common goal: to intentionally develop international and intercultural knowledge, skills and attitudes in all students. But, ten years on, how much had been achieved? Several of us shared our sense of frustration at the slow rate of progress in achieving this goal for all students, just as others have before us (cf. Leask & Bridge, 2013). As one of the disciplinary academics among us put it:

The concept is all very well, but how do I get started? I understand the idea but I can't see what's behind it. I can't find a direction. It's all too abstract, ideological even. It doesn't take you anywhere.

As academics who both teach students and advise colleagues on their teaching, these words resonated with us deeply. Many universities have bold statements in their strategic plans about the value and place of internationalisation in their institution. However, when it comes to operationalising internationalisation at the teaching learning interface, many academics say they are exasperated by what they see as a hollow shell behind the rhetoric. Little attention has been given to what these concepts mean in practice, how they can be conceived, implemented and assessed within specific disciplines, and across degree programmes. Academic voices have

largely been silent in the literature on international education to date. This is a problem because internationalisation addressed through the curriculum – like any curriculum development – can only come to life in disciplinary contexts. Differences between disciplines extend far beyond the content they teach; they ‘go to the heart of teaching, research and student-faculty relationships’ (Becher & Trowler, 2001, p. 4). For this reason, ‘internationalisation of the curriculum’ is best thought of as a construct, or way of thinking about curricula and teaching/learning, rather than a set of prescribed practices (Curro & McTaggart, 2003).

To address the challenge of realising IoC in specific disciplinary contexts, the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) funded a National Teaching Fellowship project, ‘Internationalisation of the Curriculum (IoC) in Action’ led by ALTC Fellow, Betty Leask. This project involved teams of academics in several different disciplines in Australian universities. Each team addressed the question:

How can we internationalise the curriculum in this discipline area, in this particular institutional context, and ensure that, as a result, we improve the learning outcomes of all students?

As a result of Leask’s project, we now have a range of disciplinary case studies that contextualise the process of internationalising the curriculum in Australian universities (Leask, 2013). It is our intention here to extend Leask’s work by foregrounding academics’ perspectives, in their different disciplines and locales, as they engage with internationalisation of the curriculum. We asked academics in the disciplines of business, education and health to describe and reflect on their joys, frustrations, challenges, achievements, and importantly the outcomes for their students as they have engaged with IoC. Individually and collectively their stories draw out similarities and differences across and within disciplines in different institutional, national and regional contexts. They bring new ways of thinking about the possibilities and processes of internationalising teaching and learning. In keeping with our aim to foreground academic voices, each of the contributions is narrative in style. The emphasis is on real stories, which reflect on the process, as well as the outcomes of the practice of internationalising the curriculum.

In this introductory chapter, we consider the importance of narratives to the study of international curriculum development, both as a research methodology and a way of changing practice. Through the richness and vivacity of storytelling we hope to add new understanding to the internationalisation of the curriculum in action. But, before we discuss the value of this narrative approach, it will be helpful to place it in context, by reviewing the historical development of ‘internationalisation of the curriculum’ (IoC) and considering its increasing relevance in a rapidly globalising world. We begin by outlining the fundamental conceptual shift in international education, from a narrow focus on mobility for some, to a broader vision of internationalised learning for all – whether they are at home or abroad. While tracing the parallel development of the concepts ‘internationalisation at home’, ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ and ‘internationalisation of the curriculum’ (IoC), and recognising all as valuable

and convergent concepts, we concentrate on IoC as the primary framing device in this book.

CONVERGING NOTIONS: I@H, IOC AND COMPREHENSIVE
INTERNATIONALISATION

Historically, internationalisation in the European and North American higher education sectors has largely focused on outward-bound student mobility while British, Australian and New Zealand efforts have largely focussed on developing higher education as an export industry and increasing the flow of incoming international students. Yet, during the past two decades, universities in each of these regions have begun to recognise and address a new responsibility, namely: to prepare students to live and work effectively and ethically in an increasingly interconnected world. It is this sense of responsibility that is driving the shifting focus in the internationalisation discourse in many countries. There is a growing understanding that opportunities for developing intercultural and global perspectives, understandings and skills must be woven into the fabric of the formal and informal curriculum, and that this is particularly important for non-mobile domestic students, who form the majority in many universities.

This shift is evident in the policy statements of countless universities, yet realising it at the coalface of teaching and learning is another matter. One significant challenge is the multiple and contested understandings of internationalisation particularly among those at the coalface.

According to Altbach et al. (2009, p. 24) internationalisation is:

notable for the multiple ways in which it has manifested itself around the world. Although each local, national, and regional context presents unique characteristics, several broad trends can be identified globally.

Similarly, Knight (2008, p. 1) observes that internationalisation is understood in a diverse range of ways, and appears in a variety of ways in the literature and in practice. No universally embraced definition of internationalization has emerged to date. Consequently, several broad-based labels for internationalisation have evolved and new labels are advanced to encapsulate it (Whitsed & Green, 2013). Marginson and Sawir (2011, p. 14) observe internationalisation has been a 'familiar' term, and maintain this is problematic because 'internationalisation' is then 'subjected to extensive and varied use in research and discussion'. Or in other words, it is now 'multivocal' (Turner, 1977). Consequently, it is deployed in multiple, competing and contradictory ways and purposes by stakeholders.

While internationalisation remains a contested site two observations can be made. First, in general terms, internationalisation is represented as a response to globalisation and is often conceptualised in terms of inputs and processes, such as specific policy initiatives (Altbach, 2002), systematic efforts (Van der Wende, 1996), or institutional level structural adjustments (Harman, 2005), rather than rather than the impact these

activities have on those who engage in them. Second, the diverse range of definitions and subsequent approaches to internationalisation often impede understandings and result in diverse, often fragmented approaches to endeavours for curriculum internationalisation. Combined, these factors contribute to a state where academics are unsure about or lack confidence to address the *inter*-personal, -relational, and -cultural dimensions afforded by an internationalised curriculum. That said, several attempts have been made to conceptualise and define an approach to whole-of-curriculum design that will result in all students developing intercultural, globally orientated perspectives, skills, mind sets and dispositions. Three approaches have evolved over time and established themselves as dominant framing devices within the internationalisation discourse. These are: internationalisation at home (I@H); ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ (Hudzik, 2011); and, internationalisation of the curriculum (IoC). All three approaches, according to Knight (2008), draw attention to the aspects of internationalisation that happen on ‘home campuses’, including ‘the intercultural and international dimensions in the teaching-learning process and research, extracurricular activities, and relationships with local and ethnic groups, as well as the integration of foreign students and scholars into campus life and activities’.

In the European context where I@H developed, Bengt Nilsson¹ is credited with drawing attention to the importance of addressing the intercultural learning, diversity and higher education nexus (Otten, 2003). IaH was, in part, a reaction to the perceived failure of the ‘initial Erasmus Programme’ to internationalise learning for the vast majority students who were not likely to be mobile (Wächter, 2003, p. 5). Whereas internationalisation in Europe had largely focused on student and academic mobility, I@H offered ‘an understanding of internationalisation that went beyond mobility and [placed] a strong emphasis on the teaching and learning in a culturally diverse setting’ (Wächter, 2003, p. 6). As Leask and Beelen (2009, p. 2) observe, I@H requires curriculum to include ‘international elements for all students’, with the goal being to equip them with the competencies required to interact and work in increasingly culturally diverse local and international contexts.

More recently, in the American internationalisation discourse, under the banner of ‘comprehensive internationalisation,’ Hudzik (2011) likewise argued the importance of including the intercultural dimensions of internationalisation in the curriculum at home institutions. Hudzik (2011, p. 6) defines ‘comprehensive internationalization’ as ‘a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research and service mission of higher education’. In an interview with us (Whitsed & Green, 2012), Hudzik stressed that the ‘core mission [of higher education] is the production of graduates who can live, work and contribute as productive citizens in an increasingly fluid and borderless global context’. Thus, he concluded: ‘you can’t have comprehensive internationalisation without internationalisation of the curriculum’.

Closely related to I@H and comprehensive internationalisation, ‘internationalisation of the curriculum’ (IoC) emerged in the Australian context, in

part, to address the issue of the large non-mobile student population, and, in part, as a reaction to the commercialisation and commodification of higher education. While I@H and IoC evolved out of a similar desire to foreground the intercultural and knowledge dimensions of internationalisation, there are subtle differences between the two conceptualisations (Leask & Beelen, 2009). I@H is defined as ‘any international activity with the exception of outbound student and staff mobility’ (Wächter, 2003), and IoC, was defined originally as ‘[c]urricula with an international orientation in content, aimed at preparing students for performing (professionally/ socially) in an international and multicultural context and designed for domestic students as well as foreign students’ (Bremer & van der Wende, 1995, as cited in Caruana & Hanstock, 2003, p. 4).

This definition was taken up by the OECD, as well as IDP, and many universities particularly in Australia. More recently however, the following definition offered by Leask (2009, p. 209) has gained prominence:

Internationalisation of the curriculum is the incorporation of an international and intercultural dimension into the preparation, delivery and outcomes of a program of study.

Leask’s rewriting of the original definition is valuable for two reasons: it explicitly refers to the intercultural and it includes outcomes. Expressing similar concerns to de Wit (2011a & b), Leask (2005) stresses that internationalisation of a curriculum should not be seen as an ‘end’ in itself, but rather as ‘a strategy which will assist learners to become more aware of their own and others cultures’. Hence the importance of focussing on what students learn from an internationalised curriculum.

Several scholars have offered definitions for the learning outcomes of IoC. Drawing out areas of agreement within the literature, the Centre for International Curriculum Inquiry and Networking (CICIN), in Oxford, UK articulated three intended outcomes of an internationalised curriculum, which were summarised by Green and Mertova (2009, p. 31) in the following manner:

1. *Global perspectives*: ‘As well as disciplinary knowledge, IoC demands knowledge of other countries and cultures and competence in other languages’. This requirement underscores the importance of interdisciplinary education, because it entails ‘historical, local and global perspectives’.
2. *Intercultural competence*: Essentially ‘intercultural competence involves a sensitivity to the perspectives of others, a willingness to try and put oneself in the shoes of others and see how things look from their perspective (Clifford, 2008 citing Olson & Kroeger, 2001)’. In addition, the ability to communicate with people from cultures other than one’s own is generally thought to require an understanding of the nature of racism.
3. *Responsible global citizenship*: This means understanding the ‘necessity’ to ‘engage with issues of equity and social justice, sustainability and the reduction

of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination'. This final goal, being a global citizen, is understood to underpin the previous two.

Drawing on a range of authors including Rizvi (2000), McTaggart (2003), Leask (2005) and Whalley et al. (1997), Jones and Killick (2007, p. 112) developed an expanded list of learning outcomes encompassed by internationalised curricula. These include:

- understanding the global nature of economic, political and cultural exchange;
- demonstrating culturally inclusive behaviour;
- viewing change as positive;
- engaging critically with the global plurality of knowledge;
- appreciating that knowledge is constructed differently in diverse cultures;
- being aware of one's own cultures and perspectives;
- being able to identify ethical issues that may arise in their personal and professional; live in international and/or intercultural contexts;
- valuing cultural and linguistic diversity;
- applying critical thinking skills to problems with an international or intercultural dimension;
- reflecting critically on one's own cultural identity and its social construction;
- recognising and appreciating different cultural perspectives on the same issues; and,
- developing a global imagination.

According to Jones and Killick (2007), the degree to which curricula in any university address these outcomes is determined to some extent by the rationale underpinning IoC initiatives. The more mature, complex and 'values-based' the model of an internationalised curriculum, the more it will encompass skills and attitudes as well as knowledge. Achieving these goals requires the active engagement of academic staff in each discipline (Clifford, 2009). While university administrators need to provide clear policies and strategies regarding IoC, academics within the disciplines need to be intellectually engaged with the concepts, and to understand the rationale for IoC.

In short, academics are pivotal to the realisation of the goals of IoC, just as they are to the goals of I@H and comprehensive internationalisation. Hudzik (2011, p. 29), like Leask and Beelen (2009) argues, 'the most important variable in comprehensive internationalization is the faculty' [If they are not brought into the] process effectively, they may see this variously as an inconvenience, as interference in academic freedom, a challenge, and something distasteful'. Hudzik (2011) maintains that without faculty support and participation 'comprehensive internationalisation,' will not be realised. Similarly, Jones and Killick (2007) observe that cultural change of the type required to sustainably and organically nurture, grow and support an internationalised curriculum 'cannot be effected by university edict alone; it requires the creative utilisation of the imagination and agency of those who comprise the

INTRODUCING CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES ON INTERNATIONALISING THE CURRICULUM

university' (p. 114). Academics are the nexus, positioned at the interface of the institutional rhetoric and the realisation of students' learning, so their engagement with the aims of IoC and the teaching and learning practices required to achieve these aims is vital.

INTERNATIONALISATION OF THE CURRICULUM IN ACTION

Betty Leask's ALTC Fellowship, 'Internationalising the curriculum (IoC) in action' (2012) places academics and their disciplines at the heart of the *process* of curriculum development. At the same time, Leask's (with Bridge, 2013, p. 81) very 'broad conceptualisation of curriculum', which encompasses 'all aspects of the teaching/learning situation and the student experience', is likely to be at odds with understandings in many disciplines, which have generally not considered the influencing potential of informal dimensions of curriculum. Furthermore, Leask and Bridge (2013, p. 82) emphasise the impact of the 'often over looked' hidden curriculum. By 'hidden curriculum' they mean the implicit understandings concerning 'power and authority' structures inherent in a discipline or school/faculty, through which one comes to understand 'what and whose knowledge is valued and not valued'. Thus, the process of curriculum internationalisation must involve a critical exploration of the foundations of one's knowledge within one's discipline. Such explorations need to question the discipline's fundamental assumptions and how these work to either afford or constrain the development of the intercultural and global perspectives expected in an internationalised curriculum.

Such a critical engagement with disciplinary knowledge necessarily places academic staff at the centre of curriculum internationalisation. Academic/teaching staff are 'the primary architects' of the curriculum (Leask & Bridge, 2013); it is they who set the aims and objects, design the course(s) of instruction, select the content, determine the methods of teaching and instruction and the set the learning tasks and assessments. If internationalisation of the curriculum is to be fully realised it is vital their centrality in the process is recognised. Yet, academic staff are often 'uncertain what internationalisation of the curriculum means or do not think it has anything to do with them' (Leask & Bridge, 2013, p. 80, also Clifford, 2009; Green & Whitsed 2013; Leask, 2013). Indeed, as Rizvi and Lingard (2009, p. 173) observe, 'the appeal of the idea of internationalization of the curriculum appears ubiquitous, [but] it is not always clear what it means and how it might represent a new way of prioritizing and organizing learning'.

In the following section we discuss three major challenges to bringing IoC to life in the disciplines: the intercultural dimension and its implications for personal and professional development; the invisibility of the 'curriculum' itself in higher education (Barnett & Coate, 2005); and the nature of disciplinary cultures and practices.

THE CHALLENGES OF MOVING FROM CONCEPT TO ACTION

Doing IoC is undeniably challenging work. Not only does it require critical engagement with the foundations of one's disciplinary knowledge, but also with the ways of teaching and assessing student learning. Thus, there needs to be a 'continuous effort focussed on the nature of knowledge, pedagogy, learning processes, content and the achievement of outcomes' (Leask & Beelen, p. 6). Internationalisation of course content alone typically fails to develop the intercultural dimensions because it fails to address issues of identity and engagement (Liddicoat, Eisenchlas, & Trevaske, 2003, p. 19). Not surprisingly then, many academics feel under-informed, under-supported, under-prepared and under-confident when it comes to IoC (Leask & Beelen, 2009; Green & Whitsed, 2013).

For educators as well as students the intercultural dimension of IoC is particularly challenging because it necessarily 'involves epistemological explorations [into] some of the thinking which informs an interdisciplinary notion of "intercultural"' (Crichton et al., 2004, p. 42, 44). Also essential is the development of reflexivity. Again, according to Crichton et al. (2004, p. 5):

Understanding one's own linguistic, socio-cultural, political, ethical and educational constructs, values and beliefs, and their formation due to one's own enculturation based on the interrelation of language, culture, and learning has continuous relevancy in the ongoing project of intercultural teaching and learning across curriculum that aspires to 'internationalisation'.

Hence, the 'internationalisation of the academic Self' (Sanderson, 2008) is vital for IoC; in other words it may require personal as well as curriculum transformation. Several studies suggest that parochial attitudes among academic staff are likely to be a major inhibitor of IoC (e.g., Bond et al., 2003; Teekens, 2003). If today's 'ideal graduate' is an interculturally sensitive and competent, socially responsible, globally aware citizen, it follows that the ideal lecturer is one who 'broad[ens] curricula and incorporate[s] pedagogic approaches... [who, above all] recognises that this requires us to challenge our Western template of knowledge and pedagogy' (Shiel, 2006, p. 20). Facilitating the learning of the 'ideal graduate' calls for skills and attributes many academics feel they do not have (Leask, 2004). This is further evidenced when considering the range of skills that have been linked to intercultural competence in Management Education literature. For example, Bird, Mendenhall, Stevens and Oddou (2010) cluster 17 skills around three dimensions: relationship, personal and perception management. These include mental flexibility, non-judgementalness, cosmopolitanism, emotional sensitivity, self-awareness and stress management. In the context of 'global skills' development, which is an important aspect of IoC, Bird et al. (2010) highlight the lack of direction, support and guidance provided to academics to develop and assess such skills in their students through their teaching.

A further challenge is suggested by Barnett and Coate's interrogation of the concept of 'curriculum' in higher education (also see Barnett, 1997; Barnett, Parry, & Coate, 2001). These authors observe that projects in higher education focusing on teaching and learning are proliferating, yet ironically scant attention is being paid to curriculum. A number of reasons for this silence are offered including sensitivities 'associated with values and interests of different stakeholders' (Barnett & Coate, 2005, p. 151). At a more fundamental level there is 'the invisibility of the curricula' itself in universities. As Barnett and Coate (2005, p. 152) put it: '[c]urriculum... has a will-o-the-wisp quality'. While Barnett acknowledged back in 1997 that notions of curriculum in higher education were beginning to change, our experience tells us that this is occurring unevenly across disciplines and universities. We concur with Barnett and Coate's (2005, p. 2) observation that curriculum design is rarely a reflective practice in universities. Like the intercultural dimension, the invisibility of the curriculum has profound implications for the kind of academic staff development required for IoC.

Finally, there is the reality of differing understandings of knowledge, ways of teaching, learning, assessing, and researching within disciplines (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Neumann, Parry, & Becher, 2002). For this reason, top-down management driven measures to implement IoC policy are bound to be ineffective. We know this from experience. Curriculum development and teaching are practices situated and embedded within specific disciplines and disciplinary units (variously known as departments, schools or faculties). Thus, faculty academics have been defined as the 'gatekeepers' or 'harbingers' of curriculum change, because 'basic changes in the curriculum do not occur until faculty in their disciplinary and departmental areas are ready to implement them' (Groenings & Wiley cited in Green & Schoenberg, 2006, p. 4).

Given the challenging and ongoing nature of curriculum development, it is essential that academics become intellectually engaged with the concept of IoC and enabled to interpret it within their own situated practice; that is, within their disciplinary communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), which enable and/or constrain innovation. As we have argued previously (Green & Whitted, 2013), a critical understanding of how academics learn to teach within disciplinary communities of practice, or 'teaching and learning regimes' (Trowler & Cooper, 2002) is essential if we are to understand what blocks and enables disciplinary teams to internationalise their curriculum.

In their critique and extension of Lave and Wenger's conceptualisation of communities of practices, Kemmis and Groontenboer (2008, p. 51) underscore the socio-cultural, political and economic factors, which 'prefigure practices, enabling and constraining particular kinds of sayings, doings, and relatings among people within them, and in relation to others outside of them'. Thus, the individual and the social are mutually constituted; knowledge and identity – the (self) understandings,

values and skills of individuals – are constituted through engaging with culture and discourses, the social structures, the material-economic arrangements of the worlds they inhabit (Kemmis & Grootenboer, 2008, p. 55). Kemmis and Smith (2008, p. 4) contend that teachers can respond in two different ways to this dialectic between the individual and the extra-individual in the workplace: *praxis* and practice. *Praxis*, they define as a morally committed and informed practice, which is based on an understanding of the interrelationship between the self, others and their conditions of practice. In contrast, practice implies a certain disinterest, or lack of understanding of the wider implications of one's actions. In short, practice concerns pragmatism and survival, while *praxis* involves both personally transformative learning and collective action in the wider socio-cultural context of the discipline (Green, Hibbins, Houghton, & Ruutz, 2013).

In our view, doing IoC effectively means engaging in *praxis*. We have already argued that IoC involves personal transformation through the 'internationalisation of the academic Self' (Sanderson, 2008). As we will elaborate in the next section, it also involves challenging the 'sayings, doings and relatings' – in other words, the 'practice architectures' (Kemmis & Grootenboer, 2008) – within disciplinary units. Fostering IoC *praxis* calls for a particular approach to personal and professional development for individual academics and disciplinary teams. Formal, structured, top-down approaches to staff development largely fail to engage academics, or meet their needs precisely, we suggest because they promote practice rather than *praxis*.

The approach Leask took to academic staff development in her 'IoC in action' Fellowship (2012) was based on a deep appreciation of the need to empower academics to make necessary personal and collective changes for themselves within their own disciplinary contexts. The project she developed, involved working with disciplinary teams across several disciplines in several Australian universities to explore academics' understandings of IoC and their perceptions of what enabled and blocked its development. In the model Leask and Bridge (2013) developed based on this Fellowship work (Figure 1), the place of disciplinary knowledge is foregrounded as a critical determinant in the conceptualisation and practice of IoC. Importantly, however, disciplinary knowledge (its ways of knowing, seeing and doing) is nested within and shaped by the institutional, local, national, regional and finally global context. Leask and Bridge's framework suggests that while broad disciplinary areas such as business, health and education might share commonalities, differences will arise due to the dynamic interrelationships between these contextual layers. Furthermore, dominant and emergent paradigms within a discipline, the requirements of relevant professional bodies and practices, assessment practices, and even the approach to developing learning outcomes are all influenced by the nested context in which these activities take place.



Figure 1. IoC conceptual framework (Leask & Bridge, 2013)

To internationalise the curriculum Leask (2013) stresses the importance of disrupting the hegemonic forces (implicit and explicit) within disciplines that constrain curriculum innovation. Creating the space for criticality and reflexivity can open the curriculum to new imaginings, and new ways of thinking (Leask, 2013; also Green & Whitsed, 2013). Achieving this openness means involving whole disciplinary teaching teams, precisely because disciplinary ‘teaching and learning regimes’ (TLR) (Trowler & Cooper, 2002) have the power to constrain or foster innovation. Unless they are encouraged and supported to be otherwise, academic staff are likely to be constrained by their particular TLR, ‘culturally bound’ by their ‘own disciplinary training and thinking’, and thus blinkered to the possibilities for IoC.

In light of the contingent, situated nature of IoC (Leask & Bridge, 2013), Leask developed and trialled a process for IoC development. Essentially, this process is a form of Critical Participatory Action Research (CPAR) (Kemmis, 2007), whereby teams of academics responsible for the curriculum within a discipline actively inquired into their own teaching and their students’ learning in order to inform their understandings and make improvements (Leask & Bridge, 2013; Green & Whitsed, 2013). Although diagrams of action research with their distinctive phases

– review, planning, action, evaluation (Kemmis, 2007) – typically suggest that such an approach to IoC will be neat and formulaic it is anything but. Effectively done, CPAR is participatory, reflective, critical and on-going (Kemmis, 2007). It allows for multiple cycles of engagement, investigation and collaboration (Green & Whitsed, 2013). And importantly, it engages an often neglected element in action research – the imagination of the participants – which fuels the creativity necessary to produce curriculum change (Green & Whitsed, 2013; Leask & Bridge, 2013). Hence, Leask’s (2013) process model of IoC development involves five phases: reviewing, imagining, planning, acting, evaluating (and back to reviewing, and so on).

While Leask’s IoC process can be applied by individual academics to their particular units of instruction, it is essentially premised on a team-based approach. This is because the complex, higher order learning outcomes associated with IoC call for a developmental approach to curriculum development. Indeed, the value of collectively reviewing IoC across whole programs of study (degrees) was recognised by all participants in Leask’s project. This was particularly the case in teams situated in disciplinary units, which had taken a heavily modular approach to curriculum ‘design’ (irony intended). As one participant in the project observed, there was value in revealing ‘the disconnect between the units of study’ (Green & Whitsed, 2013, p. 156). This participant’s team concluded that their modularised curriculum made it difficult for academics in her school to develop shared understandings and practices, and it made it difficult for her students to negotiate developmental learning pathways through their degree programme. In other words, curricular modularisation in and of itself acted as a ‘blocker’ (Leask, 2015) to IoC in that context.

Our ongoing collaboration with Betty Leask has been integral to our own learning and thinking about IoC. Our work with her has engaged us in reflection and deliberation, leading and guiding, giving and taking. It has deepened our understanding of the interrelationship between ourselves, our disciplinary ‘others’ and their conditions of practice. In other words, it has engaged us in *praxis*. As such, it has and continues to be an ongoing process of constructing, interrogating and reconstructing meaning through our stories of practice.

TELLING STORIES: WHY IOC NARRATIVES?

Teaching in universities is complex work, fraught with contradiction, and often messy (Jones, 2013). When planning this book, we invited contributors to take the ‘narrative turn’ (Kohler-Riessman, 2008), evident in the social sciences since the 1980s, in order to construct, interrogate, evaluate and reflect on this messy work. We were keen to take this approach because it promised to provide a way of analysing the complex, non-linear and necessarily contextual process of curriculum development. In effect, the ‘narrative turn’ we refer to has included four interrelated moves: the acceptance of narrative as a particular way of knowing; a move from numbers to

stories as data; a shift from a focus on the universal and disembodied to the local and specific; and a shift in the relationship between the researcher and the people participating as subjects (Clandinin, 2007, p. 9).

In considering ‘narrative as a way of knowing’, Clandinin and Rosiek (2007, p. 35) point out that:

human beings have lived out and told stories about that living for as long as we could talk. And then we have talked about the stories we tell for almost as long. These lived and told stories and the talk about the stories are one of the ways that we fill our world with meaning and enlist one another’s assistance in building lives and communities.

Bruner (1985) argues that the narrative ‘mode of thought’ is a particular form of human knowledge, which he refers to as ‘narrative cognition’. This, he argues, is fundamentally different from the scientific (positivist) mode, which has often dominated discussions of epistemology. According to Bruner, human beings have no other way of describing and making sense of lived time than in narrative form. Foundational to narrative research then is the idea that knowledge gleaned from lived experience can be created by and held in stories. The story tellers themselves construct meaning by putting ‘data’ into their own words and revealing the latent or implicit meanings of their actions. This acknowledgement of the story tellers as creators and communicators of knowledge resonates with Leask’s (2013) model for IoC within disciplines, in that the latter positions the academic staff as architects, owners and directors of the process of curriculum internationalisation.

The narrative turn has much to offer educational research. As John Dewey once observed, ‘the study of education is the study of life [because it necessarily entails] ‘the study of epiphanies, rituals, routines, metaphors and everyday actions (cited by Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. xxiv). Accordingly, Clandinin and Connelly (1995) argue that narrative research is a particularly appropriate way to explore the ‘tension filled’ ‘knowledge landscapes’ of teachers, especially of those who are reforming their professional identities through new practices, and in response to new demands in the environment. From their perspective, ‘curriculum’ is defined as ‘an account of teachers’ and [students’] lives together. [In the process of ‘curriculum making] teachers, learners, subject matter and milieu are in dynamic interaction’ (p. 3). Story-telling is crucial to the formation of both (disciplinary) teacher identity and curriculum practices. Curriculum is constitutive of, and constituted by, the discourses and material conditions of academic practice in disciplines. Approaching stories of curriculum making as data worthy of research can make implicit aspects of the process visible for interrogation and analysis. In bringing such stories into the public arena, we hope to challenge one of the significant blockers of IoC: the low status of teaching relative to research in universities. As Shulman (1993, pp. 6–7) observes, the low status of teaching partly stems from its intensely personal nature. Therefore, he reasons, teaching needs to change ‘from private to community property’ through the production and dissemination of ‘artefacts that capture its richness and complexity’.

In our view, the ‘narrative turn’ we have taken in this book is not only a valuable method of research, it also involves *praxis* – if undertaken reflectively. Changing the stories that get told within a discipline can change the way teaching and learning is designed and carried out in that space. As Ben Okri puts it: ‘We live by stories/we also live in them.... If we change the stories we live by/ Quite possibly we change our lives’. Curriculum change involves disciplinary communities (Green et al., 2013; Green & Whitsed, 2013; Leask & Bridge, 2013), and these communities are constructed through narrative. For better or worse, faculties operate as communities of practice ‘where culture is both enacted and constructed and where personal identity coalesces, is shaped and reshaped’ (Trowler & Cooper, 2000, 30). Story-telling is integral to this process; it is the means by which individual members both absorb and become absorbed in disciplinary ways of knowing, doing and being. Learning at work ‘involves the construction of identities ... identity, knowing and social membership entail one another’ (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 53). For this reason, we have sought out stories of internationalising the curriculum within, and by disciplinary teams, rather than as individual undertakings.

The accounts of doing IoC in this book have been structured around the three interwoven ‘commonplaces’ of narrative: temporality, sociality, and place (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 20). Clandinin (2007) notes that attending to the dynamic interplay between these three dimensions is, in part, what distinguishes the narrative turn from other qualitative methodologies. For our purposes, an appreciation of, and ability to work with these narrative ‘commonplaces’ is important because it can elucidate and enrich the process oriented, socio-cultural, understanding of IoC captured by Leask (2013, and Leask & Bridge, 2013). Firstly, regarding temporality, we follow Ricoeur (1984) in arguing that one way humans make sense of apparently chaotic experience is by imposing narrative order on it. According to Ricoeur, humans experience time in two ways: as linear succession and as ‘phenomenological time’. The latter comes from an individual’s own sense of what has been, is and will be. In telling stories we make sense of our experience by integrating chronological and phenomenological time. Hence temporality in narrative entails the imagining of future possibilities. From this perspective, construing (and reconstruing) narratives of practice must be an integral part of a disciplinary team’s ongoing journey through the phases of Leask’s action research approach if they are to develop a strong sense of agency through the process. Likewise, the narrative dimensions of sociality and place enable disciplinary teams to make sense of the complex and dynamic interplay of people and place suggested by Leask’s IoC framework (Figure 1). ‘Sociality’ concerns the ‘complexity of the relational composition of people’s lived experiences’ within social conditions, which are understood to include cultural, social, institutional and linguistic narratives (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006, p. 480). As Baldwin (2013, p. 100) argues, drawing on Charles Taylor, the ‘narratives by which we constitute our Selves are always framed by “webs of interlocution,” that is, the language (or narratives) that flow around us’. ‘Place’ in narrative is understood in terms of ‘the specific concrete, physical and topological boundaries of place or sequences of

places where the inquiry and events take place’ – thus it emphasises the situatedness of academic practice. All in all, the interplay between these three dimensions of narrative make it a particularly useful way of making sense of curriculum making processes within the complex, often competing discourses and practices in higher education.

During the writing of this book, we as editors have also been interested in what gets excluded from each of the contributions. The very process of creating a narrative is one of selection – what goes in and out. Baldwin (2013, p. 106) argues that scholarly work on narratives must deal with the issue of contingency, in other words ‘the notion that the narrative being presented. could be otherwise. [N]othing is predetermined about the course of a narrative; things could always have been different. All narratives are essentially incomplete’. Accordingly, we’ve asked contributors to critically consider why they chose a particular approach to IoC over others in their context; in other words, what could have been, why it wasn’t, and what could be done in the future.

Of course, there are limitations to the narrative turn we have taken in this book. Narrative researchers understand a story of this process to be a construction, an act of creation that gives a meaningful shape to inner and outer experiences, not an account of facts. We acknowledge that the contributors to this book are not providing an ‘objective’ or final reading of their data; each of them presents a very subjective narrativisation of events within a specific context. Each narrative is open to question and revision, not only by the authors and their stakeholders (Creswell, 2007), but also by you, the reader. Nevertheless, these narratives are *scholarly*. They are consistent with the qualitative tradition in that they draw reflexively on personal experience and theoretical perspectives. Wherever possible, these narratives make sense of evidence of the impact of curriculum changes from students’ perceptions and learning outcomes. Moreover, most of them are written communally. Varying, sometimes competing voices are evident in the telling of these stories, thus sharpening their critical edge. In the final analysis, these stories of practice are valuable because they take practice knowledge from the private to the public sphere. They break down the ‘pedagogical solitude’ of university teaching (Shulman, 1993), and open it to interrogation and analysis.

Opening up the normally private stories of teaching to public scrutiny has to some extent confirmed our expectations – gleaned from the literature and our own practices – and to some extent unsettled them. The themes that have emerged from these narratives individually and collectively are briefly sketched out in the following overview of chapters.

OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTERS

Each chapter in this book foregrounds academics’ perspectives on their own engagement with internationalisation of the curriculum as a concept and a practice. In view of the deepening appreciation of the impact of disciplinary cultures on

curriculum development so evident in the recent literature, we believe there is considerable value in focusing on specific disciplines. Yet when faced with a dearth of publicly available accounts of IoC across all disciplines, it was difficult to decide which ones to focus on. In the end, the choice of the three represented here – business, education and health – was made for no other reason than we needed to start somewhere.

We must also acknowledge the book's limitations in terms of regional scope. From our first conversations about this book, at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, we have been mindful of the dominance of European and Anglophone perspectives in the literature about IoC, and the internationalisation of higher education more broadly. Consequently, we sought contributions from a wide range of countries. We are pleased that we have been able to include chapters about doing IoC in Hong Kong (Lazarus & Trahar), the United Arab Emirates (Almond & Mangione), and Africa (van der Kooij, Breidlid, & Carm), albeit from the perspectives of Anglo-European writers involved in transnational education. As with our decision regarding the disciplinary scope of this book, we see these three highly reflexive accounts of IoC beyond the Anglo-Euro zone as a small step in the right direction. Of course, we hope other disciplinary stories from other geographical regions will follow ours.

Despite the focus on just three disciplinary areas, predominantly within Euro-Anglo sphere, each of these narratives is unique. In part, this is to be expected since the contexts in which these chapters have been written are intentionally diverse – there are narratives from an array of sub-disciplines, institutions and locales. The approaches taken to IoC in these chapters are equally diverse. We have welcomed contributions from those who have been working on internationalising the curriculum for some time, and also from those who are less advanced. For our purposes, the location of learning (at home or abroad) does not matter; what is important is that the curriculum is designed, or redesigned to prepare graduates to work ethically and effectively in an increasingly interconnected world. So each chapter is unique in its description of the joys, challenges and outcomes of curriculum internationalisation within a specific context. At the same time, each chapter is uniform in the sense that it describes what has been done, and reflects on the motivation (or drivers) for change, challenges encountered, achievements, and the outcomes for students. Finally, each chapter finishes with some consideration of the same question: what next?

Structurally, the book is divided into three main sections, one for each of our broad disciplinary areas. Each of these sections is framed by a brief introduction, which draws attention to intra-disciplinary similarities and differences and to emerging cross-disciplinary themes. While a comparison of stories within each section in some ways confirms earlier findings (Becher & Trowler, 1989; Clifford, 2009) regarding disciplinary similarities, it also reveals interesting intra-disciplinary debates, and unresolved tensions. For example, within education, the title of one chapter, by Elizabeth Lazarus and Sheila Trahar – 'Internationalising a Transnational

Higher Education Programme: Pursuing Sameness or Disrupting Educational Imperialism?’ – articulates a question that is considered in some depth across all of the education chapters, regardless of context. That is, they all acknowledge and interrogate the culturally embedded nature of teaching and learning and question the dominance of Western pedagogical theories within their discipline. At the same time, we have been surprised by the recurrence of particular narrative threads in these stories regardless of discipline. A concern with conceptualising, implementing and assessing intercultural capabilities, or competence is one such overriding theme.

The debates within disciplines and striking similarities between disciplines, which are evident throughout this book, add an interesting counterpoint to the conception of disciplinary ‘tribes’ (Becher & Trowler, 2001) and underscore the challenges shared by individual academics, regardless of discipline in a rapidly globalising higher education sector. Indeed, the narrative approach taken in this book has enabled us to illustrate the complex interplay between the individual and the extra-individual in the process of internationalising the curriculum. Each chapter demonstrates that disciplines are not impervious to change. Rather they are socially constructed communities, comprised of individual academics, situated within specific, complex environments who, in the end, internationalize *their* curriculum. Thus, the chapters that follow help to flesh out Gavin Sanderson’s (2008) ‘foundation for the internationalisation of the “academic Self.”’

In short, the process of editing this book has deepened our understanding of the possibilities and the pitfalls of IoC and expanded our imaginations of what it could mean for our *praxis*. We hope that the following chapters might similarly engage and inspire you, our readers.

NOTE

- ¹ See *Journal of Studies in International Education* (2003) 7 (1) for a special issue on internationalization at home, edited by Bengt Nilsson and Matthias Otten. *The Sage Handbook of International Higher Education* (Deardorff, de Wit, Heyl & Adams 2012) also provides an extensive overview of the development of I@H and internationalisation in the European context.

REFERENCES

- Altbach, P. G. (2002). Perspectives on internationalizing higher education. *International Higher Education*, 7(4), 6–8.
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. A report prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education, Paris.
- Baldwin, C. (2013). Living narratively: From theory to experience (and back again). *Narrative Works: Issues, Investigations, Interventions*, 3(1), 98–117.
- Barnett, R. (1997). *Higher education: A critical business*. Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Barnett, R., & Coate, K. (2005). *Engaging the curriculum in higher education*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

- Barnett, R., Parry, G., & Coate, K. (2001). Conceptualising curriculum change. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(4), 435–449.
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of the disciplines* (2nd ed.). Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and the Open University Press.
- Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., Stevens, M. J., & Oddou, G. (2010). Defining the content domain of intercultural competence for global leaders. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(8), 810–828.
- Bond, S., Qian, J., & Huang, J. (2003). *Role of faculty in internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum and classroom experience*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Bruner, J. (1985). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Caruana, V., & Hanstock, J. (2003). *Internationalising the curriculum: From policy to practice*. Proceedings from the Education in a changing environment conference, University of Salford, UK. Retrieved August 22, 2010 from <http://www.edu.salford.ac.uk/her/>
- Clandinin, D. J. (Ed.). (2006). *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Rosiek, J. (2007). Mapping a landscape of narrative inquiry: Borderland spaces and tensions. In D. J. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 35–75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Clifford, V. (2009). Engaging the disciplines in internationalising the curriculum. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 14(2), 133–143.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (2006). Narrative inquiry. In J. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 375–385). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. University of Nebraska, Lincoln: Sage Publications.
- Crichton, J., Paige, M., Papademetre, L., Scarino, A., & Wood, M. (2004). *Integrated resources for intercultural teaching and learning in the context of internationalisation in higher education*. Research Centre for Languages and Cultures Education, University of South Australia. Retrieved February 17, 2005.
- Curro, G., & McTaggart, R. (2003). *Supporting the pedagogy of internationalisation*. Paper presented at the 17th IDP Australian Education Conference, Melbourne, Australia.
- Deardorff, D., de Wit, H., Heyl, J., & Adams, T. (Eds.). (2012). *The Sage handbook of international higher education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- de Wit, H. (2011a, October 23). Naming internationalisation will not revive it. *World University News*. Issue 194. Retrieved January 1, 2012 from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20111021215849411>
- de Wit, H. (2011b). *Trends, issues and challenges in internationalisation of higher education*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Centre for Applied Research on Economics and Management of the Hogeschool Amsterdam.
- Green, M. F., & Shoenberg, R. (2006). *Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines*. Washington, DC: American Council of Education.
- Green, W., & Mertova, P. (2009). *Internationalisation of teaching and learning at The University of Queensland: A report on current perceptions and practices*. Retrieved December 13, 2014 from <http://www.uq.edu.au/tedidev/docs/loTL-at-UQ.pdf>
- Green, W., Hibbins, R., Houghton, L., & Ruutz, A. (2013). Reviving praxis: Stories of continual professional learning and practice architecture in a faculty-based teaching community of practice. *Oxford Review of Education*, 39(2), 247–266.
- Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2013). Reflections on an alternative approach to continuing professional learning for internationalisation of the curriculum across disciplines. *Journal of Studies in*

INTRODUCING CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES ON INTERNATIONALISING THE CURRICULUM

- International Education: Special Issue, Internationalisation of the Curriculum and the Disciplines*, 17(2), 148–164.
- Harman, G. (2005). Internationalization of Australian higher education: A critical review of literature and research. In P. Ninnes & M. Hellstén (Eds.), *Internationalizing higher education: Critical explorations of pedagogy and policy* (pp. 119–140). Hong Kong, China: Comparative Education Research Centre.
- Hudzik, J. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action*. NAFSA Association of International Educators. Retrieved from <http://www.nafsa.org/resourcelibrary/Default.aspx?id=24045>
- Jones, A. (2011). Seeing the messiness of academic practice: Exploring the work of academics through narrative. *International Journal for Academic Practice*, 16(2), 109–118.
- Jones, E., & Killick, D. (2007). Internationalisation of the curriculum. In E. Jones & S. Brown (Eds.), *Internationalising higher education*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Kemmis, S. (2007). Action research: Educational research and evidence-base practice. *Martyn Hammersley* (pp. 167–180). Los Angeles and London, UK: Sage.
- Kemmis, S., & Grootenboer, P. (2008) Situating praxis in practice: Practice architectures and the cultural, social and material conditions for practice. In S.Kemmis & T. Smith (Eds.), *Enabling praxis: Challenges for education* (pp. 37–62). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Kemmis, S., & Smith, T. (2008). Praxis and praxis development. In S. Kemmis & T. Smith (Eds.), *Enabling praxis: Challenges for education* (pp. 3–13). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publications.
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalization*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Leask, B. (2005). Internationalisation of the curriculum: Teaching and learning. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 205–221.
- Leask, B. (2012). *Internationalising the curriculum in action: Final report*. Office of Learning and Teaching. Retrieved December 13, 2014 from <http://www.olt.gov.au/resource-internationalisation-curriculum-action-2012>
- Leask, B. (2013). Internationalising the curriculum in the disciplines – Imagining new possibilities. *Journal of Studies in International Education: Special Issue, Internationalisation of the Curriculum and the Disciplines*, 17(2), 103–118.
- Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalising the curriculum*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Leask, B., & Beelen, J. (2009). *Enhancing the engagement of academic staff in international education*. Paper presented at the Advancing Europe-Australia cooperation in international education: Symposium background papers, Melbourne, Australia.
- Leask, B., & Bridge, C. (2013). Comparing internationalisation of the curriculum in action across disciplines: Theoretical and practical perspectives. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 43(1), 79–101.
- Leask, B., Whitsed, C., & Green, W. (2014). Internationalising the curriculum in action. Retrieved December 13, 2014 from <http://www.ioc.global>
- Liddicoat, A. J., Eisenclas, S., & Trevaskes, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Australian perspectives on internationalising education*. Melbourne, Australia: Language Australia.
- Lingard, B., & Rizvi, F. (2010). *Globalising educational policy*. Florence, KY: Routledge.
- Marginson, S., & Sawir, E. (2011). *Ideas for intercultural education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nilsson, B., & Otten, M. (2003). Editorial. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 3–4.
- Okri, B. (1997). *A way of being free*. London, UK: Phoenix Paperbacks.
- Otten, M. (2003). Intercultural learning and diversity in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 12–26. doi:10.1177/1028315302250177
- Ricoeur, P. (1984). *Time and narrative*. Chicago and London, UK: University of Chicago Press.
- Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. California & London, UK: Sage Publications.

W. GREEN & C. WHITSED

- Rizvi, F. (2005). International education and the production of cosmopolitan identities. In A. Arimato, F. Huang, K. Yokoyama, & D. Hiroshima (Eds.), *Globalization and higher education*. Hiroshima: Research Institute of Higher Education.
- Shulman, L. S. (1993). Putting an end to pedagogical solitude. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 25(6), 6–7.
- Teekens, H. (2003). The requirement to develop specific skills for teaching in an intercultural setting. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 108–119.
- Trowler, P., & Cooper, A. (2002). Teaching and learning regimes: Implicit theories and recurrent practice in the enhancement of teaching and learning through educational programmes. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 21(3), 221–240.
- Turner, V. (1977). *The ritual process*. New York, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Turner, Y., & Robson, S. (2007). Competitive and cooperative impulses to internationalization: Reflecting on the interplay between management intentions and the experience of academics in a British university. *Education, Knowledge & Economy: A Journal for Education and Social Enterprise*, 1(1), 65–82.
- Van der Wende, M. (1996). Internationalizing the curriculum in higher education: Report on an OECD/CERI study. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 2(2), 186–195.
- Wächter, B. (2003). An introduction: Internationalisation at home in context. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(5), 5–11.
- Whalley, T., Langley, L., Villarreal, L., & College, D. (1997). *Best practice guidelines for internationalizing the curriculum*. Province of British Columbia, ministry of education, skills and training and the centre for curriculum, transfer and technology.
- Whitsed, C., & Green, W. (2013a). Internationalisation begins with the curriculum: In conversation with Prof. John Hudzik. *University World News*. Issue 00347. Retrieved December 13, 2014 from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130123121225469>
- Whitsed, C., & Green, W. (2013b). What's in a name? A theoretical exploration of the proliferation of labels for international education across the higher education sector. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18(2), 105–119.

Wendy Green
Tasmanian Institute of Learning & Teaching
University of Tasmania, Australia

Craig Whitsed
Centre for University Teaching & Learning
Murdoch University, Perth, Australia