Internationalisation at Home on the Move

Jos Beelen
Betty Leask

This article provides a summary and complete overview of the concept of Internationalisation at Home (sometimes abbreviated to IaH), including its origins ten years ago, its development since and its present situation. Although the concept of Internationalisation at Home originated in Europe, this does not mean that the phenomenon of curriculum internationalisation is limited to that continent, so this overview situates Internationalisation at Home within a broader context. Approaches and practices in Europe are contrasted with those in Australia and similarities and differences are highlighted. The article also provides an overview of the tools or instruments that constitute Internationalisation at Home and discusses some of the obstacles commonly faced by those seeking to implement Internationalisation at Home in their institutions.

The article concludes with a brief discussion of the global state of affairs with regard to Internationalisation at Home anno 2011, with an emphasis on Europe. This discussion draws on the results of the 2010 Global Survey of The International Association of Universities and additional scholarly literature in the field. It is argued that Internationalisation at Home is appropriately a dynamic, evolving concept – a concept 'on the move' – a response to institutional and regional issues, which takes account of the global context within which those issues are situated.

Content | Page

1.   Introduction

Intercultural competences for all

Over the last ten years, internationalisation of the curriculum has been recognised as being at least as important as traditional forms of internationalisation, such as mobility. Globalisation, "those processes by which the peoples of the world are incorporated into a single world society, a global society" (Albrow 1990, p. 9), has fuelled the need for an internationally oriented, interculturally competent, global workforce. International and intercultural competences are no longer required only by a small minority of professionals that will work abroad. In a globalised world, those who were once far away are now our work colleagues and our neighbours. If they are not physically close, they are virtually so. The boundaries between the local, the national and the global have been blurred in both our professional and personal lives.

Globalisation has created a world where every citizen is, at least in some sense, a citizen of the world at the same time as they are a citizen of their own country. Simultaneously the massification of higher education has also expanded the range and number of students studying in universities. Mobility has been and continues to be limited to a small minority of students, and other international and intercultural activities – such as those organised as part of the co-curriculum – do not reach all students. Thus the formal curriculum is the only vehicle for ensuring that all students acquire the international and intercultural competences they will need as global citizens and professionals.

2.   Internationalisation at Home: origin and development

The Malmö approach

The term 'Internationalisation at Home' emerged in 1999 at Malmö University. Bengt Nilsson, newly appointed vice-president for international affairs, was faced with the fact that this newly established university did not have an international network yet, so that it could not offer its students the traditional study-abroad experience. Therefore, opportunities had to be found 'at home' for students to gain these experiences. The newly established university also had a social mission. The composition of the student population had to reflect the diversity of the city and engage with the local community. A characteristic element of the Malmö approach at this time was the Nightingale Project, in which students mentored children of recent immigrants (Sild Lönroth & Nilsson 2007). While the value of students developing international and intercultural knowledge, skills and attitudes as part of their formal study programme is evident in the literature before this time, the focus in Europe was traditionally on periods of study abroad and on exchange as the primary means of achieving this goal. In his situa-

tion at Malmö, Nilsson recognised an immediate need to change the way people thought about internationalisation. He also recognised the broader benefits that a new way of thinking about internationalisation across Europe might have, for students in other institutions. Given the persistently low number of mobile students and the difficulty of measuring what they had learned from their experiences a focus on internationalisation for all students 'at home' seemed timely. He coined the term 'Internationalisation at Home' as a way to signal a new way of thinking about internationalisation in Europe.

Internationalisation at Home was taken up by a Special Interest Group within the EAIE. In 2001, they published a Position Paper in which they outlined the concept (Crowther, et al. 2001). In April 2003, an international conference on Internationalisation at Home took place in Malmö, and in the same year, a special issue of the JSIE was published (Nilsson & Otten 2003), followed by a conference in Rotterdam in 2005 (Teekens 2006). This concluded the work of the original interest group.

Special Interest Group

With a different composition, the Special Interest Group then continued its work. It developed a training course which became part of the EAIE's professional development programme in 2006. The next steps were the simultaneous publication by the EAIE of a practical guide to the implementation of Internationalisation at Home (Beelen 2007) and an Occasional Paper (Teekens 2007).

2.1 Internationalisation at Home: conceptual notions and definitions

The original concept of Internationalisation at Home had a strong focus on intercultural issues and on diversity. It used a fairly short definition, which nevertheless led to numerous questions: "Any internationally related activity with the exception of outbound student and staff mobility" (Crowther et al. 2001, p. 8). This definition implied that Internationalisation at Home was a phenomenon that could be detached from outgoing mobility. It was acknowledged however, that there was a relation with outgoing mobility in the sense that international experience at home could promote outgoing mobility and enhance the quality of a study-related stay abroad: international experiences at home would equip students with skills that would allow them to make more of their study or placement abroad.

Original definition

Internationalisation at Home was not presented as a didactic concept, in the sense that it included didactic or methodological elements. Rather, Internationalisation at Home could rely on existing didactic concepts such as comparative methodology. Within the Special Interest Group, Joseph Mestenhauser stressed the importance of a systems-based approach to Internationalisation at Home:

Systems-based approach

"Internationalisation at Home as a system of international education offers the possibility of finding a new way in which higher education mainstreams the international dimension in all segments of the universities, reforms the curriculum, mobilizes community resources, institutionalizes international education and focuses on relevance to the global job market."

(Mestenhauser 2007, p. 70)

This underlines the fact that Internationalisation at Home has a comprehensive scope in that it addresses all students and not just the mobile minority, that it encompasses both the formal and the informal curriculum as well as services. The overall aim of Internationalisation at Home is that all students leave the university as professionals who are competent to work and live in a globalised world.

Two connected streams

The concept of Internationalisation at Home received considerable attention as was evident from the sessions on Internationalisation at Home at the annual conferences of EAIE. In her discussion of key concepts, elements and rationales for the 2005 IAU Global Survey report, Knight (2006, p. 25; also Knight, 2008) distinguishes Internationalisation at Home as one of the two streams in internationalisation. One is *internationalisation abroad*, including all forms of education across borders: mobility of students and faculty, and mobility of projects, programmes and providers. The second movement is that of *internationalisation at home* – activities that help students to develop international understanding and intercultural skills (Knight 2008, pp. 22 – 24). She does see a relation between the two streams: "The emergence of this concept coincides with or perhaps counteracts the increased emphasis on student mobility as expressed in new national and regional mobility programmes and also the growing interest in cross-border education."

She stresses that the two streams are interdependent rather than independent. She broadens Nilsson's original concept of Internationalisation at Home and distinguishes a 'diversity of activities' that constitute Internationalisation at Home: curriculum and programmes, teaching/ learning processes, extra-curricular activities, liaison with local cultural/ethnic groups and research or scholarly activity (Knight 2006, 27, Fig. 1.5). In the analysis of the 2005 Global Survey, Knight says that the survey addresses a number of "Internationalisation at Home related factors ... the international/intercultural dimension of the curriculum, research collaboration and area and foreign language studies" (Knight 2006, p. 128). In 2008, Knight (p. 22) again concluded that two streams of internationalisation seemed to be emerging: "internationalisation abroad and internationalisation at home" (for which she now introduces the alternative term "internal internationalization").

2.2 The need for clarification

The 2009 Global Survey identifies activities "which focus on actions that entail or require the movement across boundaries ('internationalization abroad') and activities that focus on what takes place on-campus ('internationalization at home')" (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010 p. 34). As in the previous survey, the international and intercultural dimension of the curriculum is an item in the questionnaire, but the 2009 survey also includes Internationalisation at Home as an item . This is confusing, especially as the authors do not comment on the relationship between the two items.

Before the 2009 Global Survey, Knight (2006, 2008) made reference to Internationalisation at Home related activities, elaborating on the original concept without offering a new definition. While a new definition may not be necessary or helpful, some clarification and elaboration is required. The following points are commonly agreed characteristics of Internationalisation at Home, in keeping with the original definition:

- Internationalisation at Home is aimed at all students and is therefore part of the compulsory programme.

- Internationalisation at Home is a set of instruments and activities 'at home' that focus on developing international and intercultural competences in all students.

- Internationalisation at Home is based on the assumption that, while students will travel for personal reasons, the majority will not travel for study-related purposes, although the latter option is not entirely excluded.

- May include short-term outgoing mobility in the form of study visits or research assignments that are a component of the compulsory curriculum.

- Only includes the individual experiences of students undertaken during study and placement abroad if these are integrated into the home institution's standard assessment tools (such as the portfolio for all students).

2.3 Internationalisation at Home: concept or movement?

Knight uses the term 'concept' for Internationalisation at Home. Others rather refer to Internationalisation at Home as a movement. In a 2010 article, with the self-proclaimed provocative title 'The End of Internationalisation', Brandenburg and De Wit draw the conclusion that the focus of internationalisation has shifted from a focus on loftier aims to a focus on the instruments that constitute the means to reach those aims. They mention that Internationalisation at Home has become one of them when they say: "Even the alternative movement of 'internationalization at home' of the late 1990s has shifted rapidly into this instrumental mood." (Brandenburg & De Wit 2010, p. 16). If Internationalisation at Home has indeed gone the way of internationalisation abroad, this means that at least it has reached maturity.

Future of Internationalisation at Home

It is possible that at some point in the future, we will no longer need to distinguish between internationalisation at home and abroad and between formal and informal international learning. This will, however, depend on our ability to enhance and assess the international and intercultural learning of all of our students as a normal part of every programme of study. This will require the development of a variety of valid and reliable evaluation instruments and teaching strategies if we are to ensure that every student acquires the knowledge, skills and attitudes that universities and employers consider essential in global citizens and professionals. In the interim, the concept of Internationalisation at Home is a useful way to focus our attention on what we do in our classrooms and on our campuses 'at home' to ensure the systematic development of these capabilities in all students.

3. Assessing ten years of Internationalisation at Home

The mobile minority

After more than ten years, the rationale for Internationalisation at Home seems unchanged. It is still only a small minority of students who seek to develop their international and intercultural competences through studying abroad. Whether they are successful in this we do not know, since there is rarely, if ever, any consistent, reliable and systematic assessment of their learning from these experiences. This is largely the case regardless of whether the experience is either a short-term or a long-term experience (De Wit, 2011, p. 15), although some have argued that the longer the experience the greater the impact (Dwyer, 2004). Internationalisation at Home is directly related to the most important rationale for internationalisation identified in the 2010 Global Survey as being to "Improve student preparedness for a globalized/internationalized world" (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 62,

fig. I.B.6). It is remarkable that we expect to achieve this aim for all our students by sending a small percentage of them abroad, and furthermore that we then neglect to assess their learning outcomes in a systematic way.

The curriculum at home therefore remains the most reliable way to assist all students to acquire international and intercultural competencies. In this more controlled setting it is more feasible to manage the quality and integrate the international dimension into the curriculum.

As international and intercultural competences are required of all graduates in a globalised world, and Internationalisation at Home is a reliable tool to achieve this, it logically follows that Internationalisation at Home must be provided for and be accessible to all students.

3.1   The relationship of Internationalisation at Home to other concepts

Internationalisation at Home is related to other concepts associated with internationalisation and is both similar to and different from them. In the USA, the concept of Internationalisation of the Campus, or Comprehensive Internationalisation, shares much in common with Internationalisation at Home. In Australia the concept of Internationalisation of the Curriculum (sometimes abbreviated to IoC) also has much in common with the concept of Internationalisation at Home. The term 'Internationalisation of the Curriculum' is both a general term across the globe and one that denotes a specific approach in Australia. These two concepts will be discussed briefly here to allow a comparison with Internationalisation at Home.

Comprehensive internationalisation

Engberg and Green (2002) describe Campus or Comprehensive Internationalisation as:

> "a change that is both broad – affecting departments, schools, and activities across the institution – and deep, expressed in institutional culture, values, and policies and practices. It requires articulating explicit goals and developing coherent and mutually reinforcing strategies to reach them. A comprehensive internationalised campus has more than a series of courses or programs that promote international learning: it intentionally links these components together to foster a learning environment and provide a set of experiences to *as many students as possible*".
>
> (Engberg & Green 2002, pp. 10 – 11 – emphasis added)

Internationalising the Campus

The focus on reaching 'as many students as possible' suggests a similar focus to that of Internationalisation at Home which, perhaps being slightly more ambitious, seeks to reach all students. In any case, both appear to be concerned with ensuring the development of international and intercultural skills, knowledge and attitudes to more than the small percentage of students who are internationally mobile, and with the provision of a particular type of learning environment on the home campus. The Institute of International Education (IIE) has since 2001 awarded the annual Andrew Heiskell Awards to 'outstanding initiatives' in different categories, including 'internationalizing the campus' and (from 2009) in the special category 'internationalizing the community college campus'. Dutschke (2009, p. 70) mentions two examples of winners in the former category, one of which included a year of study abroad while the other consisted of a short-term study trip. Over a number of years, a total of 400 students participated in 23 of those study trips at a university with 12 000 students; hardly a strategy that is reaching the majority of students. Dustchke also quotes the award criteria for the category 'Internationalizing the Campus' as: "advancing curriculum development and providing services to international students". While these criteria have since been rewritten and the mention of services removed, Dutschke (2009, p. 72) concludes that study abroad is still the main component of internationalisation at most American universities, and that on-campus activities are often also tied to study abroad. The same view is held by Hudzik (2011, p. 9) when he writes: "The movement of students and faculty across borders for periods of learning and discovery is by its nature the primary experience and active-learning component of internationalization.

In this regard, the emphasis is the reverse of that evident in the concept of Internationalisation at Home, in which study abroad is only a minor component, under certain conditions (as described earlier).

Internationalisation of the Curriculum in Australia

In relation to Internationalisation of the Curriculum in the Australian context, the following definition provides insights into the relationship between the concepts of Internationalisation at Home and Internationalisation of the Curriculum.

> "Internationalisation of the Curriculum is the incorporation of an intercultural and international dimension into the content of the curriculum as well as the teaching and learning processes and support services of a programme of study. An internationalised curriculum will engage students with internationally informed research and cultural and linguistic diversity. It will purposefully develop their international and intercultural perspectives as global professionals and citizens."
>
> (Leask 2009, p. 209)

In her definition, Leask includes the services aspect, not mentioned by Knight, but certainly an important aspect of Internationalisation at Home as well. She also stresses the importance of the careful construction of learning environments, with specific reference being made to teaching and learning processes, given that students do not spontaneously start learning from each other the minute they enter an international classroom (Leask 2010). While this definition does not explicitly mention study abroad, nor does it exclude it. In this regard Internationalisation of the Curriculum is more like Internationalisation at Home than the concept of Campus or Comprehensive Internationalisation in the USA. However, like Comprehensive Internationalisation, Internationalisation of the Curriculum is concerned with creating an internationalised campus environment through the provision of a curriculum and services that support student engagement with diversity, including the cultural and linguistic diversity that surrounds them in the world, in class and on campus (Leask 2009, p. 206). Some of these services and activities may seek to actively encourage study abroad, integrated into the curriculum, as part of the total student experience. Internationalisation at Home, however, does not actively stimulate outgoing mobility in the way that Campus Internationalisation and, to a lesser extent, Internationalisation of the Curriculum do. Unlike Campus Internationalisation, Internationalisation at Home is focussed on developing international and intercultural learning outcomes in all students. In that respect it resembles Internationalisation of the Curriculum.

The aims of Internationalisation at Home, Internationalisation of the Curriculum and Internationalisation of the Campus have one thing at least in common – they seek to assist the majority, if not all students, to acquire intercultural and international knowledge, skills and attitudes. There are some differences in emphasis in the approaches taken:

Common notions

An internationalised curriculum will:

- Engage students with internationally informed research and cultural and linguistic diversity.

- Purposefully develop defined international and intercultural perspectives.

- Progressively assess learning outcomes.

- Prepare students to deal with uncertainty by opening their minds and developing their ability to think both creatively and critically.

- Move beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries and dominant paradigms.

- Look different in different contexts.

**Mobility and
Internationalisation
at Home**

Travel usually goes hand in hand with a change in language. Virtually all students will be mobile for holiday or travel, but only a small minority of students go abroad for several months for study or placement. Short term mobility in the form of study visits abroad will, for most students, be the only study-related mobility they undertake. If these study trips are part of the curriculum for all students, they would fall within the concept of Internationalisation at Home. How much these trips contribute to increasing students' competences depends very much on the way they are set up and followed up. In the contexts of Australia and the US, international mobility requires a far greater effort than in Europe and involves considerable cost.

3.2 Delivering Internationalisation at Home

Tools vs. aims

There are a range of tools that are useful in achieving different levels of internationalisation at home. The tools include – but are not limited to – international literature, case studies, guest lecturers, short term study visits abroad as part of the curriculum, virtual mobility, and incoming student mobility. These tools can be used to construct a framework for Internationalisation at Home. It is important to keep in mind that Internationalisation at Home is in itself an instrument for acquiring competences and not an aim in itself.

**Language vs.
international dimension**

In countries where English is not the first language, incoming guest lecturers and students necessitate the change to English as the language of instruction. It is a frequently found misconception that teaching a course in English in itself makes that course international (De Wit 2011). However, the international dimension depends on the angle and didactic approach rather than on the language of instruction. This requires the lecturer to construct a learning environment in which literature and case studies with different angles are used. The lecturer is central in constructing the learning environment. The next section, therefore, describes international classrooms with a particular focus on the competencies of teaching staff.

4. Internationalisation at Home and International Classrooms

**Not all international
classrooms are
the same**

Given the regional variations discussed above it is perhaps not surprising that how an international classroom is defined and constituted varies across regions, countries and institutions. Beelen (2007, pp. 25 – 28) distinguishes four types of international classrooms in countries in which English is an additional language. *Classrooms with an international orientation*, those in which international issues, comparisons, literature and cases constitute the international angle while

teaching and learning take place in the local language, are the first category. In the second category, *international classrooms in the local language*, the students come from different countries but share a language, e.g. an international classroom in Germany in which students from Germany, Austria and the German-speaking parts of Switzerland and Belgium study together. The third category consists of *'classic' international classrooms*, with a mix of students from different countries, some, many or all studying in a second language, usually English. The fourth category consists of *virtual international classrooms*, where the students study together online, without meeting physically. The first category may overlap with the second, third and fourth category, and indeed it would be desirable if it did. For example, in an international classroom in the local language (category 1), a classic international classroom (category 2) or a virtual international classroom (category 3), international issues, comparisons, literature and cases could – and arguably should – be included if the aim is to develop international and intercultural awareness, understanding and competence in students.

International classrooms can be powerful learning environments but require careful planning in order to be successful. The skills that a lecturer in an international classroom needs have been described by Teekens (2001). She stresses that "the lecturer is the one who is able to make a classroom into an intense international and intercultural learning experience for the home students" (p. 38) and highlights the need for teaching staff to possess a broad range of skills including:

The international lecturer

- Awareness of and familiarity with the fact that the established canon of knowledge in his or her field may differ substantially in other academic traditions.

- Awareness that some students expect a different role from him or her than the one they are accustomed to in their own educational setting.

- Awareness that there may be other reasons for students not to speak up, other than lack of proficiency in the language of tuition.

- Realising that the use of IT in education is determined by culture and that, unless this has been made explicit, will exclude some students.

- Having basic knowledge of the main international differences on the labour market regarding qualifications, professional recognition and possible periods of probation for the specific profession for which the students are educated (Beelen 2007, pp. 40 – 45).

Language and culture

The role of the teacher in some international classrooms is further complicated by the fact that we cannot assume that students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds will mix easily. Research conducted over the last ten years (see, for example, Volet and Ang 1998; Maundeni 2001; Summers and Volet 2008; Welikala and Watkins 2008, Zhao, Kuh &; Brown 2008; Warwick 2008; Leask 2009) suggests that in the international classroom and on campus it is common for students to gravitate towards those who are 'like them' and the role of the teacher as manager and facilitator of intercultural engagement in an international classroom is a critical one. Leask (2009) describes this situation in an Australian context in some detail. The language of instruction in the classrooms she describes is the first language of the home students, and the international students are in the minority, thus giving the home students an advantage. It remains to be seen if the same processes apply in a non-English-speaking country, where neither the home nor the international students (or their lecturer) are using their first language and thus they are all, to some extent, more equal.

Mix of students

Another factor that influences the success of an international classroom is the mix of students. It is desirable that the International Office is involved in ensuring the provenance and number of incoming international students within individual classes and across the institution. For example it is an advantage if the number of incoming students is high enough to allow all students at the home institution to study at least one semester with international students in their classroom during their studies. If that is the aim, the university will have to generate considerable incoming mobility, in a planned and strategic way and this would lead to considerable cost. International classrooms can therefore not be the only tool within an Internationalisation at Home strategy.

Assessing learning

Finally there is the issue of assessing learning outcomes in international classrooms. Establishing an international classroom should not be an end in itself, but a foundation for an Internationalisation at Home strategy which, as a whole, is aimed at the development of intercultural and international competencies for all students. Deardorff (2009) and Deardorff, Thorndike Pysarchik & Yun (2009) stress the importance of stating goals and measurable objectives in these areas in international classrooms. This applies whatever their category and wherever they are.

5. Obstacles to internationalisation of the curriculum

The Global Survey 2010 distinguishes between external and internal obstacles to advancing internationalisation in general. Insufficient financial resources come out as the main internal obstacle on a global level, as well as in all the regions (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 81, fig. I.C.6). On an aggregate level "limited faculty interest" and "limited experience and expertise of staff and/or lack of foreign language proficiency" rank "fairly high" among the internal obstacles to internationalisation in the perspective of HEI's (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 23). They share second and third place with 11 % each. The authors of the survey consider the lack of interest of academic staff "worrisome" and mention that institutions "need to focus far more on mobilizing, training and providing support to faculty members and staff to build up internationalization knowledge and readiness if they are to reach their internationalization goals". (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, pp. 77 – 78).

Obstacles in the 3rd Global Survey

The list below provides a closer look at obstacles to internationalisation of the curriculum, as they were perceived by academics who have participated in EAIE training courses in Internationalisation at Home:

Obstacles perceived by academic staff

1. Vision, leadership, policy and strategy

1A.	Lack of vision at institutional, faculty and/or meme level.

1B.	Management does not show leadership.

1C.	Lack of policy for internationalisation of the curriculum.

1D.	Confusion about the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum.

2. Aims

2A.	Lack of clarity about intercultural and international learning aims for the programme.

2B.	Lack of feedback from the world of work on intercultural and international competences.

3. Management

3A.	Lack of support for the internationalisation process.

3B.	Unclear decision to implement internationalisation of the curriculum.

4. Facilities and support

4A. Lack of time to implement internationalisation of the curriculum.

4B. Lack of financial resources to implement internationalisation of the curriculum.

4C. Lack of support from the International Office.

4D. Uncertainty where to get advice on methodological and educational issues.

5. Academic staff

5A. Lack of engagement in internationalisation of the curriculum.

5B. Lack of English language proficiency.

5C. Lack of methodology for teaching in a second language.

5D. Lack of knowledge and skills to implement an international dimension.

6. Communication and networking

6A. Lack of communication with others engaged in the same process.

6B. Uncertainty about how to find partners abroad.

7. Students

7A. Lack of motivation of students.

7B. Lack of language proficiency.

8. Quality assurance

8A. Unclear how international/intercultural competences are assessed.

8B. Lack of assessment tools.

It seems clear that "limited faculty interest" and their lack of engagement in internationalisation can be explained partly by these obstacles. Training and support can certainly overcome a number of obstacles, especially those in categories 4, 5 and 6 above.

6. Internationalisation at Home across the world

The 2010 Global Survey gives an overview of internationalisation across the world in six different regions: North America, Latin America & Caribbean, Europe, Africa, Middle East and Asia & Pacific. For each of these regions we will look first at what the survey revealed about Internationalisation at Home in that particular region. The questions in the survey are not always suitable for measuring Internationalisation at Home, and in some cases create confusion (Beelen, 2011). The answers do however provide a general picture. Where available, information from other sources has been added to fill in some of the detail.

Regional state of affairs

6.1 Asia & Pacific

The 2010 Global Survey shows that "strengthening the international/intercultural content of curriculum" is fourth on the list of priorities of universities in this region with 33 % of universities ranking it among their priorities (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 91, fig. I.D.7). It found that 15 % include Internationalisation at Home among their top priorities. This does not diverge much from the scores in Europe (resp. 30 % and 17 %). The focus on Internationalisation at Home in the Asia and Pacific region is quite unevenly distributed between Asia on the one hand and Australia and New Zealand on the other. There are very few signs that internationalisation of curricula is as yet an item in Asian universities. The Hong Kong Institute of Education has run a few seminars on the topic and contributes to the discussion within the EAIE.Special Interest Group, Internationalisation at Home.

The 2010 Global Survey shows that the focus on internationalisation of the curriculum is quite strong in Australia and New Zealand with 67 % of HEI's including it among their priority activities along with 22 % that include Internationalisation at Home (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 167). The authors of the survey do not explain the relation between these categories. It is therefore not clear if the 67 % refers to internationalisation of the curriculum which includes aspects of outgoing mobility, whereas the 22 % refers to activities that take place exclusively at the home institution. The relatively high scores of Australia and New Zealand may reflect the prominent role of the Special Interest Group, Internationalisation of the Curriculum, of the International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) which has taken the lead when it comes to the internationalisation of the curriculum in Australia. The group has a Memorandum of Cooperation with the Special Interest Group, Internationalisation at Home, of the EAIE, signed in Nantes in September 2010, and so there is some understanding in the region of the close connection between these two concepts.

Australia and New Zealand

New Zealand (26.8 %) and Australia (22.5 %) have the highest percentages of tertiary education students with another country of residence (OECD 2009, p. 327). This offers excellent opportunities for using incoming student mobility to internationalise the campus.

The informal curriculum

At the University of South Australia, much valuable research has been done into shaping the formal and the informal curriculum to ensure the development of international and intercultural perspectives in all graduates. The evidence suggests that purposeful and strategic management of student activity and the formal curriculum in international classrooms as well as of mentoring systems within the co-curricular (or informal curriculum) environment can make a significant difference to the benefits for both home and the international students (Leask 2009).

6.2 Europe

Situation in Europe

The 2010 Global Survey shows that Europe as a whole scores low on "strengthening the international/intercultural content of the curriculum" (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 91, fig. I.D.7). The authors of the survey explain this low position on the European priority list by commenting on the fact that many European universities have already embarked on activities to internationalise their curricula and therefore assign less importance to it. At the same time, other universities would assign less importance to internationalisation of the curriculum because they are not yet ready to embark on the process (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 175).

Differences within Europe

The Global Survey does not distinguish between different countries or regions within Europe, but in fact there are considerable differences. The focus on Internationalisation at Home is strongest in the Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Norway and Sweden), Finland, the Netherlands and Flanders. Between 2006 and 2008, the EAIE delivered five training courses on Internationalisation at Home. Of the 82 participants, 10 came from Sweden, 6 from Denmark, 6 from Norway, 4 from Finland, 13 from the Netherlands and 7 from Belgium (all from Flanders). The total proportion of participants from Scandinavia, Finland, the Netherlands and Flanders (total population 47 million) was 56 % and shows a significant contrast to the 7 % of participants from Germany, France and the UK combined, with a total population of 207 million (http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu). This makes it doubtful whether Egron-Polak and Hudson are correct in their conclusion. It seems remarkable that the focus on Internationalisation at Home apparently remains strong in universities that have already embarked on the process while it is simply not on the agenda of others. The low score of Europe is therefore probably determined by the fact that this is as yet the case for the majority of European universities, except for a number in north-western Europe.

It is no coincidence that the interest in Internationalisation at Home is strongest in small countries or in countries with a small population that need to adapt to the course of events determined by the bigger European countries and that other major player, the European Union. Small languages mean that there is a strong focus in these countries on English as a second language. This is demonstrated by the findings of *Education at a Glance* (2009) when it comes to the number of programmes delivered in English. Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands and Finland fall clearly into the category "many programmes in English", while Flanders and Norway fall in the category "some programmes in English" (OECD 2009, p. 316, Box C 2.2.).

North-Western Europe

Another characteristic of these countries is that they have an internet penetration of more than 85 % of the population, ranging from 85.3 % in Finland to 94.8 % in Norway (Internet World Stats, June 2010, Internet Usage in Europe). They share this characteristic with Iceland (97.6 %) and Luxemburg (85.3 %). This may yet be an indication of the outward looking mindset in these countries.

In the Netherlands, most Universities of Applied Sciences have included Internationalisation at Home in their institutional policies. Foremost are Hogeschool van Amsterdam (HvA) and Hogeschool van Arnhem en Nijmegen (HAN). Both started to implement Internationalisation at Home across all their programmes and for all their students. The former university has designed a system for the support of the implementation of Internationalisation at Home (De Wit & Beelen 2011). This is an attempt to address an obstacle that becomes manifest in the Global Survey: limited expertise of academic staff with regard to internationalisation (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 23). The focus on Internationalisation at Home is less marked in research universities in the Netherlands, but then research tends to have an international focus anyway.

The Netherlands

In Sweden, the University of Malmö, where the concept of Internationalisation at Home originated and where it has been part of central policy since early days, has done regular surveys and reports on the state and progress of Internationalisation at Home (Nilsson 2003; Bergknut 2006, 2007).

Sweden

Belgium is an interesting case. Teaching the second language of the federation (i.e. French in Flanders and Dutch in the Walloon region) is compulsory in secondary schools. This means that English is the third language in Belgium. A recent suggestion to allow secondary schools to choose English as a second language raised a storm of protest in the midst of a tense political situation. This is indeed a political issue since it would require changing the constitution. In spite of this, there is a marked interest in English medium education in Flanders. Already in 2001, a conference on Internationalisation at Home took place in Flanders (Vlaamse Hogescholenraad 2001). University College Ghent

Flanders

has regularly organised workshops and training events on Internationalisation at Home. The attention in Belgium's French Community (the Walloon region) is largely lacking, as it is in France.

Germany

In Germany, the National Agency for Socrates and Erasmus (DAAD) organises regular training seminars on 'Internationalisierung zu Hause', which are well attended. The German Universities of Applied Sciences have developed a range of international activities within their home curricula. Most of these are however aimed at particular groups of students and do not affect all students. They would therefore fall short of that essential characteristic of Internationalisation at Home and would rather resemble American practice.

United Kingdom

In the United Kingdom there is strong interest in internationalisation of the curriculum and in intercultural education. The shift towards making use of the diversity of the student body in the UK is unmistakable, but the situation is fundamentally different from that in the rest of Europe since English is the language of instruction.

Southern and Eastern Europe

The focus on Internationalisation at Home in Southern Europe is limited to individual institutions such as Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan (Mazzoleni & Senn 2007). The Catalan universities ran a training course on Internationalisation at Home in 2006. Universities in Eastern Europe are largely absent from the stage of Internationalisation at Home.

6.3 Africa

Africa as a whole

The 2010 Global Survey outcomes show that 29 % of African universities count "strengthening the international/intercultural content of the curriculum" among their priority policy items. Just 10 % include Internationalisation at Home, the lowest score of any region (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 91, fig. I.D.7).

South Africa

So far, the focus on Internationalisation at Home seems limited to South Africa. Mobility to Europe and other continents involves travelling considerable distances and is therefore problematic. At the same time, South Africa's universities are dealing with a great variety of international students mainly from other African countries. These are both reasons why South African universities have embraced Internationalisation at Home, as has the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA). The University of Cape Town embedded Internationalisation at Home in its institutional policy in 2006 and embarked on a process of operationalisation of the concept (Thomas & Kaunda 2007). The Internationalisation Management Advisory Group at UCT held a colloquium on Internationalisation at Home in 2008, which was attended by representatives from most universities in

the country. This was followed, in May 2011, by a two-day 'teachers' lab' at the University of Cape Town, in which teaching staff focused on integrating an international dimension into their existing courses.

6.4 North America

North America has the highest scores in the Global Survey for both "strengthening the international/intercultural content of the curriculum" (40 %) and Internationalisation at Home (18 %) (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 91, fig. I.D.7), yet this does not mean that internationalisation of the curriculum is well advanced.

The American Council on Education has been mapping internationalisation since 2001. In its 2008 survey of American higher education, it concluded that: "Overall, internationalization does not permeate the fabric of most institutions; it is not yet sufficiently deep or as widespread as it should be to prepare students to meet the challenges that they will face once they graduate." (Green, Lu & Burris 2008, executive summary). The same report reached the conclusion that internationalisation is not a high priority on most campuses, it is possible for students to graduate without any exposure to international/global issues and that, since 2001, progress has been slow and uneven.

6.5 Latin America & Caribbean

Latin America scores fairly low on "strengthening the international/intercultural content of the curriculum", with 27 %. Only the Middle East has a lower score. The score on Internationalisation at Home is rather low with 11 %, just 1 % above that of Africa (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 91, fig. I.D.7). Internationalisation of the curriculum does not seem much developed in Latin America as a whole.

The World Bank published a report on the international dimension in higher education in Latin America in 2005. It came to the conclusion that "very little curricular change has occurred in Latin America" (De Wit, Jaramillo, Gacel-Ávila & Knight 2005, p. 346).

In her discussion of higher education in Latin America, Gacel Avila (2007, p. 404) concludes that "few institutions integrate international, global, intercultural or comparative topics in their curricula" and that the concept of internationalisation at home is "unknown". She further concludes that the use of IT is used more to expand the national educational offer than for internationalisation of the curriculum.

Mapping internationalisation

An unknown concept

Individual institutions

This does not mean that individual institutions in the region have not embraced the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana is one of those. The World Bank report concluded that in Mexico, none of the surveyed institutions focused on integrating an international dimension into its curricula (De Wit et al. 2005, pp. 256 – 257). Universidad Regiomontana in Monterey however, has developed an institution-wide approach to Internationalisation at Home (Teissier 2007). The university also set up virtual international classrooms, which were presented at the EAIE conference in Nantes in September 2010. Another active player in Mexico is the University of Guadalajara. The Mexican Association for International Education (AMPEI) will be instrumental in driving internationalisation of the curriculum forward in that country.

6.6 Middle East

It was found that 25 % of universities in the Middle East include "strengthening the international/intercultural content of curriculum" among their top priorities, the lowest score of any region. Significantly, the Middle East is the only region that does not include Internationalisation at Home as a priority at all (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 91, fig. I.D.7).

7. Conclusion

A dynamic concept

Internationalisation at Home is a dynamic concept which has grown very quickly from small beginnings ten years ago. There are clear indications that it has 'struck a chord' with educators in institutions across Europe as well as in other parts of the world. It has been successful to some extent in shifting ways of thinking – and therefore the focus of internationalisation – from student mobility (which only involves a small percentage of students) to what happens at home for all students. As a concept it will continue to evolve in response to the local, regional and global contexts within which it operates – it will continue to be 'on the move'. This is appropriate given the rapid rate of change evident in the world today, which is likely to continue into the future. While it has much in common with the concepts of 'Comprehensive Internationalisation' (USA) and 'Internationalisation of the Curriculum' (Australia), it is also unique in some ways. A key underpinning of all of these concepts is that it is now expected that higher education will prepare all graduates to participate as citizens and professionals in a globalised world. This world is one in which resources and opportunities are not shared equally. It is facing critical environmental issues. The citizens and workers of this world are increasingly affected by the actions of others in the global, national and local community.

Looking ahead

In this world, internationalisation cannot be for the minority, it must be for all. That this has been recognised across the world, albeit to different degrees within and across regions and nations, is evident from the 2010 Global Survey. While the approaches taken in different regions and countries are likely to be different, we can expect that they will all be striving to actively engage students with their internationalisation agendas, as part of their response to globalisation. We can also anticipate that there will be much that we can learn from each other as we pursue these agendas. The involvement of academic staff in the internationalisation process will continue to be high on the agendas of universities across the world. The development of effective tools to assess the intercultural and international competences of all students is another issue that will receive much attention in the years to come. International interaction and collaboration in these fields have the potential to develop cultural insight and exchange that is enriching and enabling for institutions as well as for students.

References

[1]   Beelen, J. (Ed.). (2007). EAIE professional development series for international educators Vol. 2. Implementing internationalisation at home. Amsterdam: EAIE.

[2]   Beelen, J. (2011). Internationalisation at home in a global perspective: A critical survey of the 3rd global survey report of IAU (Manuscript submitted for publication).

[3]   Bergknut, K. (2006). Internationalisation at home at Malmö University; Structures and work areas 2006. Retrieved from www.mah.se

[4]   Bergknut, K. (2007). Case study: Malmö University, Sweden. In J. Beelen (Ed.), EAIE professional development series for international educators Vol. 2. Implementing internationalisation at home (80 – 86). Amsterdam: EAIE.

[5]   Brandenburg, U., & Wit, H. de. (2010). The end of internationalization. International higher education, 62 (winter 2011), 15 – 17. Retrieved from: http://www.bc.edu/research/cihe/ihe/issues/2011.html

[6]   Crowther, P., Joris, M., Otten, M., Nilsson, B., Teekens, H., & Wächter, B. (2001). Internationalisation at home; A position paper. Amsterdam: EAIE.

[7]   Deardorff, D. (Ed.). (2009). Implementing intercultural competence assessment. In D. Deardorff, (Ed.). The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence (477 – 491). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

[8]   Deardorff, D.,Thorndike Pysarchik, D., & Yun, Z.-S. (2009). Towards effective international learning assessments: principles, design and implementation. In H. de Wit (Ed.), Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education (EAIE Occasional Paper 22), 23 – 37.

[9]   De Wit, H., Jaramillo, I.C., Gacel-Ávila, J., & Knight, J. (Eds.). (2005). Higher Education in Latin America, the International Dimension. Washington DC: World Bank.

[10] De Wit, H. (2011). Law of stimulating arrears? Internationalisation of the universities of applied sciences, misconceptions and challenges. In H. de Wit. Trends, issues and challenges in internationalisation of higher education (7 – 24). Amsterdam: Hogeschool van Amsterdam.

[11] De Wit, H. & Beelen, J. (2011). Socrates in The Netherlands: facilitating internationalisation of the curriculum at Hogeschool van Amsterdam (Manuscript submitted for publication).

[12] Dutschke, D. (2009). Campus internationalization initiatives and study abroad. College and University 84 (3), 67 – 73.

[13] Dwyer, M. (2004). More Is Better: The Impact of Study Abroad Program Duration. Frontiers, 10, 151 – 164.

[14] Egron- Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2010). Internationalization of higher education: Global trends, regional perspectives (IAU 3rd Global Survey Report). Paris: IAU.

[15] Engberg, D., & Green, M. (2002). Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

[16] Gacel Avila, J. (2007). The process of internationalization of Latin American higher education. Journal of Studies in International Education 11 (3/4), 400 – 409.

[17] Green, M. F., Luu, D., & Burris, B. (2008). Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2008 edition. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

[18] Hudzik, J. (2011). Comprehensive internationalisation: From concept to action, executive summary. Washington, D.C.: NAFSA. Retrieved 06-24-2011 from www.nafsa.org.cizn.

[19] Internet World Stats. Retrieved 02-17-2011 from www.internetworldstats.com

[20] Knight, J. (2006). Internationalization of higher education: New directions, new challenges (2005 IAU Global Survey Report). Paris: IAU.

[21] Knight, J. (2008). Higher education in turmoil; the changing world of internationalization. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

[22] 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. http://jsi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/13/2/205 (1552 – 7808).

[23] Leask, B. (2010). 'Beside me is an empty chair'; The student experience of internationalization'. In E. Jones (Ed.) Internationalisation and the student voice (3 – 17). New York: Routledge.

[24] Mazzoleni, E., & Senn, L. (2007). Case study: Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano, Italy. In J. Beelen, (Ed.), EAIE Professional Development Series for International Educators Vol. 2. Implementing internationalisation at home (87 – 92). Amsterdam: EAIE.

[25] Maundeni, T. (2001). The role of social networks in the adjustment of African students to British society: Students' perceptions. Race, Ethnicity and Education, 4(3), 157 – 180.

[26] Mestenhauser, J. (2006). Internationalization at home; Systems challenge to a fragmented field. In H. Teekens (Ed.), Internationalization at home: A global perspective (67 – 77). The Hague: Nuffic.

[27] Nilsson, B. (2003). Internationalisation at home from a Swedish perspective: The case of Malmö. Journal of Studies in International Education, 7(1), 27 – 40.

[28] Nilsson, B. & Otten, M. (Eds). (2003). Internationalisation at home [Special Issue]. Journal of Studies in International Education, 7 (1).

[29] OECD (2009). Education at a glance 2009. Paris: OECD.

[30] Sild Lönroth, C. & Nilsson, B. (2007). A nightingale sang in Malmö Square. The story of the Nightingale programme at Malmö University, Sweden. In H. Teekens (Ed.), EAIE Occasional Paper 20. Internationalisation at home: Ideas and ideals (61 – 68). Amsterdam: EAIE.

[31] Summers, M., & Volet, S. (2008). Students' attitudes towards culturally mixed groups on international campuses: Impact of participation in diverse and non-diverse groups. Studies in Higher Education, 33(4), 357 – 370.

[32] Teekens, H. (2001). The international classroom; Teaching at home and abroad. The Hague: Nuffic.

[33] Teekens, H. (Ed.). (2006). Internationalization at home: A global perspective. The Hague: Nuffic.

[34] Teekens, H. (Ed.). (2007). Internationalisation at home: Ideas and ideals (EAIE Occasional Paper 20), Amsterdam: EAIE.

[35] Teissier, C. (2007). Institutional development for Internationalisation at Home: A case study from Mexico. In H. Teekens (Ed.), EAIE Occasional Paper 20. Internationalisation at home: Ideas and idealism, (23 – 32). Amsterdam: EAIE.

[36] Thomas, C., & Kaunda, L. (2007). Case study: University of Cape Town (UCT), South Africa. In J. Beelen (Ed.), EAIE Professional Development Series for International Educators Vol. 2. Implementing internationalisation at home, (70 – 79). Amsterdam: EAIE.

[37] Vlaamse Hogescholenraad [Association of Flemish Universities of Applied Sciences] (2001). Internationalisation @ home; Verslag van de conferentie aan AHOWO [Report on the AHOWO Conference]. Brussels: VLHORA.

[38] Volet, S., & Ang, G. (1998). Culturally mixed groups on international campuses: An opportunity for inter-cultural learning. Higher Education Research and & Development, 17(1), 5 – 23.

[39] Warwick, P. (2008). Listening to international students. In R. Atfield & P. Kemp (Eds.), Enhancing the international learning experience in Business Management, Hospitality, Leisure, Sport, Tourism (113 – 124). Newbury, Berkshire UK: Threshold Press.

[40] Welikala, T., & Watkins, C. (2008). Improving intercultural learning experiences in higher education: Responding to cultural scripts for learning. London: Institute of Education.

[41] Zhao, C-M., Kuh, G.D., & Carini, R.M. (2005). A comparison of international student and American student engagement in effective educational practices. Journal of Higher Education, 76(2), 209 – 232.

Rationale and purposes

Biographies:

Jos Beelen is a researcher and consultant on internationalisation of the curriculum at the Centre for Applied Research into Economics and Management at Hogeschool van Amsterdam, University of Applied Sciences. He is Chair of the Special Interest Group, Internationalisation at Home, of the European Association for International Education (EAIE) and Visiting Fellow at Leeds Metropolitan University's Centre for Academic Practice and Research in Internationalisation (CAPRI).

Betty Leask is an Australian National Teaching Fellow and an Associate Professor at the University of South Australia. She has researched, published and presented extensively in the field of internationalisation of the curriculum in higher education. She is a board member of the International Education Association of Australia, convenes the Association's Internationalisation of the Curriculum Special Interest Group, chairs the Research Committee and is a Visiting Professor at Leeds Metropolitan University's Centre for Academic Practice and Research in Internationalisation (CAPRI).