JOS BEELEN

9. GLOBAL AT HOME

Internationalisation at Home in the 4th Global Survey

INTRODUCTION

> A significant development in the conceptualisation of internationalisation has been the introduction of the term[s] 'internationalisation at home' […]. (Knight, 2013, p. 85)

The *4th Global Survey* of the International Association of Universities (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014), is a fitting topic for this publication for three reasons. First, because Hans de Wit has been closely involved, through his membership of the Advisory Committee, with the Global Surveys, while at the same time raising critical questions about its outcomes (see e.g., de Wit & Beelen, 2014). He also critiqued the conceptualisation of internationalisation as mobility only and advocated Internationalisation at Home as a means to provide internationalisation opportunities to all students (see e.g., de Wit & Jones, 2012; de Wit & Jooste, 2014).

A second reason is that the Global Surveys are the only available source for quantitative research on Internationalisation at Home at local levels but on a global scale. The Surveys paint an aggregate global picture based on a regional structure and informed by local universities. It therefore connects the global and the local in the internationalisation of higher education.

A third, and final, reason is that the 4th Global Survey was the first to include dedicated questions on Internationalisation at Home, where previous surveys just included this concept merely as an item in some of the questions. This article therefore also looks back at critical review (Beelen, 2011) of the *3rd Global Survey* (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010) and reflects on the extent to which the dedicated questions in the *4th Global Survey* have led to a better understanding of policies and practices for Internationalisation at Home.

The outcomes of the *4th Global Survey* are compared and complemented here with those of two other recent surveys: *Trends 2015* of the European University Association (Sursock, 2015) and the *EAIE Barometer* of the European Association for International Education (Engel et al., 2015), with recent literature and with experiences of Internationalisation at Home in practice. In order to place the outcomes of these surveys in context, we first explore their respective aims, the composition of the respondents and further relevant differences and similarities.

E. Jones et al. (Eds.), Global and Local Internationalization, 55–65.

On the basis of the surveys, six key issues are considered with regard to Internationalisation at Home: strategies and priorities, activities that universities undertake to implement their strategies, internationalised learning outcomes and their assessment, the experience and expertise of academic staff, professional development for Internationalisation at Home and, finally, the role of international officers in the process of Internationalisation at Home. After the discussion of each issue, recommendations for the 5th Global Survey are given, where relevant.

Out of the discussion of the six issues, a number of misconceptions arise, some of which have already been identified by de Wit (2011). In the concluding section of the chapter, a summary of recommendations for the 5th Global Survey is given and conclusions are drawn.

SURVEYS COMPARED

The surveys discussed here are: the *4th Global Survey* (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014), *Trends 2015: Learning and Teaching in European Universities* by the European Association of Universities (EAU) (Sursock, 2015) and *The EAIE Barometer; Internationalisation in Europe* by the European Association for International Education (EAIE). The three surveys have different aims, geographical scopes and respondents but also have enough similarities to compare their outcomes in relation to Internationalisation at Home. Those similarities and differences are first explored here.

The *4th Global Survey* focuses on internationalisation in higher education across the globe. The outcomes are given both at regional and aggregate global levels. For comparison with the two other surveys, the regional data for Europe are given here, as far as they are included in the report. The regional results for Europe were based on 609 Higher Education Institutions (HEI's) (45% of the global sample). 42% of the respondents identified themselves as international officers (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014, p. 39).

Considering that nearly half the respondents of the *4th Global Survey* were international officers, some of their views were already known before the publication of the *EAIE Barometer,* which is entirely focused on European practitioners in international higher education. The aim of the *EAIE Barometer*, the first of its kind, was to gain insight into the role, challenges and needs of practitioners in internationalisation at European HEI's. The respondents consisted of 2,093 practitioners, mainly international officers, at 1,500 HEI's.

Trends 2015 looks more broadly at how European HEI's have adapted their learning and teaching to the Bologna reforms and other contextual change drivers. The respondents represented 451 universities. Only 13% of the respondents identified themselves as international officers.

The two European surveys give a break down of respondents by country. The *EAIE Barometer* shows that The Netherlands is overrepresented with 230 HEI respondents,

more than Germany, France and Italy combined (Engel et al., 2015, p. 17). The Nordic countries are well represented too. In *Trends 2015* the top contributors in terms of respondents are Germany, Italy, Turkey and Poland (Engel et al., 2015, p. 120, Fig. 29).

This shows that, in the *EAIE Barometer*, countries where Internationalisation at Home has a relatively strong presence are well represented, while countries with many respondents in *Trends 2015* come from the other side of the spectrum.

The three surveys approach benefits and strategies for internationalisation differently. While the *4th Global Survey* includes questions on the benefits of internationalisation and connected policies and strategies, without mentioning the content of those strategies, the *EAIE Barometer* includes both a question on the benefits of internationalisation and on the content of strategies.

STRATEGIES AND PRIORITIES

The question on the content of strategies in the *EAIE Barometer* shows that 56% of European HEI's which responded include Internationalisation at Home in their strategies for internationalisation. However, 68% also include the related concept of internationalisation of the curriculum (Engel et al., 2015, p. 41, Fig. 4.2). The distinction between the two concepts is not made in the survey and the respondents were therefore most likely not aware that internationalisation of the curriculum may include the 'abroad' while Internationalisation at Home considers the 'abroad' an additional learning experience to the home curriculum. Beelen and Jones (2015) have explored these distinctions and proposed a new definition for Internationalisation at Home along these lines.

While both items are prominent in internationalisation strategies, they have a low priority. The Netherlands and Flemish speaking Belgium, where Internationalisation at Home has a long and strong tradition, both include them as their priorities 4 and 5 out of five. Curiously enough, internationalisation of the curriculum is given priority 2 in French speaking Belgium, Georgia and Italy (pp. 108–109, Fig. 0.3), where internationalisation of the curriculum has until now hardly manifested itself. It is not clear how this should be interpreted.

ACTIVITIES

The surveys allow us to see what activities European HEI's report when it comes to backing up their policies to internationalise teaching and learning. With regard to activities in general, the *4th Global Survey* shows that 31% of universities include "strengthening the international/intercultural content of the curriculum" among their top three priority actions for internationalisation (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014, p. 78). This 31% represents the same score as in the *3rd Global Survey* but that included also a related item Internationalisation at Home, which was given priority by 15% of universities (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, p.

91). With this conflicting item removed, the percentage for the remaining item remained the same.

Trends 2015 gives a much higher percentage: 64% of responding European HEI's include Internationalisation at Home among their activities (Sursock, 2015, p. 32).

A next step is to see what specific activities universities undertake to internationalise their programmes. The *4th Global Survey* mentions "activities that develop international perspectives of students" which are considered a priority by 45% of responding universities globally, as well as "programmes or courses with an international theme" (44%) and foreign language learning (44%). European HEI's include foreign language learning among their top five activities (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014, p. 101, Fig. H.2).

Trends 2015 distinguishes three type of activities for Internationalisation at Home that European HEI's consider an enhancement to teaching and learning: International students (40%), teaching in English (25%) and international staff (24%).

The highest scoring specific activity within the formal home curriculum is the provision of scholarships for outgoing mobility, which is reported by 52% of universities as a top priority (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014, p. 99). This is all the more remarkable since Internationalisation at Home is included in the list of terms as meaning "Internationalization activities that do not require physical mobility of students and staff" (p. 145).

A similar focus on outgoing mobility can be found in *Trends 2015*, where 66% of respondents indicate that they consider outgoing student mobility the main contribution that internationalisation makes to the quality of learning and teaching at the home institution (Sursock, 2015, p. 71, Fig. 17). Still, it is difficult to imagine how transferring students to a partner HEI would enhance the quality of the home curriculum per se. There may be high expectations of the contribution that returning students make to teaching and learning at home, but it is unknown to what extent this is formalised and constitutes purposeful practice.

The surveys do not allow us to draw conclusions on the effects of activities on student learning. After all, their effect and impact depends on the extent to which they are part of a deliberate strategy for internationalised teaching and learning. It is evident that teaching in English or learning a foreign language do not automatically lead to international perspectives. Nor do home students learn automatically from incoming international students nor do international staff internationalise teaching and learning by their mere presence. Another question is if these activities reach all students or just a minority. The activities may be electives for a minority of students, a single module in an entire programme or just content focused and not aimed at acquiring skills with an international or intercultural character.

The association of internationalisation with outgoing mobility is so strong that mobility even enters a question on home curricula in the *4th Global Survey* and that the effects of study abroad are considered the main contribution to the quality of teaching and learning in *Trends 2015*. Outgoing mobility and its effects assume

an importance in the surveys that seems incompatible with the fact that they only involve a minority of students.

The item 'scholarships for outgoing mobility' should be removed from question 30 in the *4th Gobal Survey* as it is not only confusing but also at variance with the design of the survey itself. The items in this question should also include other activities within an internationalised curriculum, particularly online collaboration of students.

LEARNING OUTCOMES AND THEIR ASSESSMENT

The *4th Global Survey* shows that 35% of universities across the world which responded to the survey, report having implemented outcomes for internationalised and intercultural learning at institutional level. At the same time, 18% indicate that they have implemented discipline-specific internationalised learning outcomes in all disciplines (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014, pp. 104, 106). On the basis of these figures the authors conclude that the practice of defining outcomes for international and intercultural learning is spreading quickly for such a relatively recent phenomenon.

Yet, it remains to be seen if this optimism is justified. It seems unlikely that learning outcomes at university level have an impact on teaching and learning, as they are necessarily at a general and abstract level and cannot be assessed. Only when learning outcomes are defined at programme, and module levels do they become meaningful. When the *4th Global Survey* shows that only 18% have implemented internationalised learning outcomes in all disciplines, this means that more than 80% of universities cannot assure that all their students experience international and intercultural learning within the context of their discipline or programme.

Another issue is to what extent these learning outcomes are assessed. After all, meaningful intended learning outcomes can only be defined within the context of a programme of study. Jones (2013, p. 113) therefore concludes that the literature only contains a limited number of studies into the achievement of internationalised learning outcomes for all students and notices a "relative lack of research into the outcomes of an internationalised curriculum for all students". She argues that more evidence is required of the achievement of these learning outcomes, in order to shed light on the benefits and the means of delivering curriculum internationalisation at home.

It can be expected that the 5th Global Survey will show another increase in the number of learning outcomes for internationalisation, considering the attention this topic is now getting both in the literature (e.g., Deardorff, 2015), in practice at universities and within academics associations such as EAIE, which has now started to deliver well attended training courses on the assessment of internationalised learning outcomes. Another driver for further development of internationalised learning outcomes – and their assessment- is quality assurance, as is visible in the Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation (CeQuInt) (Aerden, 2014). The bigger picture here is that 94% of universities which

responded to *Trends 2015* see a growing recognition of the importance of teaching in European HEI's (Sursock, p. 80).

The 5th Global Survey should include more and more detailed questions on learning outcomes and also give a regional breakdown for the outcomes of the question on discipline specific learning outcomes and their assessment.

EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE OF ACADEMIC STAFF

The authors of the *4th Global Survey* combine three staff related obstacles that universities include among their top three obstacles: limited experience/expertise (including linguistic skills) of faculty and staff (30%), limited faculty involvement/interest (22%) and limited capacity/expertise (16%) (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014, p. 68) This means that a staggering 68% of universities which responded consider the limited skills and involvement of their staff among their top three obstacles to internationalisation. This is an enormous increase compared to the *3rd Global Survey*, where this percentage was 22% (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, p. 77).

In the next Global Survey, a question on skills of academics (question 15 in the present survey) should incorporate a wider and more specific range of skills for internationalisation of curricula. Formulation and assessment of learning outcomes and foreign language learning should be among those as separate items, as has been suggested before (Beelen, 2011, 262).

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The magnitude of staff-related obstacles that universities report, contrasts sharply with the activities that they undertake to remedy them. The *4th Global Survey* shows that only 37% of universities which responded include "professional development for faculty to enhance their ability to integrate international/intercultural dimensions into teaching" among their top three internationalisation activities (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014, p. 99).

This low priority for professional development for internationalisation is remarkable, given the sharp rise in the scores for lack of skills and experience as an obstacle. We do not know what skills the respondents consider necessary for academic staff. This depends on their views on internationalisation. If they take a narrow view of internationalisation as mainly mobility, sending students out, recruiting international students and teaching in English in international classrooms, it is logical that the international and intercultural dimensions of the curriculum and the methodology of teaching and assessing them are not receiving more attention.

Trends 2015 indicates that professional development for internationalisation is equated with staff mobility. Nearly 60% of responding universities have policies in place for internationalising staff through mobility (Sursock, 2015, p. 14). The *Erasmus Impact Study* (European Commission, 2014, p. 148) indicates that teaching mobility would have a positive impact on teaching and learning but these are

self-reported data by a small minority of academics. For some universities at least this means nothing more than staff mobility without an explicit focus on the development of teaching skills.

In the 5th Global Survey, a question on professional development should distinguish the range of skills needed by academics, such as foreign language training, dedicated training for internationalisation of the home curriculum and teaching in the international classroom.

THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL OFFICERS

The *EAIE Barometer* allows us to look deeper into the role of practitioners of internationalisation in the process of Internationalisation at Home. The survey outcomes show that Internationalisation at Home has a prominent position in HEI policies (p. 41) but that it is an area of responsibility for only 12% of international officers (p. 18, Fig. 2.2).

This seems at odds with the widespread interest in Internationalisation at Home within the EAIE, culminating in the participation of more than 150 international officers in EAIE training courses on the implementation of IaH since 2006. These international officers tended to *feel* quite responsible for the implementation of Internationalisation at Home, strengthened by the fact that many others *hold* them responsible. A reason that this sense of responsibility is not reflected in the *EAIE Barometer*, could be that the responses are reported under the heading of responsibilities while the original survey question (see p. 132), was about the activities of international officers. Therefore, the *Barometer* outcomes only allow the conclusion that a minority of international officers play an active role in the implementation of internationalisation of the curriculum, not that they would not feel responsible.

The *EAIE Barometer* also mentions that the challenges of internationalising curricula are still new to many international officers. This is undoubtedly correct, but it cannot be concluded on the basis of evidence from the survey, since Internationalisation of curricula is not included in the list of challenges in the corresponding question (Engel et al., p. 81).

When international officers gain more experience, it is expected that they "provide informative insights" to institutional leaders, international peers and policy makers (Engel et al., p. 96). This would imply that the role of international officers in the process of Internationalisation at Home is mostly policy related. In reality, international officers are now keenly aware that policy will not change practice and that they will need to focus on the key stakeholders in Internationalisation at Home: the academics (see Green & Whitsed, 2015).

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT INTERNATIONALISATION AT HOME

Hans de Wit started his professorship at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences with a much-quoted list of nine misconceptions about internationalisation

(de Wit, 2011). Many of those persist to this day and their number has even increased now that specific misconceptions about Internationalisation at Home are becoming apparent. Below we distinguish two misconceptions that have already been identified by de Wit and two additional ones pertaining to Internationalisation at Home.

A prominent misconception is that teaching in English equals international education (de Wit, 2011, p. 11). This is found in *Trends 2015* when Sursock (p. 72) notes that some respondents mentioned negative aspects connected to Internationalisation at Home. They considered teaching in English problematic, but only as far as foreign language skills of academics are concerned. There is no mention of the international dimension of education, which is independent of foreign language. Nor is the methodology of teaching in a second language mentioned as an obstacle. The focus on language learning as an element of or maybe a replacement for internationalisation remains strong. It is the second priority of European HEI's according to the IAU survey (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014, p. 99).

Another misconception is that more incoming international students mean more internationalisation (de Wit, 2011, p. 13). In reality, international and intercultural learning only takes place if learning environments facilitate a purposeful learning process. In addition, all students would need to participate in international classrooms, which would require a large number of incoming students across the university (see Beelen, 2014).

An additional misconception is that recruiting international staff will automatically lead to more internationalisation in the curriculum. Research shows that this is an assumption that is not justified (Brewer & Leask, 2012, p. 250; Agnew, 2013, pp. 190–191).

Another misconception relevant to Internationalisation at Home is that electives and activities for a minority of students constitute Internationalisation at Home. Only when these activities touch all these students and are purposeful can they be called Internationalisation at Home (see Beelen & Jones, 2015).

The three surveys discussed here have their fair share of methodological issues, internal contradictions, fuzzy terminology and assumptions. These have the unfortunate effect of proliferating misconceptions or even creating new ones. While methodology and terminology can be adjusted, some aspects of the surveys constitute flaws that cannot be eradicated. One of these is the appearance of politically correct answers (see de Wit & Beelen, 2014). Another is the continued attempt to measure complex processes like Internationalisation at Home with quantitative tools that are more suitable for measuring and counting input rather than outcome.

The most prominent single issue is that internationalisation is still strongly associated with mobility and that this is also the default mode of approach of the surveys. The effects of this become apparent in the *EAIE Barometer*, where Internationalisation at Home is absent as a trend in internationalisation (pp. 54–55) because it has been omitted in the list of items that respondents could

choose from. This is all the more remarkable because the *EAIE Barometer* did detect its prominence in institutional strategies (p. 41).

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE 5TH GLOBAL SURVEY

While the inclusion of specific questions on Internationalisation at Home in the *4th Global Survey* is certainly a step in the right direction, more specific questions need to be asked to shed real light on the state of affairs in this increasingly important field of internationalisation. This could be achieved by the following steps:

- Insert a question on the specific obstacles to internationalisation of the curriculum;
- Remove grants for mobility as an item from question 30a;
- Include questions on alternative types of mobility, such as virtual mobility;
- Insert a question on the assessment of learning outcomes;
- Include a question on specific skills of academic staff for curriculum internationalisation;
- Distinguish between different skills of academics in question 15.

CONCLUSIONS

The outcomes of the *4th Global Survey* are consistent with an internationalisation practice that is still largely traditional. It is leadership driven, focused on a mobile minority, input oriented, assigns high importance to foreign language learning, is costly, does not place academic staff at the centre of internationalisation and does not offer them structured support and professional development.

Many universities may have acknowledged the shift in internationalisation that has taken place during the last 15 years, but have not really acted upon it. We are still far from home and much more needs to be done to reach the aims that universities say they have.

Still, we need to acknowledge that no quantitative survey can give us the qualitative data that we are looking for to capture the complicated process of internationalising teaching and learning. The *4th Global Survey* does not give us the answers, only the perceptions of university leadership and international officers. Still, this helps to focus further, qualitative, research into internationalisation at home.

Internationalisation at Home may have come into its own but this has not caused the conceptual and terminological confusion to diminish. It seems unlikely that the recently published new definition of Internationalisation at Home by Beelen and Jones (2015) will terminate this confusion, but it may help to stress that Internationalisation at Home is not about ad hoc activities for a section of the student population.

If universities want to make steps towards their self professed aim of increasing international awareness of students, they cannot limit themselves to some students but they have to target all students through the compulsory formal curriculum and make the activities outcomes focused rather than input based.

REFERENCES

Aerden, A. (2014). *A guide for assessing the quality of internationalisation*. Paris, France: European Consortium for Accreditation. Retrieved from http://ecahe.eu/home/services/publications/a-guide-to-assessing-the-quality-of-internationalisation/ (Accessed July 2015).

Agnew, M. (2013). Strategic planning: An examination of the role of disciplines in sustaining internationalization of the university. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(2), 183–202. doi:10.1177/1028315312464655

Beelen, J. (2011). Internationalisation at home in a global perspective: A critical survey of the 3rd global survey report of IAU. *Revista De Universidad y Sociedad Del Conocimiento, 8*(2), 249–264.

Beelen, J. (2014). The other side of mobility: The impact of incoming students on home students. In B. Streitwieser (Ed.), *Internationalisation of higher education and global mobility* (pp. 287–299). Oxford, England: Symposium Books Ltd.

Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). Redefining internationalization at home. In A. Curaj, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi, & P. Scott (Eds.), *The European higher education area: Between critical reflections and future policies* (pp. 67–80). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Brewer, E., & Leask, B. (2012). Internationalization of the curriculum. In D. Deardorff, H. de Wit, D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of international higher education* (pp. 245–266). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

de Wit, H. (2011). Law of stimulating arrears? Internationalisation of the universitiesof applied sciences, misconceptions and challenges. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Trends,issues and challenges in internationalisation of higher education* (pp. 7–24). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: CAREM.

de Wit, H., & Beelen, J. (2014, May 2). Reading between the lines: Global internationalisation survey. *University World News*, issue 318. Retrieved from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20140429110128348& (Accessed July 2015).

de Wit, H., & Jones, E.(2012, October 14). Five years of changing internationalisation agendas. *University World News,* issue 243. Retrieved from www.universityworldnews.com http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20121009165209797& (Accessed July 2015).

Deardorff, D. (2015). *Demystifying outcomes assessment for international educators: A practical approach*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

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

Egron-Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2014). *Internationalization of higher education: Growing expectations, essential values* (IAU 4rd Global Survey Report). Paris, France: IAU.

Engel, L., Sandström, A.-M., Van der Aa, R., & Glass, A. (2015). *The EAIE barometer; Internationalisation in Europe*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: EAIE.

Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (Eds.). (2015). *Critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum in disciplines: Reflective narrative accounts from business, education and health*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Jones, E. (2013). Internationalisation and student learning outcomes. *An introduction to higher education internationalisation* (pp. 107–116). Milan, Italy: Vita e Pensiero.

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

Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalisation – For better or for worse? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 17*(3), 84–90.

Sursock, A. (2015). *Trends 2015: Learning and teaching in European universities*. Brussels, Europe: European University Association.

Jos Beelen
Centre for Applied Research on Economics and Management
School of Economics and Management
Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences
The Netherlands