

This article was downloaded by: [University of Ballarat]

On: 29 March 2012, At: 16:49

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Higher Education Research & Development

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cher20>

Moving beyond 'wishing and hoping': internationalisation and student experiences of inclusion and engagement

Betty Leask^a & Jude Carroll^b

^a Division of Business, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia

^b Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK

Available online: 30 Aug 2011

To cite this article: Betty Leask & Jude Carroll (2011): Moving beyond 'wishing and hoping': internationalisation and student experiences of inclusion and engagement, Higher Education Research & Development, 30:5, 647-659

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2011.598454>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Moving beyond ‘wishing and hoping’: internationalisation and student experiences of inclusion and engagement

Betty Leask^{a*} and Jude Carroll^b

^a*Division of Business, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia;* ^b*Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK*

There is clear evidence from a number of studies conducted over the last decade that the student experience of internationalisation in universities around the world can be both positive and negative. In this paper we explore these polarised views of internationalisation as they are recorded in the literature. We argue there is evidence of too much emphasis on ‘wishing and hoping’ that benefits will flow from cultural diversity on campus and not enough emphasis on strategic and informed intervention to improve inclusion and engagement. We start by exploring what happens when students are forced into cross-cultural encounters without additional actions and interventions and go on to discuss what we can learn from examples of successful inclusion and engagement in multi-cultural classrooms. We suggest that there are at least three things we should focus on in order to enhance students’ engagement with cultural diversity and ensure that real benefits for student learning result from culturally diverse campuses and classrooms. These are alignment of the formal and informal curriculum, a focus on task design and management and new approaches to professional development of academic staff. The need for reflective practice, which includes ongoing and focussed evaluation of the effectiveness of interventions, is also highlighted.

Keywords: diversity; intercultural interaction; professional development; student engagement

Introduction

The literature on internationalisation in higher education frequently includes statements about the benefits arising from creating culturally diverse campuses and classrooms. Here is a typical example, written by a Vice Chancellor in the UK in the preface to a 2008 report on ‘The Global University’:

Thankfully, it is becoming increasingly clear to us that the main benefits of the globalisation of higher education are not financial (as valuable as that may be) but intellectual and cultural. The coming together of people from different parts of the world to study has the potential to form creative global communities that learn to interact and collaborate in new and previously incomprehensible ways. Such is the dynamism of life in the ‘global village’. (as cited in Shiel & McKenzie, 2008, p. 1)

Other authors agree. Their claims include that people from different backgrounds who study in one physical location will create ‘a flow of knowledge and cultures across

*Corresponding author. Email: betty.leask@unisa.edu.au

national boundaries' (Slethaug, 2007, p. 5). Graduates, it is asserted, can draw upon the experience and the skills developed in culturally diverse universities in their own future employment (see, for example, Ryan, 2004). It has even been claimed that studying on culturally diverse university campuses could contribute to world peace (Larkins, 2008).

Alternative views are equally easy to find in the literature on internationalisation, some even suggesting that the authors of such claims are 'deluding themselves' (Wright & Lander 2003, p. 250). There is certainly evidence to suggest the benefits that are sought are not always achieved. One study conducted by the UK Council for International Student Affairs (UKCISA, 2004) quotes international students as saying they return home after three years' study without having made a single social contact with a UK student and only one in three say that they have made any UK friends. De Vita (2007) drew on a wide-ranging review of the literature on internationalisation to support his conclusion that 'the ideal of transforming a culturally diverse student population into a valued resource for activating processes of international connectivity, social connectivity and intercultural learning is still very much that, an ideal' (p. 165). Such studies say they are recording what is actually happening on campuses, not aspirations or hypothetical possibilities. Researchers who look at students' experiences describe a campus environment where those who are perceived as belonging to cultural and linguistic minorities are locked into the status of 'outsider', either unwilling or unable to engage with the dominant majority. A few studies found more disturbing consequences such as a study in the USA, which found that perceived prejudice and racist behaviour by university professors, classmates and community members towards some groups of students mitigated against the benefits of diversity (Hanassab, 2006). In these situations the likely solution is that 'outsiders' will adopt new skills and behaviours until they appear to be so 'like us' that they are almost invisible, thereby precluding the opportunities inherent in diverse campuses and classrooms.

We explore these polarised views of internationalisation in this paper and suggest three ways to improve students' experiences of internationalisation. We also argue there is evidence of too much emphasis in the past on what, in the words of the Aretha Franklin song, can only be referred to as 'wishing and hoping ... and dreaming' that benefits will flow from cultural diversity on campus. Instead, we propose more strategic approaches and interventions and activities that have the potential to deliver real benefits for student learning. The need for ongoing and focused evaluation of the effectiveness of such actions, resulting in modification and ongoing improvement, is also highlighted.

What happens when we don't intervene?

When Welikala and Watkins (2008) conducted interviews with 40 students from a wide range of national backgrounds, they heard UK students described as dominating and self-centred, leaving non-native English speakers feeling disempowered:

International students. ... Their voices are not heard and they are not happy and feeling comfortable. It is always the English talking ... you know, it is their language. ... From the childhood, they get used to this talking and arguing thing. So they talk all the time. No space for others. ... You know, in our culture, we have a different style of talking ... (Brazil, in Welikala & Watkins 2008, p. 29)

Other studies also suggest that the isolation described by incoming students results from attitudes and actions of home students and academic staff. For example, Chalmers

and Volet (1997) found that home students and their teachers saw students from South East Asia as being largely homogenous and did not cite any characteristics likely to encourage cross-cultural interaction or shared learning. South East Asian students were described as passive rote learners who adopt a surface approach to learning and who were not able to adjust easily to the demands of their Australian study program. They were said to lack the skills required for analysis and critical thinking and to 'stick together'. The home students (in this case, Australians), described their South East Asian classmates as actively resisting participation in class and as having no desire to mix with local students. Ten years later, a different study by Summers and Volet (2008) again found negative and stereotypical perceptions of students from South East Asia that inhibited home students from cross-cultural interaction in the classroom and from effective participation in cross-cultural group work. Our own studies in Australia and Sweden have also found that international students who actively sought to learn and socialise across cultures in class and on campus encountered attitudes and actions in domestic students that, combined with the realities of their busy lives, made it very difficult for international students to connect with local students (Leask, 2005, 2010). Yet, paradoxically, there is also evidence that both students and staff see intercultural interaction as an important component of internationalisation (Cooper, 2009; Leask, 2005).

Some studies explain the lack of cross-cultural interaction and collaboration in classrooms and campuses as a consequence of international (rather than local) students' behaviours. Furnham and Alibhai (1985, as cited in Zhao, Kuh, & Carini, 2005) found that international students 'had a preference for making friends from the same country or students from other nations over students from the host country' (p. 210). In a study over one year, Brown (2008) repeatedly interviewed 13 students from a cohort of 150 that was almost exclusively recruited from outside the UK. She also observed the cohort as a whole. She reports that, in the beginning, all interviewed students expressed great hopes that they would meet and work with a wide range of students from a wide range of different cultures. Yet, as early as the first few days of their 'international' experience, she noticed them self-selecting their social and work companions. For example, the students' 'get-acquainted' bus tour required two buses and Brown noticed that students selected the bus populated by those from the continent on which they had previously lived. Within weeks, work alliances were further fixed by language and nationality and remained so for all but a tiny number of students who moved between and within these cultural 'silos'. Maundeni (2001) reported that students who socialised outside their cultural group felt that their own group discussed and disapproved of them. Other studies document the effects of 'silos', as in a study by Warwick (2008) in a UK university where 70% of the non-native English speakers at the university agreed with the statement 'I have not used spoken English as much as I wanted to' and only 40% thought their spoken English had improved.

These and other studies about cross-cultural encounters and attitudes, most of which are derived from one location or institution and which stretch back over several decades, are confirmed by recent data from a large national survey conducted in Australia. The 2008 Australian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE), administered by the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER), collected data from more than half the total number of universities in Australia and New Zealand (ACER, 2009). A questionnaire, called the Student Experience Questionnaire (SEQ), was administered online. Among other things, students in 29 institutions were asked how often they: 'had conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their

religious beliefs, political opinions or personal values' and 'had conversations with students of a different ethnic group than your own' (ACER, 2009, p. 72).

Respondents were also asked to what extent their institution encouraged contact among students from different social, economic or ethnic backgrounds. The results, summarised in Table 1, show that around 50% of students said they had only sometimes, if ever, had any conversation with those who were culturally or ethnically 'different' during their entire university study. There was little difference in the response patterns between first-year and later-year students in relation to these questions. This large-scale study suggests that the university experience is ineffective in increasing cross-cultural interaction and engagement over time.

These studies, individually and collectively, support the view of those challenging the automatic benefits of campus diversity in engendering culturally diverse encounters. Instead, they suggest relatively low and infrequent interactions with those outside of the speaker's own language and cultural group in many and possibly even most universities in Australia and the UK. The studies are evidence of the consequences of the 'wishing and hoping and dreaming' approach to the inclusion and engagement of international and domestic students. They show the need for taking deliberate and strategic action to assist all students, domestic and international, to move outside of their cultural comfort zone.

At one level, the results of these studies are unsurprising. The literature on intercultural communication and competence confirms that cross-cultural work, conducted in a language where everyone is not equally comfortable, requires resilience, effort and additional time. It is 'psychologically intense' and has several risk factors associated with it, including risk of embarrassment and risk of failure (Paige, 2003, p. 13). Some studies (for example, Smith, 2006; Stone, 2006a, 2006b) have found that domestic students, who are juggling work and study as well as other commitments, can regard time spent getting to know others' cultural backgrounds or past experiences as time wasted. In a small scale focus group study in Sweden in 2008, one of the authors of this paper listened to over 50 students describe their frustrations with fellow students' struggles to find the words or to adjust to others' unfamiliar accents. Native English-speaking home students may never have had to develop skills such as checking understanding or expressing complex ideas in simple language. The immediate demands on home students' time may result in them overlooking the future utility of such skills for a global world. In such

Table 1. Percentage of students agreeing with statements on the Student Experience Questionnaire (SEQ).

SEQ question	Response	First year	Later year
[H]ad conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions or personal values	Never	8	9
	Sometimes	37	40
	Often	32	32
	Very often	23	20
	Total	100	100
[H]ad conversations with students of a different ethnic group than your own	Never	8	9
	Sometimes	34	36
	Often	32	31
	Very often	26	24
	Total	100	100

a context, cross-cultural communication can seem a distraction from or even a threat to achieving learning goals, especially if those goals are not clearly linked to the interactions required to achieve them.

On the other hand, explanations for difficulties in cultural interaction and collaboration cannot all rest with home students' attitudes and behaviours. Newly-arrived students may hold a rosy view of how foreigners are treated 'back home' and be disappointed not to be received with equivalent (often imagined) openness and curiosity. A number of studies over a considerable number of years have shown that incoming students are surprised not to feel more welcome. Spurling (2007) found this in a study of Chinese students' experiences in the UK. Other studies stretching back over two decades describe students as surprised to encounter new teaching and learning strategies, different from those with which they are familiar (for example Elsey & Kinnell, 1990; Johnson, 1992; Ryan & Zuber-Skerritt, 1999; Spack, 1997; Weilikala & Watkins, 2008). In response to these findings, many universities run orientation and induction programs for international students in the first few weeks of a semester. These programmes frequently focus on making students feel welcome and on telling students what they will be expected to do. Most early input, however, falls short of assisting students to make the required adjustments to their behaviour in order to meet the expectations they will encounter in this new educational environment. Adjustments may take years and some people never do adjust. Turner (2006a) describes how the Chinese students in her study did become familiar with UK study practices and expectations but only in so far as they could describe them rather than use them skilfully – many never adopted the underpinning assumptions and beliefs. Turner describes this disjunction as them having learnt about learning, without particularly participating in these new processes. Students in a further study were described as developing 'surface skills' as an exercise in 'British style' (Turner, 2006b, p. 27). Such approaches are unlikely to result in the formation of the dynamic global communities of learners described in marketing brochures and aspirational policy statements.

Thus, while it is recognised that it is important for all students to develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to engage with diversity in a globalised world, and there is general agreement that diversity on campus provides a valuable resource to develop these in all students, it is also apparent that the international campus is not always a positive place to be and may only rarely be a site of satisfying and rewarding intercultural learning. Pike and Kuh made this point in 2006, echoing an earlier report produced by the UK Council for Overseas Students' Affairs (UKCOSA), with the title, *Britain's unrealised asset: A monograph on the educational benefits of overseas students* (UKCOSA, 1990). What is needed, therefore, is not more studies to document the apparently unchanging situation; we need to create new situations, drawing from examples of where students from diverse backgrounds have learned with and from each other. Such examples provide valuable direction in how to create learning spaces, both inside and outside the classroom, that engage all students in the learning process.

What can we learn from examples of successful, cross-cultural engagement?

Student engagement, defined as the extent to which all students participate in purposeful learning activities, is frequently linked to the quality of student learning outcomes (Spurling 2007). It is also recognised that much learning at university occurs in the informal curriculum, outside formal learning environments and that these experiences

can and should support the learning which occurs as part of the formal curriculum (ACER, 2009). Thus it is as important to take action to ensure successful cross-cultural engagement in the informal curriculum as it is in the formal curriculum. The formal curriculum is commonly understood as the planned and sequenced programme of teaching and learning activities organised around defined content areas and assessed in various ways. The informal curriculum includes the various extra-curricular activities that take place on campus. Whilst informal curricular activities are optional and outside formal requirements of the degree or programme of study, they nevertheless contribute to (and in many ways define) the culture of the campus. Thus, informal curricular activities are an important part of the landscape in which the formal curriculum is enacted. The informal curriculum is also frequently taken to include those aspects of the student experience sometimes referred to as the 'hidden' curriculum: that is, to include incidental lessons that are learned about power and authority and about what and whose knowledge is valued and not valued. Hidden lessons, both positive and negative, are learned from such things as which textbooks and references are used and the way that in-class and out-of class activities are organised.

Both the formal and the informal curriculum provide many opportunities for students to learn by reflection on their own experiences in cross-cultural encounters as well as 'vicariously' through observing others engaged in both successful and unsuccessful cross-cultural encounters (Cox, McKendree, Tobin, Lee, & Mayes, 1999). Similarly, there is much we can learn vicariously from examples of successful cross-cultural engagement in both the formal and the informal curriculum that will help us to move to strategic planning for interaction and cultural engagement. To illustrate this point, a brief summary of one example of successful cross-cultural engagement in the informal curriculum and what was learned from it follows (for more detail on this study see Leask [2009, 2010]).

What happens when we do intervene? A case study

The University of South Australia has implemented a range of strategies to embed internationalisation into the fabric of university policy and procedures. The process of internationalising the curriculum in a planned and systematic way commenced in 1996 when the university adopted a statement of seven graduate qualities for all graduating students, including one (GQ7) that specifically addressed students' international and cross-cultural skills and perspectives. It was made clear to academic staff that, in order to demonstrate GQ7, students would need to be taught, to practice and to be assessed on their international and intercultural skills and knowledge. General support resources were provided, many of which focused on the value of student diversity in the classroom and on campus diversity as a resource for developing international perspectives in all students. However, the design and implementation of discipline- and programme-specific strategies and classroom learning activities was essentially left up to academic staff. In 2006, a decade after the adoption of this approach to the internationalisation of the curriculum in all undergraduate programs, an institution-wide survey indicated that neither international nor domestic students were satisfied with the quality and quantity of interaction they were having with cultural others inside or outside of the classroom. Although graduating students in general might have been assessed on these qualities, the lived experiences for most were more in line with the silos described above.

In an attempt to address this issue in one faculty, some modifications were made to an existing mentoring program. Students involved in the modified program were then asked to respond to the same institution-wide survey questions asked in 2006. In the modified

program, mentors ('Business Mates') were required to work in pairs rather than individually and with groups of students, rather than individual students. Mentors and mentees were deliberately matched for diversity between 'home' and 'international' students. The 'mixed pairs' of mentors had around five months to work with, get to know and support their group of mentees, also deliberately 'mixed' to contain both international and domestic students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Organising the Business Mates program in this way was a deliberate attempt to demonstrate that the faculty valued cross-cultural interaction as a learning strategy and to facilitate and support student engagement in intercultural learning. Mentors were commissioned to organise a range of welcome activities during orientation and a number of social activities for their mentee group over a full semester of study.

Direct comparison of responses to the institution-wide survey questions from Business Mates and students involved in a peer-mentoring program in another faculty in which mentors and mentees were not culturally diverse provided an indication of the effectiveness of the changes made to the Business Mates program in facilitating cross-cultural engagement and integration. Students involved as mentors in both programs were asked to indicate to what extent they believed that involvement in the program had resulted in them improving their skills in communicating across cultures and how likely they would be to communicate with people from different cultures in the future, both in class and out of class. In 2008 and again in 2009, those involved in the Business Mates program were more likely to indicate they had improved their skills in cross-cultural communication than those involved in the other program (see Table 2). In addition mentors and mentees involved in the Business Mates program indicated consistently over two years that their involvement in the mentor scheme had made them more likely to choose to work in class with people from a different cultural background to their own and to socialise with people from a different cultural background to their own (Table 3).

This study suggests that it is possible to make a difference. It illustrates that reflective practice and seemingly small adjustments to a program can significantly impact on the extent to which students engage in meaningful cross-cultural interaction. Individually and collectively, this and other studies reported in the literature (and discussed below) suggest that there are at least three things we should focus on in order to enhance students' engagement with cultural diversity.

1. Align the formal and the informal curriculum in the first year and beyond

Some transference of skills and positive pre-disposition towards intercultural communication from the informal to the formal curriculum was evident in the mentoring study. Over two years, both mentors and mentees indicated that, as a result of their involvement in the program, in the future they were 'more likely to choose to work in class with people from a different cultural background to my own' (Table 3). While the impact is

Table 2. Impact of the mentoring programs on cross-cultural skills development.

As a result of this activity did you improve your skills in cross-cultural communication?	Business MATES (paired mentors)		Unpaired mentors	
	2008	2009	2008	2009
Agreement rate (%)	81	80	60	68

Table 3. Impact of the mentoring program on future behaviour.

Statement	Level of agreement (Mentors)		Level of agreement (Mentees)	
	2008	2009	2008	2009
As a result of my experience in the mentoring program I am more likely to choose to work in class with people from a different cultural background to my own. (%)	60	70	40	50
As a result of my experience in the mentoring program I am more likely to socialise with people from a different cultural background to my own. (%)	60	76	43	49

more noticeable amongst mentors than mentees, the results indicate that there is value in aligning both the formal and the informal curriculum towards the achievement of intercultural learning goals.

Other research (Summers & Volet, 2008) indicates the importance of early experiences at university as being ‘particularly important for the development of the necessary skills and willingness to engage in group work with people of other cultures’ (p. 366). The mentoring study also suggests that it is necessary to focus on more than just the first-year experience of students. The results, summarised in Table 3, show that the impact on the future behaviour of student mentors, who were later-year students, was more positive than the impact on the student mentees (who were first-year students). In this instance ‘positive’ is defined in terms of being more predisposed to work and socialise with people from other cultures both in and out of class. This result may be due to both the intensity and the nature of the experience, since the mentors were more closely involved in working across cultures towards shared goals than were the mentees. The results do not deny the importance of the first year, but rather indicate the need to reinforce early interventions with follow-up activities and opportunities which align the formal and the informal curriculum throughout the degree programme. This alignment makes intercultural interaction part of ‘the way we do things around here’ and has the potential to take us into the fourth phase of internationalisation identified by Webb (2005) – normalising of internationalisation of the curriculum (p. 114).

Volet and Ang (1998) describe the complex alignments necessary between the formal and informal curriculum, providing opportunities throughout and around a program of study for students from different cultures to work together. They describe small groups working on both structured and unstructured tasks with the outcomes being assessed and non-assessed. To achieve this level of planning and co-ordination, work is needed in the formal curriculum at programme level. Programme teams need to plan across courses and across years, mapping where particular skills will be taught and practised through interactions and activities (such as assessed group tasks). Programme-level planning questions might include:

- When will students begin to engage with others in the programme in low-risk, nonthreatening ways?
- How will they be prepared for this?
- How will teaching staff and students create time for reflection on interactions and experiences with students from different language or national/cultural backgrounds?

- Who will provide guidance and assistance for students to learn more about themselves and others through this reflection?
- How will the programme signal to students that time and effort expended to get to know and understand other students will be time well spent?
- How will the informal curriculum support the formal curriculum in this area?

2. The design and management of tasks and activities

It is important to carefully design and manage tasks and activities in both the formal and the informal curriculum. Tasks and activities must be designed in such a way that, because of their very nature, they cannot be completed satisfactorily without meaningful intercultural interaction. Furthermore, we cannot assume that all students will be prepared to undertake cross-cultural work without training or support. The mentoring program was carefully managed to ensure that both domestic and international student mentors were trained in what to expect when they entered into a cross-cultural encounter. They were made aware of the effort that would be required and the likely benefits of continuing to work at it. All mentors received training in cross-cultural skills and in self-awareness and awareness of others. The program was managed in such a way that risk factors, particularly the risk of failure, were reduced. Since the program was part of the informal curriculum and was not assessed, any 'failure' would not interfere with a student's progress towards a degree. If mentors encountered problems, there was always someone to talk to about the issue and to help to resolve it. The result was a programme where students could try, fail and try again without significant penalty, perhaps realising the often-stated maxim that failure can be a learning opportunity. They encouraged and helped each other in achieving their goals. Evaluation of the programme indicated that several factors had contributed to the success of the program, through stimulating meaningful cross-cultural engagement.

The tasks undertaken were authentic (i.e., to assist students from diverse cultural backgrounds to feel at home in the university community) and each mentor had an important and unique role to play in their group. In the formal curriculum, aiming for authenticity means relating cross-cultural group-work tasks to the discipline or subject as well as to the students' own experiences. Task design needs to ensure that cross-cultural work is logical and necessary for successful completion of the task. Can the teacher design a task where none of the students can complete it without the co-operation of the rest of the multi-cultural group? One example is a task that requires interviewing someone from another culture as well as undertaking more traditional research, followed by comparing the learning gained from both and applying that to a realistic task.

Another important aspect is that the amount of effort and the time required to complete any task requiring cross-cultural interaction should be reflected in the value or grade given to it. It has to be worth doing. Participants in the mentoring program were all made aware of the importance placed on the development of intercultural competence as a graduate attribute and the value placed on it by employers. Students were given time to get to know each other and to audit each others' skills and knowledge. Other studies have also shown that building in time for training in cross-cultural communication prior to the commencement of cross-cultural group work substantially improves the chances of success (Briguglio, 2006) and that it is important to provide sufficient time for cross-cultural group members to learn how to work together rather than expecting them to be able to perform effectively in a few short weeks (Osmond

& Roed, 2010). In the mentoring programme, students had around six months to work together, a time frame that was found in at least one other study to be the minimum necessary for diverse groups to work effectively (Summers & Volet, 2008). Unless sufficient time and value are attached to cross-cultural tasks, usually through assessing the process as well as the final result, students are unlikely to select an option that requires maximum effort and that has a higher risk of failure.

The above criteria for successful group work suggests the need for fewer, more carefully selected and longer group-work assignments that also provide (or draw upon) training and support for cross-cultural interaction. In the formal curriculum, these larger tasks must deliver discipline-specific learning. They will also set the stage for cross-cultural skill development and student integration in the informal curriculum. Equally, it is perhaps the informal curriculum that sets the stage for the formal curriculum to be successful in that the informal creates a campus culture that develops, values and rewards intercultural engagement.

3. *Professional development for intercultural engagement*

As the earlier review of the literature on cross-cultural engagement shows, students' and teachers' attitudes and beliefs appear to have changed very little over two decades. Caruana (2010) found that academic staff exhibited 'uncertainty and lack of confidence' (p. 40) when dealing with issues associated with internationalisation of the curriculum and noted their struggle to put institutional policies into practice within the 'proximate, subjective territory of their own learning and teaching practice' (p. 41). This may explain their persistent use of largely ineffective strategies when working with culturally diverse groups, despite decades of evidence of their poor impact. We argue therefore that, to reverse the trend, we need to develop new and more effective approaches to professional development. These approaches must engage staff seriously and reflectively in curriculum design that aims to facilitate internationalisation of the curriculum through intercultural engagement. Barnett and Coate (2005) argue that curriculum design 'should be understood as the imaginative *design of spaces as such*, spaces that are likely to generate new energies among students and inspire them, and so prompt their *triple engagement* – in knowing, acting and being' (p. 3). Such an approach to curriculum design is well-suited to the achievement of learning outcomes associated with intercultural engagement through innovative and reflective teaching practices. It necessitates a shift in focus in professional development programs from what teachers need to learn to do to counteract skills and knowledge deficits within students, to how they can create learning spaces within their own disciplinary spheres that encourage meaningful and purposeful interaction and cross-cultural engagement. This approach will provide multiple opportunities for direct and vicarious cross-cultural learning for both staff and students.

This is not to say that some of what has been done in the past will not be useful in assisting teachers to audit and enhance their cross-cultural teaching skills. Can they oversee and encourage effective cross-cultural interaction through, for example, group-work tasks? Do they know how to design appropriate tasks, co-ordinate cross-cultural group processes and handle conflicts and assessment issues? Can they find ways in the curriculum to engineer and support student interaction and cross-cultural competence? Can they work as a teaching team to create and monitor safe, significant opportunities for students to interact and learn from these processes? It is likely that multiple strategies adapted to individual, institutional and disciplinary contexts,

together with modelling of good practice in the design and delivery of professional development programmes for internationalisation, will be most effective.

We also argue that any strategies for building proactive processes for interaction should be applied to the formal *and* informal curriculum, which together constitute the lived experience of students. This means including support and administrative staff in any plans for professional development and extending their role beyond initial induction and welcome events. The range of roles is broad: international student advisers, learning advisers, counsellors and professional development staff as well as affiliated service providers such as local and national student unions and even employer groups and community organizations, local councils and service clubs. Taken together, this implies an ambitious cross-institutional recognition that only by changing the culture and campus environment can students start to feel able and comfortable with moving out of the current silos. This will require leadership and informed action over time.

Conclusion

Polarised views of internationalisation were explored in this paper and three ways to move towards the formation of creative global communities that ‘interact and collaborate in new and previously incomprehensible ways’ (as cited in Shiel & McKenzie, 2008, p. 1) were described. This will not occur spontaneously.

Moving from ‘wishing and hoping and . . . dreaming’ requires we re-conceptualise ‘the curriculum’ to include both its formal and informal aspects and we ‘align’ these to ensure positive cross-cultural interaction and engagement occurs as a normal part of every student’s university experience. We have shown the value of small-scale but carefully planned adjustments to an existing program within the informal curriculum and have presented evidence that the changes made a real difference to students’ experiences of inclusion and engagement and influenced their learning. The conclusions drawn in this paper are also, however, based on the findings of large studies. It is argued that all of these studies, individually and collectively, provide a rich source of information and evidence on which to initiate changes to curriculum and task design and professional development for academic staff.

We need fewer, if any, studies that document the unsatisfactory experiences of students, both home and international, resulting from a failure to take planned and strategic action to promote positive cross-cultural interaction. We can now confidently predict what will occur when issues of cultural and academic diversity on internationalised campuses are not addressed proactively. We also have sufficient direction from the documented experiences of small groups of students and from large-scale research projects to get on with redesigning curricula and learning tasks to improve student experiences of inclusion and engagement. In this process the professional development of all involved in designing and delivering courses and services to students, both within the university and the wider community, will be crucial. It is time to develop new and effective approaches and interventions to ensure campus and classroom culture motivates and rewards interaction across cultures for all students. Let’s get on with it.

References

- ACER. (2009). *Engaging students for success: Australian student engagement report/Australasian survey of student engagement*. Camberwell, VIC: ACER.

- Barnett, R., & Coate, K. (2005). *Engaging the curriculum in higher education*. Maidenhead, UK: SRHE & Open University Press, MacGraw-Hill.
- Briguglio, C. (2006). Empowering students by developing their intercultural communication competence: A two-way process. *Proceedings from 2006 ISANA Conference: Educate, advocate, empower*, 5–8, December, UNSW, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved February 2, 2010, from <http://www.isana.org.au/multi-ethnic-communication/empowering-students-by-developing-their-intercultural-communication.html>
- Brown, P. (2008). The adjustment journey of international postgraduate students at an English university. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 7(2), 232–249.
- Caruana, V. (2010). The relevance of the internationalised curriculum. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalisation and the student voice* (pp. 30–41). New York: Routledge.
- Chalmers, D., & Volet, S.E. (1997). Common misconceptions about students from South East Asia studying in Australia. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 16(1), 87–98.
- Cooper, V. (2009). Inter-cultural student interaction in post-graduate business and information technology programs: The potentialities of global study tours. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(6), 557–570.
- Cox, R., McKendree, J., Tobin, R., Lee, J., & Mayes, T. (1999). Vicarious learning from dialogue and discourse. *Instructional Science*, 27(6), 431–458.
- De Vita, G. (2007). Taking stock: An appraisal of the literature on internationalising higher education learning. In E. Jones & S. Brown (Eds.), *Internationalising higher education* (pp. 154–167). London: Routledge.
- Elsay, B., & Kinnell, M. (1990). *The learning experiences of overseas students*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Hanassab, S. (2006). Diversity, international students and perceived discrimination: Implications for educators and counsellors. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(2), 157–172.
- Johnson, I.M. (1992). Different perspectives, different purposes: Some issues relating to the education of overseas students. *Education for Information*, 10(4), 269–277.
- Larkins, R. (2008, April 23). A battle we must not lose. *The Australian* (Higher Education Supplement), p. 25.
- Leask, B. (2005). *Internationalisation of the curriculum and intercultural engagement: A variety of perspectives and possibilities*. Paper presented at the Australian International Education Conference, Gold Coast, Qld. Retrieved October 11, 2009, from <http://www.idp.com/aiec2005/program/article17.asp>
- 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. (2010). 'Beside me is an empty chair': The student experience of internationalisation. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalisation and the student voice* (pp. 3–17). New York: Routledge.
- Maudeni, 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.
- Osmond, J., & Roed, J. (2010). 'Sometimes it means more work': Student perceptions of group work in a mixed cultural setting. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalisation and the student voice* (pp. 113–124). New York: Routledge.
- Paige, M.R. (2003). On the nature of intercultural experiences and intercultural education. In M.R. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 1–20). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Pike, G., & Kuh, G. (2006). Relationships among structural diversity, informal peer interactions and perceptions of the campus environment. *Review of Higher Education*, 29(4), 425–450.
- Ryan, Y. (2004). Teaching and learning in the global era. In R. King (Ed.), *The university in the global age* (pp. 164–180). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Ryan, Y., & Zuber-Skerritt, O. (Eds.). (1999). *Supervising postgraduates from non-English speaking backgrounds*. Buckingham, UK: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Shiel, C., & McKenzie, A. (2008). *The global university: The role of the curriculum*. London: Development Education Association, Retrieved September 11, 2009, from <http://www.dea.org.uk>
- Slethaug, G. (2007). *Teaching abroad: International education and the cross-cultural classroom*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

- Smith, K. (2006). Facilitating dialogue for a more inclusive curriculum. *Reflecting Education*, 2(1), 103–120.
- Spack, R. (1997). The rhetorical construction of multi-lingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(4), 765–774.
- Spurling, N. (2007). Exploring adjustment: The social situation of Chinese students in UK higher education. *Learning & Teaching in the Social Sciences*, 3(2), 95–117.
- Stone, N. (2006a). Navigating other cultures: Responses from an Australian university to the challenges of ‘internationalising the student learning experience’. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(4), 311–318.
- Stone, N. (2006b). Conceptualising intercultural effectiveness for university teaching. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(4), 334–356.
- 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.
- Turner, Y. (2006a). ‘So how was it for you?’: Evaluating the transnational education experience five years on. *International Journal of Learning*, 12(3), 249–257.
- Turner, Y. (2006b). Chinese students in a UK business school: Hearing the student voice in reflective teaching and learning practice. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 60(1), 27–51.
- UKCISA. (2004). *Broadening our horizons: International students in UK universities*. Retrieved January 7, 2010, from <http://www.ukcisa.org.uk/files/pdf/BOHreport.pdf>
- UKCOSA & Overseas Students’ Trust. (1990). *Britain’s unrealised asset: A monograph on the educational benefits of overseas students*. London: UKCOSA & Overseas Students’ Trust.
- Volet, S., & Ang, G. (1998). Culturally mixed groups on international campuses: An opportunity for inter-cultural learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 17(1), 5–23.
- Webb, G. (2005). Internationalisation of curriculum: An institutional approach. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all* (pp. 109–118). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Welikala, T., & Watkins, C. (2008). *Improving intercultural learning experiences in higher education: Responding to cultural scripts for learning*. London: Institute of Education.
- Wright, S., & Lander, D. (2003). Collaborative group interactions of students from two ethnic backgrounds. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 22(3), 237–252.
- 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* (pp. 113–124). Newbury, UK: Threshold Press.
- 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.