Internationalising the Curriculum in a UK University: Beliefs and Practices of Academics

Weici Zhong

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of Education and Lifelong Learning

University of East Anglia

September 2022

Abstract

Whilst internationalisation of research and recruitment has become an important strategy for many UK universities, internationalisation of the curriculum has often been less prioritised. Despite the public statements that universities make about how international or internationalised they are, how exactly internationalisation of the curriculum is implemented in institutions and classrooms often remains unclear. Sometimes this tends to be narrowly understood as developing appropriate teaching approaches for international students.

My thesis examines how internationalisation of the curriculum is being implemented in a UK university from the perspectives of academics across a range of disciplines/subjects. An ethnographic-style case study approach was adopted to explore how twenty-six academics from eight departments (including Mathematics, Environmental Sciences, Education, Business, International Development, Languages, Politics, and Literature) engage with internationalisation of the curriculum – including how they interpret and implement it in practice. Participant observation, semi-structured interview and documentary analysis were the main data collection instruments. Drawing on Street's (1993) notion of 'culture as a verb' and Holliday's (1999, 2011) notions of 'small cultures', 'cultural realities' and 'cultural arenas', I explore how the social contexts in which academics work and teach shape their understandings and practices of internationalising the curriculum.

My study reveals that academics take different approaches to internationalising the curriculum: from a 'symbolic' approach (adding diverse cultural perspectives and practices to the curriculum) to a 'transformative' approach (aiming to dismantle the domination of the Eurocentric canon and treating global perspectives and epistemologies as the central tenets of the curriculum). Findings suggest that discipline/subject is not the only factor affecting how academics engage with internationalisation of the curriculum. Individual understandings and practices are shaped by how they see the world and different country experiences, what they understand to be the purpose of university education, how they see their discipline/subject, their approach to teaching, and how they perceive knowledge hierarchies in the academy.

Amid the rising calls for decolonising the curriculum in the UK higher education sector, the findings of my study are particularly timely and have implications for universities' future strategies. Contributing new insights into the meanings of and approaches to internationalising the curriculum, my thesis challenges the market discourses on internationalisation currently permeating UK higher education. It encourages university leaders to listen to the voices of academic staff and students when developing strategies for internationalising their university.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to people who generously offered me help during my PhD research. Without their help, this thesis would not have been possible.

My deepest thanks go to my supervisors: Professor Anna Robinson-Pant and Professor Yann Lebeau. Dear Anna and Yann, thank you for your challenge, patience, nurturing, and encouragement. Your insightful comments on the thesis always provided me with plenty of food for thought. From you, I have learnt how to be a critical researcher. Thank you for believing in me and supporting me through the toughest of times.

I want to extend my heartfelt thanks to Professor Ming Cheng. Dear Ming, thank you for your guidance in the early stages of my research. Your encouragement strengthened my confidence in carrying on with my research. For that, thank you very much.

I am very grateful to the academics who participated in my research and offered their precious time. Thank you for your openness, kindness, and tremendous support. I will always appreciate your trust in me and your interest in my research.

I am also indebted to the staff, faculty, and my fellow PhD researchers at the School of Education and Lifelong Learning in the University of East Anglia. Thank you for making my PhD journey pleasant and less lonely.

Finally, my sincere thanks go to my friends, both in the UK and in China, who have accompanied me through the ups and downs in my life over the years. Thank you for your friendship. To my parents who encouraged me to pursue my dreams and have provided me with a great deal of support. Thank you for your unconditional love.

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 My journey into the research topic

I came to the UK to study on an MA Education programme at the University of Wolverhampton in 2015. Before that, I was a postgraduate student studying translation and interpreting at the Northeast Normal University in China, a programme that lasted three years. In the first year of the programme, I learnt that the university where I studied in China had built partnerships with UK universities and that we, as students, could choose to exchange and study there for one year. My undergraduate degree was in the major of English language and literature. I always wanted to study in an English-speaking country to meet the people there and to get to know more about the culture. I thus prepared for the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) exam and got the offer of studying on the MA Education programme.

Studying on the MA Education programme in the UK was an eye-opening experience for me. I was fascinated by the lectures on various teaching and learning theories and excited to step into a field which I was not familiar with. But in the meantime, I spent some time adjusting to the different teaching and learning cultures in the UK university where I studied. For instance, the seminars and group discussion activities were quite new to me. I was more used to the lecture-style class rather than seminars in which I was expected to discuss topics with fellow students. Another big difference that I experienced was the assessment methods and criteria. For each of my chosen modules, I was asked to write essays at the end of the semester. I remembered that the term that teachers emphasised the most was 'critical thinking'. I was asked to critically review the literature and to be critical about the things that I wrote. Whilst critical thinking was not a completely new concept to me, I rarely saw it as an assessment criterion when I studied for my degrees in China. I struggled a bit with the assignments in the first semester as I did not know how to show my critical thinking in the essays. To solve this problem, I sought help from my

teachers and asked for their feedback on my writing assignments. The formative feedback that they gave me helped me to gain a better understanding of the academic conventions regarding writing essays in the UK higher education system and their expectations with regard to my essays in terms of styles, structures, and critical thinking.

In addition to the support from teachers, discussing my concerns and feelings about the difficulties that I encountered in studying in the UK university with my fellow students who came from countries other than my own, helped me to overcome the culture and learning shock in the early stages of my studies. The same and similar experiences shared by my peers in our conversations made me feel that I was not the only one who struggled. Talking with them about my academic studies and social life in the UK led me to not only reflect on the beliefs and values that I upheld but also to learn those of other cultures and societies. As Gu, Schweisfurth and Day (2010: 20) suggest, the experience of intercultural adaption within a different educational environment and a different culture and society is not 'linear and passive' but 'a complex set of shifting associations between language mastery, social interaction, personal development and academic outcomes.' The academic and personal support that I got from my teachers and peers helped me through the transitional period of my studies in the UK and succeed in adapting to the new living and studying environments.

Whilst I benefited a lot from studying on the MA Education programme in the UK university, I was aware that academics adopted different teaching approaches and some of them did not take 'internationalisation of the curriculum' seriously in their practices. The scope of the curriculum in some modules of the programme that I took was quite limited; for instance, the curriculum in some modules only focused on what happens in the UK and there was little discussion in class on how things are understood and implemented in other societies and cultures. The personal experience of studying on the MA Education programme in the UK made me realise that whilst many UK universities make public statements that they consider 'internationalisation' as an important aspect of their education and university development, 'internationalisation of the curriculum'

might not be taken seriously in these universities. I then became interested in this research topic and wanted to investigate the meanings of and approaches to internationalising the curriculum in the context of UK higher education.

1.2 Rationale for this study

Internationalisation is perceived by some scholars as an agenda of growing strategic importance to UK higher education institutions (Trahar and Hyland, 2011; Bourn, 2011; Luxon and Peelo, 2009; De Vita and Case, 2003). Knight (2004: 11) in her seminal work defines 'internationalisation' as 'the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education.' According to Knight's definition, the internationalisation of UK higher education has been gathering pace. For instance, the UK has been the second most popular study destination in the world for international students after the US (Universities UK International, 2020). In 2018-19, 485,645 international students were studying at higher education institutions across the UK, accounting for 20.7% of the total student population, 14.9% of all undergraduates and 37.1% of all postgraduates (ibid.). Concerning the staff, in 2018-19, there were 91,805 international staff working at higher education institutions across the UK, representing 20.9% of the total workforce (ibid.). In the same year, 142 UK universities delivered some form of Transnational Education (TNE) to their students in 226 countries and territories worldwide, and 7.4% of all UK-domiciled, full-time, first-degree graduates spent a period of their studies abroad (ibid.). The UK has also been the third-largest producer of internationally co-authored publications in the world, rivalled only by the US and China. In 2019, 23.8% of total UK research funding came from international sources and 57.2% of all UK publications were the result of international research collaborations (ibid.).

Yet scholars point out that whilst many UK universities have established an internationalisation strategy, some of them are primarily concerned with the economic

rationales for internationalisation and pay less attention to the implications of internationalisation for the curriculum in the institution (Wawick and Moogan, 2013; Trahar and Hyland, 2011; Luxon and Peelo, 2009). In an analysis of the internationalisation strategies of seven UK universities and the views of staff and students on how internationalisation strategies have been implemented in their university, Warwick and Moogan (2013) suggest that the internationalisation strategies of all seven UK universities primarily focus on the business and economic side of internationalisation – notably international student recruitment – and less on a broader range of activities in relation to internationalisation – for instance, internationalisation of the curriculum. They report that the PVC-level staff and the student representatives interviewed in their study have a positive view about their university's internationalisation strategies; by contrast, the academic staff interviewed in their study question their university's motivations for internationalisation, believing that 'internationalisation' for their university is all about getting income from recruiting more international students and very little else. The findings of Warwick and Moogan's study are to some degree consistent with my experience of studying on the MA Education programme in the UK university, as I observed that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' was limited and narrowly interpreted in both policy and practice in the UK university where I studied.

It is useful to note that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' has attracted considerable attention in recent years, driven by the increasing global competition for international student recruitment between higher education institutions (Wihlborg and Robson, 2018; Svensson and Wihlborg, 2010; Egron-Polak and Hudson, 2014). However, as a concept it is still thought to be poorly understood and developed in practice (Leask, 2015; Leask and Bridge, 2013; Sanderson, 2011; Bennett and Kane, 2011). While the concept has been in existence for many years since the 'Internationalisation at Home' movement started in Europe in the late 1990s (De Wit, 2013; De Wit and Merkx, 2012), what it means in practice is still in debate (Harrison, 2015; Whitsed and Green, 2014; Leask, 2009, 2005). Green and Mertova (2016) analyse the reason for the lack of consensus regarding the meaning of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' and suggest that the term combines

two fuzzy and ideologically-laden concepts ('internationalisation' and 'curriculum') and that decisions about curriculum reform and innovation for internationalisation are largely shaped by beliefs about these two concepts. In their view, given the concepts ('internationalisation' and 'curriculum') have been extensively and variously used in research and discussion, it is not surprising to find that there is less consensus on the meaning of 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. They argue that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is a 'construct' rather than 'a set of prescribed practices' (ibid: 231).

The importance of internationalising the curriculum has been recognised by scholars working in the higher education sector; indeed, some argue that every degree programme should incorporate an international and intercultural dimension into their curriculum (see, for example, Clifford and Montgomery, 2017; Leask, 2015; Trahar and Hyland, 2011; Luxon and Peelo, 2009; Turner and Robson, 2008).Yet there are still few examples in the literature about how 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is being implemented in the context of UK higher education. Where these exist, they tend to be top-down in nature, analysing the initiative of internationalising the curriculum at the policy level (see, for example, Jones and Killick, 2013, 2007) rather than taking a bottom-up approach and exploring academics' views and experiences. My study aims to fill this gap in the literature by employing a bottom-up approach to explore academics' understandings and practices of internationalising the curriculum in the context of UK higher education. The overarching research question for this study is: ***How do academics working in different disciplines engage with internationalisation of the curriculum?***

It is important to note that calls to decolonise the curriculum have risen significantly in recent years in the UK higher education sector. Since the Black Lives Matter movement following the killing of George Floyd by Minneapolis police in May 2020, many universities in the UK have made public statements about their commitments to 'anti-racism' and 'decolonising the curriculum'. A recent investigation reveals that one in five UK universities say that they have committed to decolonising their curriculum (Guardian, 11th June, 2020). A series of student-led campaigns (such as 'Why is My Curriculum White?' at

University College London, 'Rhodes Must Fall' at the University of Oxford) draw attention to the Eurocentrism in 'Western' education systems and highlight that the 'Western' education system was and is still a key site through which colonialism and colonial knowledge are produced, institutionalised, and naturalised (Shain et al., 2021). The endeavour to challenge the monopoly of 'Western' epistemological traditions, histories, and figures that comprise much of the existing curriculum and dismantle the inequalities and racism that pervade within institutions, has become a top priority to UK universities (Arday, Belluigi and Thomas, 2021).

Yet, despite the growing impetus from students and staff to decolonise the curriculum, it is less clear what this means and how it is being implemented in UK universities. Liyanage (2020: 14) suggests that there is still substantial disagreement and misunderstanding about what 'decolonisation' entails and 'institutions and students have clashed over both its meaning and its validity.' She argues that the conflation of the agenda for 'decolonisation' with that of equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) creates 'an impression of decolonisation as a collection of surface-level changes rather than a deep re-evaluation' (ibid: 24). She suggests that decolonisation practices within higher education institutions should 'reassert academic rigour by introducing new and challenging perspectives' and 'ask pedagogical questions that are chronically under-addressed' (ibid: 10).

Amid the rising calls for decolonising the curriculum in the UK higher education sector, my study exploring academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum is timely and has potential to provide insights into the internationalisation agenda and the decolonisation agenda in UK universities. In the next section, I will explain in detail how I drew on the literature around internationalisation of the curriculum to construct the research questions for this study.

1.3 Constructing the research questions

The overarching research question that I designed for this study is: ***How do academics working in different disciplines engage with internationalisation of the curriculum?*** As I discussed in the previous section, there is less consensus on the meaning of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' due to the various conceptualisations of 'internationalisation' and 'curriculum' in the literature. In this study, I drew on Leask's (2009) definition of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as my conceptual starting point to explore academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. She defines 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'the incorporation of an international and intercultural dimension into the content of the curriculum as well as the teaching and learning arrangements and support services of a program of study' (ibid: 209). Her definition reflects a broad conceptualisation of 'curriculum' and clarifies that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' goes beyond 'the content of the curriculum' and encompasses 'the teaching and learning arrangements'. Drawing on Leask's (2009) definition, I paid attention not only to the curriculum content but also the teaching methods and activities in the classroom when I explored academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. The purpose was to explore not only what is taught in the classroom but also how the content is taught by academics.

In addition to Leask's (2009) definition, Kelly (2009) also provides a broad conceptualisation of 'curriculum'. He suggests that 'curriculum' includes at least four major dimensions of educational planning and practices:

> 'the intensions of the planners, the procedures adopted for the implementation of these intentions, the actual experiences of the pupils resulting from the teachers' direct attempts to carry out their or the planners' intentions, and the hidden learning that occurs as a by-product of the organization of the curriculum, and, indeed, of the school' (ibid: 13).

According to Kelly, the 'curriculum' is not a given but is constructed through the interactions between teachers and students in the classroom (ibid.). What is special about

Kelly's definition of 'curriculum' is that he considers the 'hidden learning' as an inherent part of the curriculum. His notion of 'hidden curriculum' further explains this aspect of the curriculum. He defines 'hidden curriculum' as

> 'those things which pupils learn at school because of the way in which the work of the school is planned and organized, and through the materials provided, but which are not in themselves overtly included in the planning or sometimes even in the consciousness of those responsible for the school arrangements' (ibid: 10).

In his view, the 'hidden curriculum' embodies 'the attitudes and values of those who create them' (ibid.). In this study, Kelly's notion of 'hidden curriculum' provides a theoretical lens for me to explore academics' practices in the classroom. It was his notion of 'hidden curriculum' which led me to pay attention to the beliefs/values/assumptions that are delivered to students through the teaching examples, methods, and activities designed by academics.

As indicated in the overarching research question outlined at the beginning of this section, one of my starting assumptions about academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum was that academics from different disciplines have different attitudes towards 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. My assumption was based on two studies (Clifford, 2009; Sawir, 2011) that explore academics' views and experiences of internationalising the curriculum across a range of disciplines in the context of Australian higher education. For example, Clifford (2009) reports that academics in the so-called 'hard pure' disciplines (e.g. mathematics) interviewed in her study believe that their curriculum is inherently international in nature and that there is no need for them to internationalise the curriculum. Sawir (2011) reports that academics from the so-called 'soft' disciplines (e.g. arts, economics, business) interviewed in her study are more open to 'internationalisation of the curriculum' than academics from the so-called 'hard' disciplines (e.g. engineering, natural sciences). Based on their studies and findings, I formed the assumption that discipline is a crucial factor influencing academics' understandings and practices of internationalising the curriculum. I therefore designed

the first sub research question (RQ1) for this study as: ***How do academics working in different disciplines interpret the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum?*** I will explain further how I understand the notion of 'discipline' and apply it in this study, later in the thesis (see Chapter 3, Section 3.3).

Deep engagement in internationalising the curriculum is thought to be challenging because it involves epistemological explorations and requires 'the creative utilisation of the imagination and agency' of academics (Jones and Killick, 2007: 114). Van Gyn et al. note that the challenge for academics to engage in internationalising the curriculum is to

> 'extend our actions far beyond concerns of course content to include pedagogies that promote cross-cultural understanding and facilitate the development of the knowledge, skills, and values that will enable students, both domestic and international, to successfully engage with others in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world' (Van Gyn et al., 2009: 26).

Having conducted an extensive literature review, Joseph (2011) develops a typology of approaches to internationalising the curriculum, including the economic rationalist approach, the integrative approach, and the transformative approach. Firstly, according to Joseph, the economic rationalist approach focuses on 'educational capitalism and markets in relation to international students, offshore programmes, branch campuses overseas and twinning programmes' (ibid: 241). She suggests that when academic staff take the economic rationalist approach, 'curriculum' is seen as 'an international commodity to be traded' and 'academics' are seen as workers who 'deliver pre-packaged education with efficiency and economy' (ibid.).

Secondly, the integrative approach, in Joseph's typology, is understood as 'the integration of intercultural dimensions into an already existing curriculum' (ibid.). According to Joseph, the integrative approach can be considered as a surface analysis to cultural differences, as it 'reaffirms the binary of the Western self and the global as constructed as the non-Western global other' (ibid: 241). Moreover, this approach does not 'allow for cross-cultural exchanges in terms of knowledge and pedagogical practices' (ibid: 242).

Thirdly, the transformative approach, in Joseph's typology, is thought to be 'aligned with a critical understanding of pedagogical enquiry that includes inclusive education, feminist pedagogies and anti-racist and postcolonial pedagogies' (ibid.). The basic tenet of this approach is to 'interrogate the philosophical underpinnings of the different epistemological and ontological frameworks, and link this to cultural hierarchies' (ibid.). Joseph states that the transformative approach considers the following questions:

> 'How does knowledge work in the curriculum? How was the curriculum produced? Where does it come from? Why are we using this type of curriculum? How does this curriculum understand gendered, racial and cultural differences? What does this curriculum mean to me as an educator and academic?' (ibid.).

Joseph's typology of approaches to internationalising the curriculum suggests that academics' approaches to internationalising the curriculum are associated with their beliefs about cultural differences, the purpose of education, and the role and responsibilities of teachers. It was her typology that made me aware of the diverse approaches to internationalising the curriculum and decide to explore more about academics' approaches. Inspired by Joseph's topology, I was curious about how academics' beliefs and assumptions about cultural differences, the purpose of education and so on, shape their approaches to internationalising the curriculum. This led to my second sub research question (RQ2): ***What are academics' strategies and practices for internationalising the curriculum?***

It is useful to note that Leask (2015) categorises what she terms 'the blockers' to staff engagement in internationalising the curriculum into three different types: cultural blockers, personal blockers, and institutional blockers. Firstly, according to Leask, the cultural blockers 'derive from the values, beliefs and dominant ways of thinking in the discipline' and 'arise as a result of the way in which knowledge is constructed in the disciplines' (ibid: 106). She states that the cultural blockers may include 'skepticism about the validity of the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum, a denial of the

relevance of internationalisation to a particular discipline, and sanctions against those who challenge taken for granted ways of doing things in the discipline' (ibid.).

Secondly, the personal blockers, in Leask's view, are related to the 'mindset, skillset and heartset' of individuals to get involved in internationalising the curriculum (ibid: 108). She points out that academic staff may feel under-prepared for the task of internationalising the curriculum and uncertain where to start. For instance, they may lack understanding of emerging paradigms in the discipline and related professions, lack understanding of the concepts such as 'internationalisation' and 'curriculum', lack experience in curriculum design, and so on. From Leask's perspective, all these factors can be considered as the personal blockers to staff engagement in internationalising the curriculum (ibid.).

Thirdly, the institutional blockers, in Leask's view, are related to 'the ways in which a university organizes itself as it goes about its business' (ibid: 106). She summarises the institutional blockers as follows:

- A lack of institutional vision or policy related to internationalisation of the curriculum.
- Leaders who are not committed to or informed about internationalisation of the curriculum.
- Internationalisation of the curriculum having a low priority and few resources to support it.
- Lack of support/resourcing for academic staff to collaborate with or work in international settings.
- No expectation that academic staff members will work with colleagues within their own university who bring alternative perspectives to the discipline.
- A discourse of marketisation and commercialisation of education in relation to internationalisation (meaning that it is therefore not perceived by academic staff as "academic business").
- An internationalisation strategy that is focused primarily on income generation.
- Undervaluing of research and publications in the area of assessment, learning and teaching (ibid: 111).

Leask's conceptualisation and classification of 'the blockers' stresses the tensions and barriers for academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. However, in analysing the impact of university policies and strategies on academics' engagement, it appears that she has a rather negative starting point. Building on Leask's categorisation of 'the blockers', I tried to have a more neutral starting point in exploring the impact of university policies and strategies on academics' practices – that is, I sought to identify not only the barriers but also the opportunities created by university policies and strategies. This is reflected in the third sub research question (RQ3): ***How does the case study university's policy discourses on internationalisation shape academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum?***

Finally, before proceeding, I want to clarify the use of the term 'Western' in this thesis as it is widely used in the literature and by the participants of this study, yet the term has been problematised by scholars such as Edward Said and Stuart Hall (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1). For example, Said (1978) and Hall (1992) both suggest that the term 'Western' is a product of colonial and imperial discourses, which takes an essentialised view of culture and influences the languages of racial and ethnic inferiority/superiority. Based on a critical analysis of the accounts of Said (1978) and Hall (1992), I, in this thesis, use the term 'Western' to describe not only a geography – i.e. Europe and North America – but also the Eurocentric knowledge, education and perspectives that are created by people and institutions. Meanwhile, I put the term 'Western' in quotation marks to signal that it is a contested term.

1.4 Research design and methods

This study sets out to explore how academics working in different disciplines engage with internationalisation of the curriculum. I designed one overarching research question and three sub research questions. To answer these research questions, I adopted an ethnographic-style case study approach as the overarching methodology and decided to

focus on one UK university rather than a range of UK universities. I focused on one case study university because I was more interested in the similarities and differences between different disciplines rather than across different institutions, regarding academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. To answer RQ1, I used semi-structured interviews to explore academics' attitudes, beliefs, and conceptualisations around the term 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. To answer RQ2, I used participant observations and semi-structured interviews to explore how academics implement 'internationalisation of the curriculum' in the classroom. To answer RQ3, I used semi-structured interviews and documentary analysis to explore how 'internationalisation' is conceptualised in the university's policies and strategies and its impact on academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. A more detailed explanation of the research design and methods will be presented later in the thesis (see Chapter 4).

1.5 Conclusion and thesis structure

To sum up, the primary aim of this study is to contribute new insights into the meanings of and approaches to internationalising the curriculum. As I discussed earlier in this chapter, the calls to decolonise the curriculum have increased significantly in recent years in the UK higher education sector. In this context, I hope that my study can enable critical reflexivity on approaches to internationalising and decolonising the curriculum in the UK higher education sector and stimulate academic staff to examine their beliefs and practices with regard to the curriculum, teaching, and learning. I also hope that my study can challenge the market discourses on internationalisation currently permeating UK higher education and provide opportunities for university executives and managers to reflect on the internationalisation strategies of their institution.

This thesis consists of nine chapters. The first three chapters – Introduction, Contexts of the Study and Conceptual Framework – introduce the background information about this study and the conceptual framework that guides the research design, my analysis of the

data, and my discussion of the research findings. Chapter 4 presents the methodology for this study. In this chapter, I write about my research design, data collection and analysis methods, and the challenges that I faced during the research process. In Chapters 5, 6 and 7, I present the findings of this study. In Chapter 8, I pick up the key themes that emerged from Chapters 5 to 7 and discuss them in relation to the literature that I reviewed in Chapters 1, 2 and 3. Finally, Chapter 9 concludes the thesis with my reflections on this study and its implications for policy and practice in relation to the internationalisation of the curriculum.

Chapter 2 Contexts of the Study

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I introduce the policy, political, and institutional contexts that have shaped this study and provide some background information against which some of the analyses and discussions emerged in this thesis. I begin this chapter by introducing the marketisation of UK higher education – a characteristic of UK higher education since the 1980s. I explain how the marketisation of UK higher education impacts on the management and leadership of UK higher education institutions and their policies and strategies. Thereafter, I introduce the decolonisation movement in the UK higher education system since 2014. I explain how the decolonisation movement challenges the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the curriculum in UK universities and requires people working in the higher education sector to re-examine their beliefs about the curriculum, knowledge production, and educational practices. Finally, I introduce the case study university where this study is based, particularly its strategies, policies, and initiatives on internationalisation and decolonisation.

2.2 Marketisation of UK higher education: the policy context

Higher education in the UK has been subject to a gradual process of marketisation since the early 1980s (Brown, 2015). Compared to the early postcolonial period when UK universities offered free education to the international elites from former colonies (Pietsch, 2013), the UK government changed its policy on international students in the late 20th century and required non-EU international students to pay full tuition fees (Walker, 2014). There were several milestones during this process, such as 'the abolition of the remaining subsidy for overseas students' fees in 1980', 'the separation of funding

for teaching and research and the introduction of selective research funding in 1986', and 'the introduction of "top-up" loans for student support in 1990' (Brown, 2015: 5).

The use of 'market mechanisms' was considered by the UK government as the key route to effectively and efficiently expanding the UK higher education sector, due to the economic challenges in the 1970s (Foskett, 2010: 26). To ensure that the UK economy would continue to be competitive in the global markets, the UK government 'put the provision of higher education on a market basis, where the demand and supply of student education, academic research and other university activities are balanced through the price mechanism' (Brown, 2015: 5).

In 1999, the then Prime Minister of the UK, Tony Blair, chose the London School of Economics (LSE) to launch a policy (known as the Prime Minister's Initiative or the PMI) encouraging collaborations between universities, colleges, and other bodies to increase the number of international students in the UK, in recognition of their importance in fostering internal relations and long-term political and economic benefits (Walker, 2014). The PMI set a target of attracting an additional 75,000 non-EU students by 2005, including 50,000 in higher education and 25,000 in further education. Its aim was to consolidate the UK's position as a leading player in the global market for international study. A crucial element of the PMI was investment in an ambitious campaign managed by the British Council to promote UK higher education. As a result of cross-sector collaboration involving stakeholders from UK Trade and Investment, Ministry of Defence, FCO, Home Office, UK Visas as well as the British Council, the target of recruiting an extra 75,000 non-EU students was exceeded ahead of schedule, with an extra 116,000 non-EU students enrolled (ibid.).

In April 2006, the second phase of the Prime Minister's Initiative, known as the PMI2, was launched. The PMI2 set a target of attracting a further 100,000 international students (70,000 in higher education and 30,000 in further education). Its aim was to diversify the markets by reducing dependence on a small number of sending countries, improve the satisfaction ratings given by international students in attitudinal surveys, and build

strategic partnerships at both national and institutional level through engagement in collaborative arrangements overseas. As Lomer (2016) suggests, the PMI2 marked a further step in advancing international education in the UK by recognising that it is not enough to just focus on the targets of increasing the number of international students but the quality of student learning experience in the UK needs to improve and there needs to be a growth in partnerships. While the PMI2 employed a more holistic approach in terms of policy design and development (i.e. emphasising quality over quantity and sustainability over expansion), the economic rationale was still dominant and the consensus that international students are recruited to benefit the UK economy did not change radically (ibid.).

The marketisation of UK higher education has changed the context of higher education in the UK so much that universities have to 'review fundamentally what it means to be a university and what sort of university they might wish to be' (Foskett, 2010: 36). Universities in the UK find themselves in a strongly competitive environment for many of their activities, both at home and abroad, and are faced with competition and market forces driven by the quasi-market imposed by the UK government (ibid.). A key feature of the increase in competition and marketing in UK higher education is

> 'the requirement to move from a transactional approach to marketing, in which marketing is simply an operational tool of the organisation, to a strategic approach to marketing, in which the very existence and future of the organisation is shaped at a strategic level by decisions which are market driven' (ibid: 36).

As Foskett suggests, at the strategic level, marketing has a vital place in the management and leadership of UK universities and the adoption of a market-focused perspective by those providing strategic leadership has become essential (ibid.).

The growing dominance of market discourses and practices in UK higher education made many UK universities become aggressive in competing with American and Australian universities for international student recruitment (Robson, 2011; Ryan, 2011; Maringe,

Foskett and Woodfield, 2013). The marketing model of internationalisation adopted by UK universities tends to primarily focus on recruitment of international students as an important source of revenue and not regard them as 'assets to internationalisation and the generation of new knowledge and new ways of working in the academy' (Ryan, 2011: 631). As De Vita and Case (2003: 238) suggest, 'despite paying lip service to various aspects of internationalisation, institutions are failing to make the most of the opportunity to engage in a radical reassessment of HE purposes, priorities and processes that student diversity and multicultural interaction provide.'

In this context, market discourses and practices have become dominant in the UK higher education sector and the economic rationale for 'internationalisation' is also prioritised by UK higher education institutions (De Vita and Case, 2003). The UK government policy on international student recruitment in the UK higher education sector – notably the PMI and the PMI2 – to a large degree has impacted on UK universities' policies and strategies. For instance, many UK universities treat international student recruitment as a key aspect of their internationalisation strategy (Warwick and Moogan, 2013). It is useful to note that this phenomenon is also present in the case study university where this study is based. I will further explain this point through introducing the case study university's internationalisation strategy in Section 2.4.

2.3 Decolonisation movement in UK higher education: the political context

There have been sustained calls from a growing number of students and academics to decolonise the curriculum in recent years in the UK higher education sector. Anti-racist scholars and activists have called for

> 'the end of dominant ideologies that position white, male, Western, capitalist, heterosexual, European worldviews in higher education as the dominant knowledge canon and discourse' and 'more inclusive intersectional lexicon that embodies global perspectives, experiences and

epistemologies as the central tenets of the curriculum' (Arday, Belluigi and Thomas, 2021: 300).

In 2014, students at the University of College London (UCL) produced a 20-minute video asking, 'Why Is My Curriculum White?'. The discussion became a student-led campaign against 'whiteness' (or white supremacy), the domination of the Eurocentric canon, and the lack of diversity in the curriculum in UK universities (El Magd, 2016). The campaign later received the support of the National Union of Students (NUS) with launches at Warwick and LSE in 2015 and at Bristol, Birmingham, and Manchester in 2016. Along with another NUS campaign, 'Liberate My Degree', these student-led campaigns generated a national debate about the need to decolonise the curriculum in UK universities (Shain et al., 2021).

The Rhodes Must Fall Movement in Oxford (RMFO) in March 2016 is another high-profile campaign which drew attention to the impacts of colonialism and imperialism on the higher education sector in the UK and globally. The RMFO manifesto, for example, expresses a desire to address Oxford's colonial legacy on three levels:

> '1) Tackling the plague of colonial iconography (in the form of statues, plaques, and paintings) that seeks to whitewash and distort history. 2) Reforming the Euro-centric curriculum to remedy the highly selective narrative of traditional academia which frames the West as sole producers of universal knowledge by integrating subjugated and local epistemologies … 3) Addressing the underrepresentation and lack of welfare provision for Black and minority ethnic (BME) amongst Oxford's academic staff and students' (RMFO, 2016).

By focusing on these issues, students at the University of Oxford challenged the ideological apparatus of colonialism and white supremacy and called for alternative epistemologies and approaches to knowledge production (Pimblott, 2020). It should be noted that the decolonisation movement in the UK higher education sector became prominent after the Black Lives Matter movement in response to the racist police killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis in May 2020. Since then, more universities in the UK have

made public statements about their commitments to 'anti-racism' and 'decolonising the curriculum' (Shain et al., 2021).

One of the most destructive impacts of colonialism on the global academy is thought to be the promotion of 'Western' knowledge as the universal knowledge (Andrews, 2019). As Arday, Belluigi and Thomas (2021) suggest, there has been a centring of 'Western' knowledge in the UK higher education sector at the expense of other knowledges which reside outside of Eurocentric paradigms. The centrality and monopoly of 'Western' knowledge in the curriculum facilitates a learning space that is not reflective of the diverse student populations and consequently impacts adversely on Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic (BAME) students' engagement and sense of belonging (Tate and Bagguley, 2017).

Shay (2016) explains that a curriculum that advances solely 'Western' knowledge creates a very narrow and constrained view of the world and erases the historical, intellectual, and cultural contributions of other parts of the world to our humanity. As Said (1994: 8) notes, 'Western' European literature has for centuries portrayed the 'non-Western' world and individuals from the 'non-Western' world as 'inferior' and 'subordinate' and this has contributed to the normalisation of racism among colonialists. It is argued that such dispositions impact the endeavour to embrace global perspectives that move away from the notion of Europe being the epicentre of knowledge and facilitate the entrenched institutional racism that still influences much of the discriminatory terrain in the academy and society (Andrews, 2019; Shilliam, 2014).

An important aspect of the decolonisation movement in the UK has been to 'challenge and dismantle the existing orthodoxies by advocating a curriculum that reflects the multiple histories of Black and indigenous populations globally but particularly within the United Kingdom' (Arday, Belluigi and Thomas, 2021: 298). Scholars (Leonardo, 2016; Heleta, 2016) argue that dismantling the dominant Eurocentric canon in the curriculum requires a disruption of the 'whiteness' (or white supremacy) which has been firmly entrenched in a historical colonial legacy. They suggest that 'whiteness' occupies and monopolies much of the pedagogical practices that pervade universities and in many

cases, facilitate overt and covert institutional racism and the marginalisation of academics and students of colour (ibid.). Furthermore, the dearth of BAME scholars in the academy has been considered as a contributing factor in sustaining institutional racism against ethnic minority groups; the omission of 'non-Western' knowledge and perspectives in the curriculum continues to be complicit in reproducing white supremacy and privilege (Pilkington, 2013).

To summarise, in addition to the marketisation of UK higher education, this study is also situated within the decolonisation movement in the UK higher education system. This movement focuses attention on the ways in which 'Western' education systems are rooted in white supremacy and Eurocentrism. It challenges the dominant neoliberal conceptualisations of international higher education and raises questions about who the gatekeepers to knowledge should be and challenges the power and supremacy of the Eurocentric canon in the system of knowledge production (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2021; Arday, Belluigi and Thomas, 2021). It should also be noted that the decolonisation movement has brought about changes to the policy arena of the case study university and found resonance among university executives of the case study university after the Black Lives Matter movement in 2020. I will explore this point further in the next section through introducing the decolonisation initiatives that emerged in the case study university.

2.4 The case study university: the institutional context

As I explained in Chapter 1, I decided to investigate one UK university rather than a range of UK universities because I was more interested in the similarities and differences between different disciplines rather than across different institutions regarding academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. In this section, I will introduce the case study university where this study is based and the university's specific strategies, policies, and initiatives with regard to internationalisation and decolonisation.

The case study university is a public research university in England and currently has around 17,000 students and 3,700 staff. It is a comprehensive university providing a range of courses and programmes in subjects that include the sciences, health sciences, social sciences, art, and humanities. In the academic year 2020-21, the percentage of international students among the full-time student population was 9% on undergraduate programmes, 30% on postgraduate-taught programmes, and 21% on postgraduate-research programmes. In terms of the governance structure in relation to internationalisation, the university has a Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for internationalisation and an international office which is responsible for matters such as international student recruitment and transnational education programmes. The university has also appointed academic staff as the internationalisation leads/campaigns at both faculty level and school/department level to organise and advocate events in relation to the internationalisation of the university.

In 2009, a small group of staff came together to discuss what 'internationalisation' could mean to the university and how to make sure that the international and intercultural dimensions are included in the functions (teaching, research, and service) of the university. From this informal initiative, a formal internationalisation executive was established. Thereafter, the university's internationalisation strategy paper, known as 'International Strategy 2016-2020', was published.

In an analysis of the university's internationalisation strategy paper, I identified three major objectives of the strategy: enhancing the university's international reputation; promoting international student recruitment; and raising the visibility of the university's research strengths. With regard to the first objective, the ranking in the global university league table is used as the key indicator to evaluate the university's internationalisation performance and success. The strategy paper states:

'We aspire to enter the top 200 in the Times Higher Education World Rankings for teaching and research quality. Our current ranking between 200 and 300 in these indicators contrasts our strong performance in research metrics in which we have comfortably featured in the world top 100 for a number of years. The disparity reflects a relatively less successful performance in the reputation surveys' (International Strategy 2016-2020: 1).

This extract indicates that the university executives cared about the university's competitiveness in the global higher education market. They stressed the importance of raising the university's international reputation and ranking in the global university league table to make the university more competitive than other universities both at home and abroad. The way that they linked the university's internationalisation performance and success to its international reputation and ranking in the global university league table suggests that the market discourses and practices in the UK higher education sector (that I have discussed in Section 2.2) to a large extent shaped the university's internationalisation strategy.

The second objective of the university's internationalisation strategy that I identified is to promote international student recruitment. It should be noted that the university's internationalisation strategy formulates a range of specific plans to help promote international student recruitment. For example, the strategy emphasises the need to build international offices in the university's priority countries, namely, China, India, Malaysia, Japan, and the US. The strategy paper states:

'As this internationalisation plan embeds, we should develop high-profile press for promotional campaigns in our priority countries. Examples might include about-the-line advertising in the Times Higher Education (THE), The Chronicles and other HE Press plus interviews and feature piece in similar venues. Our communications strategy will review the available channels and devise the right mix of publicity, advertising and other activity by country' (International Strategy 2016-2020: 6).

The extract above suggests that the university executives focused attention on enhancing the university's reputation in the priority countries through developing its communication strategies, in order to promote international student recruitment in these regions. It should be noted that four of the case study university's five priority countries, namely China, India, the US, and Malaysia, are among the countries sending the largest number of students to study in UK higher education institutions (Universities UK International, 2020). This suggests that when identifying countries as the priority countries to promote international student recruitment, the university executives considered the economic conditions of those countries and selected them primarily upon market considerations.

To aid in promoting international student recruitment, the university's internationalisation strategy also emphasises the importance of strategically developing networks and partnerships with 'top-quality, research-intensive institutions and other key partners and stakeholders' (International Strategy 2016-2020: 2). The internationalisation strategy paper states:

> 'The key is to work with the right institutions and to choose a model that is best suited to School requirements, strengths, and resources. Where Schools are currently dependent on international recruitment, we see it as essential that they develop at least one alternative co-educational or other recruitment route so that a wider range of international students can access their courses and provide an alternative to direct recruitment' (International Strategy 2016-2020: 3).

The extract above highlights the importance for schools/departments of the university of developing 'alternative' routes to building networks and recruiting international students. It is worth noting that the strategy to 'diversify' the markets for international student recruitment was also highlighted in the PMI2 (see Section 2.2). This suggests that the UK government policy on international student recruitment to a great extent has impacted on the case study university's internationalisation strategy, particularly the strategy to recruit international students.

The third objective of the university's internationalisation strategy that I identified is to raise the visibility of the university's research strengths. The strategy paper states:

> 'As a university, we face a gap between our research strengths and our global research reputation. To change this, we need to be clear on our key research areas and where they might best resonate globally. We need to employ focused initiatives and targeted communications strategies in order to raise our profile' (International Strategy 2016-2020: 5).

While the strategy paper stresses that the university attempts to support research that addresses major global challenges and answer questions of international importance, it appears that the ultimate objective of the strategy is to raise the 'reputation' and 'profile' of the university's research strengths. For example, the strategy paper identifies the role of research executives as follows:

> 'We should ensure that our research themes are linked to government agendas, particularly in priority countries, at both national and regional levels … The research executive plays a key role in setting those themes, communicating with academics on how they fit into those themes and the importance of publicising one's research' (International Strategy 2016-2020: 6).

The emphasis on 'publicising' further stresses how the university's strategy on research is itself driven by this overall attention to raising the university's international visibility and reputation, which dominates other objectives of the strategy.

In sum, in this analysis of the university's internationalisation strategy paper, the themes of 'enhancing the university's international reputation' and 'promoting international students' come out most strongly and there is a lack of attention to the 'curriculum'. This might suggest that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' was not given much attention in the university's policies and strategies.

As mentioned above, the decolonisation movement in the UK higher education system (see Section 2.3) brought changes to the policy arena of the case study university. In the case study university, the decolonisation movement can be dated back to 2019 when a

Black History Month event was organised by the Student Union. Students and academic staff were invited to join round-table discussions to share their ideas on topics such as decolonising the university and decolonising the curriculum. At that time, the discussions about 'decolonisation' did not draw widespread attention in the case study university: they took place among a small group of people who were interested in decolonisation initiatives elsewhere and wanted to see similar initiatives in the case study university.

Through Black History Month, more academic staff and students in the university engaged in decolonisation conversations. They attended decolonisation initiatives organised outside of the university and built their own working groups and networks in their school/department to discuss issues such as decolonising the curriculum, racial equalities, and so on. Later, driven by the Black Lives Matter movement in 2020, decolonisation conversations became the focus of more central discussions in the university and indeed, became a top priority. Some schools/departments appointed academic staff as their decolonisation leads/champions to take forward the decolonisation agenda in their respective schools/departments. In the meantime, the Vice-Chancellor of the university launched an anti-racism taskforce to address the issue of racial inequality and harassment in the university. The anti-racism taskforce has also been included in the university's equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) policy and is treated as an important area for staff and students to work on. For instance, here is how the university's EDI Annual Report describes the anti-racism taskforce:

> 'This Taskforce will facilitate join-up across the range of groups working to enhance the experience for our staff and students and will include the opportunity to discuss, support and set targets for ongoing projects such as decolonising the curriculum' (EDI Annual Report 2020: 16).

The above extract from the university's EDI Annual Report indicates that the 'decolonising the curriculum' initiative drew university executives' attention to the 'curriculum' – an area that until that point had received little attention in the university's policies and strategies. Yet it should be noted that there seems to have been a conflation of the

decolonisation initiatives with the EDI initiatives in the case study university. I will explore this point further in Chapter 7, Section 7.4.

2.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have introduced the policy, political, and institutional contexts in which this study is situated. I have explained that the marketisation of UK higher education since the early 1980s brought significant changes to the management and leadership of UK universities. One milestone is that the UK government changed its policies on international student recruitment in higher education institutions and required non-EU students to pay full tuition fees. The decline in funding from the UK government for higher education has made UK universities seek to expand their financial base and become aggressive in competing with universities both at home and abroad to recruit international students.

In an analysis of the case study university's internationalisation strategy paper, I identified three key objectives: enhancing the university's international reputation; promoting international student recruitment; and raising the visibility of the university's research strengths. In the light of these three key objectives, I argue that market discourses and practices to a large extent shaped the case study university's internationalisation strategy.

Another finding that emerged from my analysis of the strategy paper is that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' was given little attention in the university's policies and strategies. Yet it is worth noting that the decolonisation movement in the UK higher education system brought changes to the policy arena of the case study university. In the wake of the Black Lives Matter movement in 2020, the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum' became prominent in the case study university and drew university executives' attention to the 'curriculum'. The changing institutional context of the case study university described in this chapter provides the background for my analyses and

discussions in this thesis, particularly for Chapter 7 that focuses on exploring the university's strategies, policies, and initiatives on internationalisation.

Chapter 3 Conceptual Framework

3.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to introduce the theoretical concepts that I adopted from the literature and how I used them to develop a framework to shape my study and analyse my findings. The overarching research question – ***How do academics working in different disciplines engage with internationalisation of the curriculum?*** – aims to explore academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. In this study, I adopted Holliday's (1999) 'small cultures' approach because it challenges the essentialist views of 'culture', instead looking at 'culture' as fluid and ever-changing processes. Moreover, Holliday's 'small cultures' approach led me to explore the social contexts (e.g. disciplines, institutions, classrooms) in which academics work and teach and how their practices in these social contexts impact on their engagement in internationalising the curriculum. I review the key concepts in relation to a fluid and dynamic view of 'culture' that I adopted for my study in Section 3.2.

The first sub research question (RQ1) is: ***How do academics working in different disciplines interpret the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum?*** To investigate this research question, I reviewed the literature on disciplinary cultures (see Section 3.3) and adopted Becher and Trowler's (2001) typology of disciplines to select the disciplines and participants. The second sub research question (RQ2) is: ***What are academics' strategies and practices for internationalising the curriculum?*** To investigate this research question, I reviewed the literature on knowledge hierarchies in the academy (see Section 3.4) and adopted Said's (1978) notion of 'positional superiority' and Hall's (1992) notion of 'the West and the Rest' to explore academics' views on different forms of knowledge and how their views on knowledge hierarchies influence their strategies and practices for internationalising the curriculum. The third sub research question (RQ3) is: ***How does the case study university's policy discourses on internationalisation shape***

academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum? To investigate this research question, I reviewed the literature on university aims and ethos (see Section 3.5) and adopted Rolfe's (2013) notions of 'University of Excellence' and 'paraversity' and Turner and Robson's (2008) notions of 'symbolic' and 'transformative' internationalisation to explore how 'internationalisation' is conceptualised in university policies and strategies and what kind of approach that university executives took to internationalise the university.

3.2 A fluid and dynamic view of 'culture'

Inspired by Street's (1993) notion of 'culture as a verb' and Holliday's (1999, 2011) notions of 'small cultures', 'cultural realities' and 'cultural arenas', I noticed that university policies and strategies on internationalisation are often informed by essentialist views of 'culture' – that is, a view of 'cultures' as fixed and static entities rather than fluid and dynamic processes. In this section, I review the key concepts in relation to a fluid and dynamic view of 'culture' that I adopted to understand the notion of 'culture'.

3.2.1 'Culture as a verb'

Whilst disciplines within the social sciences and humanities (e.g. anthropology, sociology, history, linguistics) have accommodated the study of 'culture' in their academic inquiries, there is little agreement between them regarding the way that 'culture' is conceptualised for investigation purposes (Sarangi, 1995). Sarangi argues that any definition of 'culture' is necessarily reductionist because 'culture' is something which is constantly being made and remade (ibid.). This conceptualisation of 'culture' resonates with Street's (1993: 23) view that 'culture' is a 'verb' rather than a 'noun'.

In the paper '*Culture is a Verb: anthropological aspects of language and cultural process*', Street (1993: 23) states that 'anthropologists are currently acutely self-conscious in their

use of the term "culture", worrying about its neo-colonial, racist, and nationalist overtones.' He calls attention to Thornton's critiques on traditional definitions of 'culture' within anthropology. For instance, Thornton states:

> 'Part of the problem that besets our current efforts to understand culture is the desire to define it, to say clearly what it is. To define something means to specify its meaning clearly enough so that things which are like it can be clearly distinguished from it. Clear definitions are an essential part of any successful science, or of good speech and clear thought' (Thornton, 1988: 26).

To extend Thornton's point, Street (1993: 25) states that the downside of finding 'what culture is' is that 'we tend then to believe the categories and definitions we construct in an essentialist way, as though we had thereby found out what culture is.'

The attempt to find 'what culture is' can be considered as an act of reification. For instance, Baumann elaborates on how 'culture' is reified as follows:

> 'Culture is not a real thing, but an abstract and purely analytical notion. It does not cause behaviour, but summarises an abstraction from it, and is thus neither normative nor predictive … The anthropologist's abstraction of a perpetually changing process of meaning-making is replaced by a reified entity that has a definite substantive content and assumes the status of a thing that people 'have' or are 'members of' (Baumann, 1996: 11).

Holliday (1999: 241) points out that reification is a basic force in social life, defining it as 'the apprehension of the products of human activity as if they were something other than human products – such as the facts of nature, results of cosmic laws, or manifestations of divine will.' In Holliday's view, 'reification takes place where the notion of culture has been constructed for the purpose of explaining human behaviour but is then institutionalised into something that exists over and above human behaviour' (ibid.). He argues that as a result of reification, 'culture appears large and essentialist, and indicates concrete, separate, behaviour-defining ethnic, national and international groups with material permanence and clear boundaries' (ibid: 242). He notes that a significant

characteristic of 'reification' is that the depictions about social groupings become relatively fixed in people's minds and this results in cultural stereotypes (ibid.).

Rather than asking the question 'what culture is', which may fix its meaning and lead to cultural stereotypes, Thornton (1988) proposes focusing on 'what culture does'. He states that 'An understanding of culture, then, is not simply a knowledge of differences, but rather an understanding of how and why differences in language, thought, use of materials and behaviours come about' (ibid: 26). Similarly, Street (1993: 25) argues that 'the job of studying "culture" is not of finding and then accepting its definitions but of discovering how and what definitions are made, under what circumstances and for what reasons.' In Street's view, 'culture' is 'an active process of meaning making and contest over definition, including its own definition' (ibid.).

The notion of 'culture as a verb' (Street, 1993) led me to pay attention to 'what culture does' rather than 'what culture is'. This more fluid and dynamic view of 'culture' provided me with a new conceptual starting point to look at 'culture' and a theoretical lens through which to explore academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. In my study, I drew on Street's (1993) notion of 'culture as a verb' to explore the different ways in which academics conceptualise 'culture' and engage with 'culture' in their practices. In the next sub-section, I explore Holliday's (1999, 2011) notions of 'small cultures', 'cultural realities' and 'cultural arenas' to further explain the conceptualisation of 'culture' as fluid and ever-changing processes.

3.2.2 'Small cultures', 'cultural realities' and 'cultural arenas'

In Holliday's (1999) view, the ways of referring to 'culture' as 'prescribed ethnic, national and international entities' can be considered as a 'large cultures' approach. He considers the 'large cultures' approach as the 'default notion of "culture"' (ibid: 237). In his view, Hofstede's (2001, 1991) work on social groupings is a good example of the 'large cultures' approach. Based on a worldwide survey of employee values from IBM subsidiaries in 72

countries in 1968 and 1972, Hofstede (2001: 29) identified five indicators and dimensions to depict and distinguish national cultural characteristics, including 'power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity, and long-term versus short-term orientation.'

Holliday (2011: 4) critiques the ways in which Hofstede conceptualised 'culture' as based on essentialism that 'presents people's individual behaviour as entirely defined and constrained by the "cultures" in which they live.' He suggests that the 'large cultures' approach tends to refer to 'culture' as the 'essential features of ethnic, national or international group' (ibid: 241). In his view, the 'large cultures' approach is prescriptive, since it begins with the idea that people's cultural characteristics are inherent and unchanging. Consequently, members of an ethnic/national group are thought to have innate cultural characteristics (ibid.). By contrast, Holliday (1999: 237) proposes a 'small cultures' approach which 'attaches "culture" to small social groupings or activities wherever there is cohesive behaviour' and 'attempts to liberate "culture" from notions of ethnicity and nation.' He notes that the 'small cultures' approach does not simply mean something small in size but presents 'a different paradigm through which to look at social groupings' (ibid: 240).

There are two distinct features about Holliday's 'small cultures' approach: firstly, under this approach, 'culture' refers to 'the composite of cohesive behaviour within any social grouping' (ibid: 247); secondly, 'culture' is considered as 'a dynamic, ongoing group process which operates in changing circumstances to enable group members to make sense of and operate meaningfully within those circumstances' (ibid: 248). In Holliday's view, 'culture' is a fluid and ever-changing process. It is useful to note that Holliday's view of 'culture' is in line with Street's (1993: 23) view that 'culture' is a 'verb' rather than a 'noun'.

Holliday (2011: 55) argues that traditional understandings of 'culture' to describe people and their behaviours are too definite and defining. He thus proposes to use the terms 'cultural realities' and 'cultural arenas' instead. He defines 'cultural reality' as 'something

which is going around the individual which carries broad cultural meaning' and 'cultural arena' as 'a setting, environment or context within which cultural realities are situated' (ibid.). In his view, 'cultural realities' can 'form around and be carried with individuals as they move from one cultural arena to another' and individuals have the capacity to 'feel a belonging to several cultural realities simultaneously' (ibid.). He notes that the 'cultural realities' with which people live are complex and the social structures of countries do not necessarily define and/or confine 'cultural realties' (ibid.).

Like Street's (1993) notion of 'culture as a verb', Holliday's (1999, 2011) notions of 'small cultures', 'cultural realities' and 'cultural arenas' conceptualise 'culture' as fluid and ever-changing processes rather than fixed and static entities. In my study, Holliday's (1999, 2011) notions of 'small cultures', 'cultural realities' and 'cultural arenas' provided new theoretical lenses for me to look at 'culture' and led me to explore the social contexts (e.g. disciplines, institutions, classrooms) in which academics work and live and how their practices in these social contexts impact on their engagement in internationalising the curriculum.

3.3 Disciplinary cultures

As discussed in Chapter 1, based on studies by Clifford (2009) and Sawir (2011) that explored academics' views and experiences of internationalising the curriculum across a range of disciplines, my starting point was that academics from different disciplines would have different attitudes towards 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. In this section, I will explain how I understand the notion of 'discipline' and how I applied the notion in my study.

3.3.1 Disciplines and academic identities

Clark identifies the relationships between 'disciplines' and 'academic identities', pointing out that:

> 'The associations, learned societies, and academies that disciplines and professional areas develop generate a steady flow of symbolic materials about themselves … From such materials, and associated activities and rewards, come self-identities that may be more powerful than those of mate, lover, and family protector, or those that come from community, political party, church and fraternal order' (Clark, 1983: 80).

Following on from Clark, Henkel (2000) in her book, *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*, analyses the major changes in the structure, governance, and administration of higher education in the UK and the implications of policy change for academic identities. She suggests that 'not only has academic work provided the conditions for strong identities, but also the building of individual identities that are, nevertheless, embedded in defined communities, has been central to the dynamic of academic life in the Western world' (ibid: 13). In adopting a communitarian perspective, she emphasises the importance of a defining 'community' in the formation of academic identities. She considers 'discipline' as the main 'community' within which academics construct their identities, their values, their knowledge base, their modes of working, and their self-esteem (ibid: 15). In her view, a 'community' provides 'the language in which individuals understand themselves and interpret their world' and people in the same 'community' are 'introduced to the myths through which deeply held values and beliefs of the community are expressed' (ibid: 15).

Similarly, Becher and Trowler take up the metaphor of 'academic tribes' to refer to 'disciplines', pointing out that:

> 'The ways in which academics engage with their subject matter, and the narratives they develop about this, are important structural factors in the formulation of disciplinary cultures. Together they represent features that lend coherence and relative permanence to academics' social practices,

values and attitudes across time and places' (Becher and Trowler, 2001:
23).

Like Henkel (2000), Becher and Trowler (2001) stress the links between 'disciplines' and 'academic identities'. They hold the view that there are clear distinctions between 'disciplines' in terms of 'the characteristics in the object of enquiry; the nature of knowledge growth; the relationship between the researcher and knowledge; enquiry procedures; extent of truth claims and criteria for making them; the results of research' (ibid: 26). Building on the work of Biglan (1973) and Kolb (1981), Becher and Trowler categorise 'disciplines' into four groups: 'hard pure', 'soft pure', 'hard applied', and 'soft applied' (see Table 3.3.1).

	Disciplinary groupings	Nature of knowledge
'hard pure'	Pure sciences (e.g. physics)	Cumulative; atomistic (crystalline/tree-like); concerned with universals, quantities, simplification; impersonal, value free; clear criteria for knowledge verification and obsolescence; consensus over significant questions to address, now and in the future; results in discovery/explanation.
'soft pure'	Humanities (e.g. history) and pure social sciences (e.g. anthropology)	Reiterative; holistic (organic/river-like); concerned with particulars, qualities, complication; personal, value-laden; dispute over criteria for knowledge verification and obsolescence; lack of consensus over significant questions to address; results in understanding/interpretation.

'hard applied'	Technologies (e.g. mechanical engineering, clinical medicine)	Purposive; pragmatic (know-how via hard knowledge); concerned with mastery of physical environment; applies heuristic approaches; uses both qualitative and quantitative approaches; criteria for judgement are purposive, functional; results in products/techniques.
'soft applied'	Applied social science (e.g. education, law, social administration)	Functional; utilitarian (know-how via soft knowledge); concerned with enhancement of (semi-) professional practice; uses case studies and case law to a large extent; results in protocols/procedures.

Table 3.3.1 A typology of disciplines (adapted from Becher and Trowler, 2001: 36)

Whilst 'discipline' is a common term used to differentiate one group of academics from another, the nature of 'disciplines' is not altogether straightforward or clear. Becher and Trowler (2001) suggest that 'subject' or 'the object of enquiry' is not the only criterion to differentiate a 'discipline'. They point out that whether a 'subject' is considered as a 'discipline' largely depends on

'the extent to which the leading academic institutions recognize the hiving off in terms of their organizational structures … and also on the degree to which a freestanding international community has emerged, with its own professional associations and specialist journals' (ibid: 41).

For example, Becher and Trowler note that sometimes institutions decide to establish departments in a particular field but may find the intellectual validity of those departments is under challenge from the established academic opinion. They point out that this has happened in the case of 'black studies', 'viniculture', and 'parapsychology' (ibid: 41).

Speaking of the relationships between 'subject' and 'discipline', Evans states:

> 'Discipline can be enacted and negotiated in various ways: the international 'invisible college', individuals exchanging preprints and reprints, conferences, workshops … But the most concrete and permanent enactment is the department; this is where a discipline becomes an institutional subject. The match between discipline and subject is always imperfect; this can cause practical difficulties when, for example, the discipline-based categories of research selectivity do not fit the way the subject is ordered in a particular department' (Evans, 1995: 253).

Evans notes that the match between a 'subject' and a 'discipline' is not perfect, and a 'discipline' becomes an institutional subject through the existence of relevant departments (ibid.). Similarly, Henkel (2000) suggests that 'disciplines' are given tangible form and defined boundaries in the basic units or departments of universities. She states that each department of the university builds and rebuilds its configuration of 'disciplines' through 'the specialisations of individual members, their values and interests, and how they collaborate with each other' (ibid: 19). According to Becher and Trolwer (2001: 41), 'disciplines' are thought to be 'in part identified by the existence of relevant departments; but it does not follow that every department represents a discipline.'

In this section, I have reviewed the literature on the relationships between disciplines and academic identities (Henkel, 2000; Becher and Trowler, 2001) which posits that 'disciplines' play an important role in shaping academics' identities, values, and modes of working. As one of the goals of my study was to explore how 'disciplines' impact on academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum, I decided to select academics from a range of different disciplines. I drew on Becher and Trowler's (2001) typology of disciplines ('hard pure', 'soft pure', etc.) to select academics and make sure that they came from different subject areas. In addition, as scholars (Becher and Trowler, 2001; Henkel, 2000; Evans, 1995) suggest, 'disciplines' are partly identified by the existence of relevant departments/schools. Hence, I selected academics from different departments/schools to make sure that they came from a range of disciplines.

3.3.2 Phenomenological views on disciplinary cultures

According to Becher and Trowler (2001), disciplinary cultures can be understood from a realist or a phenomenological point of view. They note that the realist point of view looks at 'disciplinary culture' as 'reflecting a discernible and stable reality', whereas the phenomenological point of view looks at it as 'essentially socially constructed' (ibid: 37). They suggest that from a phenomenological point of view, 'disciplinary cultures' are mediated by social factors and processes (ibid.). For instance, they point out that government and other agencies have the power to shape disciplinary cultures (ibid.).

Henkel (2005) articulates a similar view and explains how the changes in the research policy in higher education impact on disciplinary cultures and academic identities. According to Henkel, the political, economic, and demographic changes that accelerated in the UK during the last quarter of the 20th century have posed a major threat to the leadership and management within UK universities (ibid.). She points out that most UK universities have transformed since the early 1980s, and substantially influenced by the model of university as 'corporate enterprise', with corporate goals and unifying, streamlined structures and strategies (ibid.). She suggests that the need for income maximisation drove most UK universities to re-assess and multiply their functions and relationships, and most UK universities started to use financial incentives to promote inter-disciplinary and domain-based research centres, external partnerships and networks, and more free-standing commercial ventures (ibid.). In this context, most UK universities were subject to 'unprecedented government steerage and scrutiny' and had to adjust themselves and compete in various forms of market (ibid: 159). For instance, due to the stringent limits placed by the UK government on public funding, there continue to be strong pressures on UK universities 'not only to change their cultures and structures to enable them to manage the new policy environment but also to review their assumptions about roles, relationships and boundaries in that environment' (ibid: 159). Because of the changes in the research policy, UK universities have become 'a site of struggle between academics and other interest groups for control of matters previously

taken for granted as academic prerogative' (ibid: 163). For instance, the idea and continued institutional reality of 'pure science' came under pressure at the beginning of the 1980s because of the adoption of the ambiguous and increasingly dominant concept of 'strategic research' adopted by policy makers (ibid.). Since then, public funding has become increasingly conditional on the defining of research as 'strategic', which is to make at least a background contribution 'to the solutions of recognised current or future practical problems' (ibid: 160).

Henkel points out that while the changes in the research policy acknowledge the importance of research that advances knowledge and understanding, they still put limits on academics' right and freedom to undertake 'basic' and 'pure' research (ibid: 160). As universities impose more complex organisational structures on the line management of departments, academic work and relationships in the institution have become more bureaucratised and visualised (ibid.). For instance, academics' performance is open to both internal administrative and academic scrutiny, and institutions gain more power to affect academics' working lives (ibid.). Henkel states:

> 'With a reduced unit of resource and institutional growth, academic policy making moved from department to the centre, and institutional leaders, rather than protecting academics from external assessment, tended to promote compliance and use them as instrument of change' (ibid: 163).

She points out that the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), introduced into the UK in the early 1990s, was considered a key driver of policy and became 'an instrument of demise of under-performing departments, as well as of enhancement of the successful' (ibid.). She states that as 'research reputation' became the strongest academic currency, most UK universities expected its strategic potential to be exploited to 'enhance income and broader influence as well as their academic reputation' (ibid: 164).

In addition, differential power between departments and academics became increasingly explicit (ibid.). Henkel argues that whilst changes in the funding of research and the context in which research is carried out have not created major disturbances for academic

values and identities, the changes in the research policy have raised fundamental questions for what it means to be an academic (ibid.). As national commitment to the policies of research selectivity and concertation was intensifying, interactions between disciplines, institutions, and academics became more complex, and academics were expected to engage across boundaries of institutions as much as within them (ibid.). According to Henkel, this is a good example to show how social factors and processes shape disciplinary cultures and academic identities (ibid.).

From a phenomenological point of view, 'disciplinary cultures' are also thought to be 'constructed by individual academics and are influenced in part by the educational ideology to which they adhere' (Becher and Trowler, 2001: 38). For example, Becher and Trowler point out that whether 'engineering' is perceived as a discipline having a 'strong collection code' (that is, where knowledge is seen as cumulative) largely depends on whether the academics concerned subscribe to a traditionalist or progressivist ideology (ibid.). They note that the science subjects can also be represented in different ways because natural scientists construe their actions and beliefs in a context-dependent way using both empiricist and non-empiricist repertoires (ibid.). The following quotes of Knorr Cetina illustrate the fragmentation of the 'epistemic machinery' (that is, machineries of knowledge construction) in the science subjects:

> 'Magnifying this aspect of science – not its production of knowledge but its epistemic machinery – reveals the fragmentation of contemporary science; it displays the different architectures of empirical approaches, specific constructions of the referent, particular ontologies of instruments, and different social machines … This disunifies the sciences; it runs counter to an assumption generally associated with the work of the Vienna Circle of more than fifty years ago, particularly the argument for the unity of science' (Knorr Cetina, 1999: 3).

According to Becher and Trowler (2001), 'disciplinary cultures' and 'disciplinary epistemologies' are inextricably intertwined. Similarly, Henkel (2000) suggests that 'discipline' is more than an epistemological construct, although epistemology has a primary place in 'discipline'.

In reviewing the literature on the phenomenological views on disciplinary cultures (Becher and Trowler, 2001; Henkel, 2000), I realised that the view that 'disciplines' and 'disciplinary cultures' are socially constructed links closely to the notions of 'culture as a verb' (Street, 1993) and 'cultural arenas' (Holliday, 2011) that I have reviewed in Section 3.2. Inspired by Street's (1993) notion of 'culture as a verb' and Holliday's (2011) notion of 'cultural arena', my study pays attention to the epistemological characters of 'disciplines' and 'disciplinary cultures' whilst at the same time viewing 'disciplines' and 'disciplinary cultures' as fluid and ever-changing processes. Street's (1993) notion of 'culture as a verb' and Holliday's (2011) notion of 'cultural arena' led me to look at 'disciplinary cultures' and academics' disciplinary identities not as a static outcome nor as a fixed entity, but rather as fluid and ongoing processes.

3.4 Knowledge hierarchies in the academy

Another element in the conceptual framework that I developed for my study focuses on knowledge hierarchies in the academy. When investigating the second sub research question (RQ2: *What are academics' strategies and practices for internationalising the curriculum?*), I paid attention to academics' views on knowledge hierarchies in the academy and how they engaged with different forms of knowledge in the literature and in the classroom. In this section, I begin with a synthesis of insights from decolonial perspectives on knowledge production to explore the influences of colonialism and imperialism on knowledge production and knowledge hierarchies. Specific examples regarding the domination of the Eurocentric canon in different educational contexts are analysed to better understand the hierarchical relationships between 'Western' knowledge and other bodies and traditions of knowledge. In addition, I review academic debates that problematise decolonising efforts in higher education to explore the tensions, contradictions, and paradoxes in decolonising the university and the curriculum.

3.4.1 Decolonial perspectives on knowledge production

Decolonisation of knowledge production and of higher education has become a major subject for discussion within academia in recent years, as discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.3. Decolonisation has also been a keynote theme at many conferences, seminars, and workshops within individual disciplines and across them (Gopal, 2021). Yet it is worth noting that calls for decolonising knowledge production are not new but were first raised in the earlier independence period of Africa (Crawford, Mai-Bornu and Landstrom, 2021). Shortly after the independence of Ghana in 1957, Kwame Nkrumah, the first president of Ghana, highlights the importance of promoting postcolonial knowledge production on Africa, including 'scholarship and research into Africa's history, culture, thought and resources' (Nkrumah, 1973: 206). Criticising European and American writing on Africa for their denial of African history that was not linked to the European incursion, Kwame Nkrumah encourages Africanist scholars 'to work for a complete emancipation of the mind from all forms of domination, control and enslavement' (ibid: 212).

Like Kwame Nkrumah who highlights the importance of promoting postcolonial knowledge production on Africa, Claude Ake, the Nigerian political scientist, advocates for endogenous knowledge production on Africa to decolonise the social sciences in Africa (Ake, 1982). In *Social Sciences as Imperialism: The Theory of Political Development*, he claims that 'mainstream Western social science scholarship on Africa and other developing countries amounts to imperialism' (ibid: 124). He articulates a view that the dominance of 'Western' scholarship and the inappropriate use of 'Western' theories to explain African social phenomena led to inadequate explanations of social realities in Africa (ibid.). In his view, the 'Western' conceptual frameworks, coupled with their Eurocentric bias, render Europe as 'advanced or even the ideal', while Africa is seen as being 'at the lower ends of the developmental continuum' (ibid: 127). In seeking an alternative social science in Africa, Claude Ake supports the call for 'endogeneity' in terms of knowledge production on Africa (ibid.). He states that 'The West is able to dominate the Third World not simply because of her military and economic power, but also because

she has foisted the idea of development on the Third World' (ibid: 141). In his view, there was a cultural and ideological reduction of Africa to a source from which data were collected and exported to Europe for advancing the production of knowledge, just as Africa was reduced to the continent where raw material was exploited and turned into finished products by Europeans (ibid.). He notes that Europe's cultural and ideological domination of Africa was established during colonialism and endured in post-independence Africa (ibid.).

Concerning the unequal relationship between the coloniser and the colonised, Frantz Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth* analyses the psychology of colonialism and suggests that colonialism is a systematic negation of the colonised, through which the coloniser is recognised as being superior to the colonised (Fanon, 1961). He points out that the coloniser had established systems of rules which governed their interaction with the colonised prior to the period of colonialism and imperialism, and these classification systems came to shape the hierarchical relationship between the coloniser and the colonised, for example through hierarchies of race and typologies of different societies (ibid.). For Fanon, the colonial world cannot be destroyed either by negotiation or by change initiated by the colonised middle class but only by violence (ibid.). He articulates a view that the human dignity and rights of the colonised are denied in the unequal colonial relationship and thus there is a need for violence as a purge for both the inferiority complex and the colonial situation that creates it (ibid.). He believes that decolonisation is a necessarily, inevitably violent process between two forces opposed to each other by their very nature (ibid.).

Continuing Frantz Fanon's argument that there is a deep connection between colonialism and the mind, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, in *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*, states that:

'Colonialism imposed its control of the social production of wealth through military conquest and subsequent political dictatorship. But its most important area of domination was the mental universe of the colonised, the control, through culture, of how people perceived themselves and their relationship to the world. Economic and political control can never be complete or effective without mental control' (Thiong'o, 1986: 16).

In Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's view, the cultural and psychological effects of colonialism on the colonised should be taken seriously as the economic, political, and military ones. He suggests that the cultural and psychological consequences of colonialism are destructive and can 'annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves' (ibid: 3). In terms of decolonising knowledge and epistemology in the colonised world, he emphasises the importance of searching for 'a liberating perspective within which to see ourselves clearly in relationship to ourselves and to other selves in the universe', and he calls this approach 'a quest for relevance' (ibid: 87). He notes that how the colonised view themselves and their environment is very much dependent on where they stand in relationship to imperialism in its colonial and neo-colonial stages (ibid.). Hence, he suggests:

'If we are to do anything about our individual and collective being today, then we have to coldly and consciously look at what imperialism has been doing to us and to our view of ourselves in the universe. Certainly the quest for relevance and for a correct perspective can only be understood and be meaningfully resolved within the context of the general struggle against imperialism' (ibid: 88).

He contends that the domination of languages of colonising nations in Africa was crucial to 'the domination of the mental universe of the colonised' (ibid: 16). Because of this, he called on African scholars and writers to write in their national languages and recover the use of African languages which had been marginalised under colonial rules (ibid.). For him, to write in the languages of Africa is part of the anti-imperialist struggles of African peoples to liberate their productive forces from foreign control (ibid.).

Interrogating the divide between 'the West' and 'the Orient', Edward Said, in his ground-breaking book, *Orientalism*, presents a thorough critique of the discipline of oriental studies and exposes how relations of power underpin both knowledge and the possibilities of its production (Said, 1978). As I mentioned in Chapter 1, Said (1978) contends that 'orientalism' as an artistic and literary current not only served as a means for 'the West' to engage with the worlds and cultures that they had never encountered before but also influenced the ways in which they pictured and understood 'the Orient'. He considers 'orientalism' as a discourse where the construction of 'the Orient' is based on the perspectives that 'the West' have of 'the Orient' and a perceived superiority of 'the West' over 'the Orient' (ibid.). In his view, the discourse of orientalism embraces the notions of power and cultural domination prevalent in human societies and has 'a history and a tradition of thought, imagery and vocabulary that have given it reality and presence in and for the West' (ibid: 5). He points to the 'positional superiority' of 'the West' as a result of the discourse of orientalism – which refers to 'putting the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing the relative upper hand' (ibid: 7) – and claims that the relationship between 'the West' and 'the Orient' is 'a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony' (ibid: 5). In Said's view, the discourse of orientalism contributes to the continuity of the oppression and misinterpretation of 'the Orient' and provides authority and legitimacy for the domination of 'the West' in the world (ibid.). He suggests that movements for decolonisation should challenge the idea that modernity is endogenous to 'the West' and the conceptual frameworks underpinning its domination of other cultures (ibid.).

Arguing along similar lines to Edward Said, Stuart Hall (1992: 308) suggests that the discourse of 'the West and the Rest' functions as a 'system of representation' and divides the world according to a dichotomy, in which 'the Rest' is conceptualised as being inferior and 'everything that the West is not', known as 'the Other'. He states that within the discourse of 'the West and the Rest', 'Western' cultures and knowledge are considered developed/good/desirable, whereas other cultures and forms of knowledge ('the Other') are considered under-developed/bad/undesirable (ibid.). In his view, the discourse of 'the

West and the Rest' promotes the colonial ideology that those who are not living in 'Western' cultures and societies are inferior and radically different and deserve to be colonised and exploited (ibid.). Moreover, he emphasises that the discourse of 'the West and the Rest' is extremely destructive because within this discourse, the world is divided symbolically into two halves, namely 'the West – the Rest', 'us – them', 'good – bad', 'civilised – uncivilised' and so on (ibid.). In his view, the binary view of the world constructs an over-simplified conception of difference and does not recognise the complex differences between and within different cultures and societies, and this consequently leads to issues such as stereotyping and fragmentation. He thus suggests that people should move away from a binary view of the world and look at cultures and societies as individuals rather than unified and homogenous (ibid.).

In line with Edward Said's analysis of the ways in which 'the West' construct discourses about 'the Orient', Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012: 2) identifies research as 'a site of struggle' between the interests and ways of knowing of 'the West' and indigenous peoples' ways of resisting such discourses. She problematises the term 'indigenous' as it appears to collectivise the experiences of many distinct populations under imperialism. For example, in her context of New Zealand, the terms 'Maori' or 'tangata whenua' are used more frequently than 'indigenous' as the universal term, while different origin and tribal terms are also used to differentiate between groups (ibid: 6). She emphasises that colonialism was not just about collection but also about 're-arrangement, re-presentation and re-distribution' (ibid: 65). She states:

> 'Imperialism and colonialism are the specific formations through which the West came to "see", to "name" and to "know" indigenous communities. The cultural archive with its systems of representation, codes for unlocking systems of classification, and fragmented artefacts of knowledge enabled travellers and observers to make sense of what they saw and to represent their new-found knowledge back to the West through the authorship and authority of their representations' (ibid: 63).

In her view, 'Western' knowledge and science are 'beneficiaries of the colonisation of indigenous peoples' and the knowledge gained through its colonisation has been used, in turn, to colonise indigenous peoples (ibid: 62). She states that 'colonialism not only meant the imposition of Western authority over indigenous lands, indigenous modes of production and indigenous law and government, but the imposition of Western authority over all aspects of indigenous knowledges, languages and cultures' (ibid: 67). She calls for decolonising research methodologies – a demand that research with indigenous peoples and communities should consider questions such as: 'Whose research is it? Who owns it? Whose interests does it serve? Who will benefit from it? Who has designed its questions and framed its scope? Who will carry it out? Who will write it up? How will its results be disseminated?' (ibid: 10). She contends that decolonising research methodologies does not mean a total rejection of all 'Western' theory/research/knowledge; rather, it is about 'centring our concerns and world views and then coming to know and understand theory and research from our own perspectives and for our own purposes' (ibid: 41).

In more recent decolonial work, Walter D. Mignolo (2011) argues for the necessity of epistemic decolonisation (ibid.). In describing the Eurocentric forms of knowledge, he writes: 'Such a system of knowledge (the "Western code") serves not all humanity but a small portion of it that benefits from the belief that in terms of epistemology there is only one game in town' (ibid: xii). The key issue for Mignolo is that epistemology 'has to be geographical in its historicity' and his notion of 'geopolitics of knowledge' affirms that all knowledge is political and socially located (Mignolo, 2000: 67). He argues for a consideration of what knowledge the geopolitics enables to be known and how it is to be known (ibid.). He suggests that the decolonisation of knowledge and epistemology occurs in acknowledging the sources and geopolitical locations of knowledge while at the same time affirming those modes and practices of knowledge that have been denied by the dominant Eurocentric canon (ibid.).

In this section, I have reviewed some key decolonial perspectives on knowledge production and exposed the necessity of considering issues such as power, domination,

and injustice in discussing global knowledge production and circulation. Said's (1978) notion of 'positional superiority' is particularly useful for my study as it conceptualises the unequal relationships between 'Western' knowledge and other bodies and traditions of knowledge. It helped me to interrogate academics' views on different forms of knowledge and explore how their views on knowledge hierarchies influence their strategies and practices for internationalising the curriculum. Hall's (1992) notion of 'the West and the Rest' deconstructs the binary conception of the world. It provided a theoretical lens for me to explore academics' views of the world and knowledge and how that impacts on their strategies and practices for internationalising the curriculum. In the next section, I explore knowledge production and knowledge hierarchies in the academy through discussing specific examples of the domination of the Eurocentric canon in different educational contexts.

3.4.2 Domination of the Eurocentric canon in different educational contexts

Clay (1996) notes that the models of scientific literacy that have been adopted for school science courses in the UK and elsewhere are predominantly Eurocentric. In analysing the English and Welsh Model, the American Model, and the International Council of Associations for Science Education Model of scientific literacy for school science education, he found that these models of scientific literacy were based on the premise that science knowledge/epistemology is universal, objective, and unproblematic. He challenges the view that science knowledge/epistemology is objective and value-free, arguing that adopting one model of scientific literacy without interrogating its epistemological basis and the consequences of its applications, can be problematic (ibid.). He draws on Ogawa's views to explain why such beliefs and practices can be problematic:

> 'Here, I must come back to the question of what the objectives of "science" as a school subject should be. I think that every culture has its own expectations of this school subject, just as it has its own science ... we cannot simply associate a set of general or universal goals with this kind of

subject … the goals need to be examined and defined by each particular society and tailored by that society to fit its own needs' (Ogawa 1989: 19).

In Clay's (1996) opinion, the dominant models of scientific literacy that have been adopted in many different countries and cultures are intrinsically Eurocentric. He notes that these dominant models of scientific literacy remain hegemonic and have not considered the scientific literacy that exists in other cultures and societies. For example, he points out that in the UK, 'school science textbooks acknowledge to varying degrees the contribution that French, German, and other European males have made to science, but they scarcely mention the organized and systematic science that has been practised in the Arab, Persian, Indian, and Chinese worlds' (ibid: 187). He states that 'our view of the world is so deeply imbued with the dominant science method that to encompass the multiplicity of other equally valid views held in societies beyond our own, we need to encompass different scientific literacies' (ibid: 190). For Clay, the reason/importance for including differing scientific literacies in the science education and curriculum is that 'science in the future will need to be more democratic and accountable to society at large and take account of the social and cultural consequences of its applications' (ibid.).

Turner (2011) discusses the dominant Eurocentric canon in the context of academic writing practices in higher education. In her book, *Language in the Academy: Cultural Reflexivity and Intercultural Dynamics*, Turner suggests that the preferred ways in which language is used and evaluated in higher education pedagogy and assessment should be seen as 'part of wider cultural practices and the effects of social and political power' rather than as a superficial practical concern (ibid: 2). She notes that the question of why academics in higher education evaluate academic writing in the way that they do has not often been asked, and academics tend to teach the rhetorical norms of academic writing as a given. She suggests that discussions of language issues in the institutional context of contemporary higher education circulate predominantly in a deficit discourse, and the cultural values inscribed in the expectations for students to perform through language in higher education have not received much attention (ibid.).

In Turner's view, 'Western' intellectual cultural history is the ground in which the rhetorical ways of using language in the academy have taken root, especially in a 'Western' institutional context (ibid.). For example, she notes that European scientific rationality and the rhetorical values (such as the values of clarity, the importance of conveying ideas with authority, the values of concision and brevity) which were established in the Age of Enlightenment are now the 'taken-for-granted rhetorical norms deemed appropriate for academic writing' (ibid: 6). She refers to this process as 'occidentalist rhetoricity', which is to acknowledge 'the specific historical and cultural values in the Western intellectual tradition, whose power has influenced the constitution of what continue to be the preferred ways of writing academically in English' (ibid: 7). In her view, 'Western' cultural and social power constructs the view of what constitutes knowledge and how best to construct and attain knowledge, which consequently affects the rhetorically preferred ways of using language in academic writing practices (ibid.).

In her book *Indigenous Research Methodologies*, Chilisa (2012) explains how 'Western' research paradigms marginalise and suppress other knowledge systems and ways of knowing. She uses HIV/AIDS research as an example to reveal how HIV/AIDS prevention employs language and categories of thinking that are alien to the infected and affected communities in postcolonial indigenous societies. Her research highlights how the hegemony of 'Western' knowledge entrenched in research methodologies makes the knowledge on HIV/AIDS from the perspectives of indigenous peoples, irrelevant. For example, she notes that whilst people in indigenous communities came up with many labels and names to describe their daily experiences with HIV/AIDS, those knowledge and experiences were invariably labelled as 'irrelevance, ignorance, beliefs in sorcery, barbaric cultural beliefs, simplistic and uncivilized thinking, beliefs in witchcraft and so on' (ibid: 61). Chilisa states that this is because the dominant discourse on HIV/AIDS often uses a standardised science laboratory language which is constructed on the basis of a cause-effect relationship to describe people's experiences. The consequence is that the knowledge and perspectives of indigenous communities and peoples usually fall outside

the language of HIV/AIDS research and are considered as 'false, of less value, or a handicap to addressing the spread of HIV/AIDS' (ibid: 76).

Through analysing the domination of 'Western' knowledge and its discourses on what can be researched and how it can be researched, Chilisa highlights the devastating impact of imperialism and colonialism on knowledge construction and production of the past and the present (ibid.). She argues that 'Western' research paradigms construct the world along binary opposites of 'self/other, colonizer/colonized, centre/periphery, developed/developing, North/South, first world/third world', which consequently privileges 'the West' as the knower and relegates 'the Other' as a deficit/problem (ibid: 74). She articulates a view that knowledge and perspectives from indigenous peoples and communities were and are ignored, marginalised, and suppressed partly because they have been considered as 'the Other' (ibid.). Hence, she calls for using postcolonial theory and critical race theory as analytical tools to interrogate the applications of 'Western' theories and methodologies as well as 'the biases, distortions and misconceptions about the colonized Other that are legitimized by the accumulated body of literature and the use of dominant languages in research' (ibid: 70). Chilisa suggests that researchers should engage with multiple epistemologies and beliefs about what count as knowledge. She argues that knowledge and perspectives of indigenous peoples and communities are 'important sources of literature that should inform problem identification and formulation, research theoretical frameworks, and meaning making, as well as legitimizing research findings' (ibid.).

In this section, I have analysed three examples to illustrate the hierarchical relationship between 'Western' knowledge and other knowledge systems in different educational contexts, including sciences subject curricula at school (Clay, 1996), academic writing practices in university (Turner, 2011) and HIV/AIDS research practices in indigenous community (Chilisa, 2012). These examples illustrate the power of 'Western' knowledge and how the Eurocentric canon suppresses other knowledge systems and ways of knowing. It is worth noting that Chilisa's (2012) point about how the 'Western' research

paradigms construct the world along binary opposites and make the 'Western' knowledge/epistemology superior to other knowledge systems and ways of knowing, echoes Hall's (1992) notion of 'the West and the Rest'. I recognised through her point about the domination/power of 'Western' knowledge and the devastating impact of the binary construction of the world and knowledge. This awareness led me to be more reflexive about these conceptualisations when I carried out my research. It also provided a theoretical lens for me to analyse academics' views of the world and knowledge and how that has impacted on their approaches to internationalising the curriculum.

3.4.3 Critiques on decolonising efforts in higher education

Contemporary debates on the decolonisation of higher education have attracted a lot of attention and challenged academics within the higher education sector to reflect on the legacies of colonialism and imperialism in universities and its implications for knowledge production (Gopal, 2021). Yet scholars suggest that paradoxes, limitations, and tensions reside within the decolonising efforts in higher education (Heleta, 2016; Arday, Belluigi and Thomas, 2021; Shain et al., 2021). For instance, Heleta (2016) notes that a paradox that haunts the decolonising efforts in South Africa is that universities continue to reproduce an epistemological hierarchy wherein 'Western' knowledge is privileged over other bodies and traditions of knowledge and ways of knowledge production. From Heleta's point of view, although progress has been made in changing highly problematic colonial structures and practices in universities since the end of the oppressive and racist apartheid system in 1994, epistemologies and knowledge systems at most South African universities remain in colonial, apartheid and 'Western' worldviews and epistemological traditions (ibid.). He writes that the curriculum at most South African universities 'remains largely Eurocentric and continues to reinforce White and Western dominance and privilege while at the same time being full of stereotypes, prejudices and patronising views about Africa and its people' (ibid: 2).

He traces the roots of Eurocentrism at South African universities and points out that universities have failed to do much to change the curriculum since the demise of apartheid (ibid.). He articulates a view that the current higher education curriculum in most fields of study (and particularly in the humanities and social sciences) in South Africa still reflects the colonial and apartheid worldviews and is disconnected from realities of the nation, including lived experiences of the majority of black South Africans (ibid.). He claims that most South African academics who teach about Africa follow the hegemonic Eurocentric canon and rely primarily on 'Western' interpretations of the continent (ibid.). For him, this kind of education can be considered as 'epistemic violence' (Spivak, 1994), which refers to the Eurocentric domination and subjugation of the colonised and attributes truth only to the 'Western' way of knowledge production. To dismantle the hegemony of Eurocentrism in South Africa, he suggests that universities must 'completely rethink, reframe and reconstruct the curriculum and bring South Africa, Southern Africa and Africa to the centre of teaching, learning and research' (ibid: 5).

In line with Heleta's point about the domination and privilege of 'Western' knowledge in higher education curriculum, Arday, Belluigi and Thomas's study (2021) explores the agenda of decolonising the curriculum in seven UK universities and its influence upon Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) students and staff in terms of their feelings of engagement and belonging within the university and academy. They report that the curriculum in the case study universities is primarily based on the dominant Eurocentric canon and omits other bodies of knowledge and ways of creating knowledge (ibid.). By highlighting the problematic nature of the curriculum in the case study universities, they contend that the dominant Eurocentric curriculum made BAME students feel marginalisation and exclusion from their history, identity and lived experiences (ibid.). They problematise the decolonising agenda in the case study universities and query the lack of transformation in the UK higher education sector in terms of creating an equitable and inclusive learning space (ibid.). They argue that higher education institutions within the UK and globally continue to be complicit in reproducing 'Western' privilege and

meanwhile the curriculum and pedagogies pervading within the institutions 'continue to remain a site for the systemic reproduction of racism' (ibid: 299).

They hold a view that decolonising the curriculum provides the opportunity to bring about fundamental epistemological change to universities, yet this will not happen until the Eurocentric institutional structures and cultures fundamentally change (ibid.). They note that the opposition to change is entrenched within the university structures and point out that debates about decolonisation create discomfort within universities, particularly among academics who wish for the Eurocentric canon to remain the same, unchanged, and uncontested (ibid.). They state that this group will do everything in their power to contest, resist and water down the decolonial change in the university and will not easily allow the breaking down of their grip on power, privilege, influence, and decision-making (ibid.). They contend that decolonising the curriculum requires substantial paradigm shifts which dismantle existing structural racist practices that continually oppress and marginalise the intellectual and cultural contributions of BAME and indigenous populations to the academy; furthermore, a collective engagement is needed throughout all levels of the university structure from an operational level through to a senior university leadership level (ibid.). In their view, the decolonising agenda cannot be left solely to BAME scholar activists and there is a need for students and academics to 'hold university institutions accountable by maintaining non-violent, intellectual and evidence-based discourses, which attempt to de-centre Eurocentrism and dismantle epistemic violence within the Academy' (ibid: 310).

Another study highlighting the limitations and tensions inherent in the decolonising efforts in higher education comes from Shain and her colleagues (Shain et al., 2021). Drawing on empirical research with students and staff who are engaged in individual and/or group-based decolonising efforts across nine universities in England, Shain et al. (2021) explore institutional responses to calls for decolonising the university. They conceptualise institutional responses through three strategies: rejection, reluctant acceptance, and strategic advancement (ibid.). They report that universities responded in

a range of ways to student demands for decolonising, but a notable shift occurred in 2020 with universities more readily embracing the language of decolonisation and anti-racism and the introduction of top-down senior manager led initiatives for decolonising the curriculum (ibid.). Drawing on the theory of interest convergence (Bell, 1980), Shain et al. (2021) analyse the structural pressures and circumstances that converge at a particular historical movement to underpin a strategic advancement of decolonising by some universities. They contend that the shift towards a strategic advancement of decolonising by some universities can be read through the lens of 'interest convergence' (Bell, 1980) as universities face pressures to recruit and retain students in the context of economic downturn, the post-Brexit period, the Covid-19 pandemic, and the Black Lives Matter movement (ibid.). In their view, these factors and pressures form an important context for universities' developing responses to demands for decolonisation (ibid.).

The investigation by Shain et al. suggests that while some university managements have actively engaged with decolonial efforts and campaigns, there has also been 'a strategic rejection of this decolonising work through refusal, delay, and silencing' (ibid: 934). They point out that many institutional actions around decolonisation in the case study universities focus on inclusion but with little commitment to a redistribution of resources and there is a lack of real structural change in universities that facilitates a transition to decolonial futures (ibid.). They report that while some participants in their study identified the strategic advancement of decolonising by universities as necessary and inevitable, they also identified the risks of top-down, institutionalised initiatives of decolonising, such as 'tokenism, superficiality, and a ramping up of the exploitation of Women of Colour, especially, as decolonising is delivered through neoliberal managerial principles' (ibid: 934). Based on these findings, Shain et al. suggest that the strategic advancement of decolonising by universities can contribute to an institutional taming or a dilution of the discourse of decolonising, 'especially when top-down initiatives and strategies are pursued while leaving intact the structures and processes that perpetuate coloniality' (ibid: 921).

In this section, I have reviewed some of the paradoxes, limitations, and tensions in decolonising the university/curriculum that have been raised by scholars. For example, Heleta (2016) and Arday, Belluigi and Thomas (2021) report that universities in South Africa and the UK continue to reproduce an epistemological hierarchy wherein 'Western' knowledge is privileged and considered superior to other bodies and traditions of knowledge. They suggest that the colonial roots/structures are entrenched within universities and have not been fundamentally dismantled. These findings and reflections are useful for my study as they made me aware of and critically reflect on the paradoxes, limitations, and tensions in decolonising the university/curriculum. Shain et al. (2021) highlight the importance of context for universities' developing responses to the calls for 'decolonisation' and reveal that university leaders and executives might instrumentalise 'decolonisation' and use it to recruit students. This finding provided a theoretical lens for me to explore how decolonisation/internationalisation is implemented in the case study university and how academics engage with the institutionalisation of the decolonising initiatives in the university.

3.5 University aims and ethos

The last element in my conceptual framework focuses on university aims and ethos. As my third sub research question (RQ3: *How does the case study university's policy discourses on internationalisation shape academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum?*) indicates, I was interested in exploring how university policies and strategies on internationalisation impact on academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. In this section, I review some key concepts related to university aims and ethos that I adopted for my study.

3.5.1 'University of Excellence' and 'paraversity'

In his book, *The University in Dissent: Scholarship in the Corporate University*, Rolfe (2013) discusses the rise of corporatism and managerialism in contemporary universities and the subsequent demise of the traditional intentions and values of scholarship in the UK and international settings. He attributes the 'growing corporatism and managerialism' in higher education to the knowledge economy and increasing competition in the global market of higher education (ibid: 3). He suggests that due to the rise of corporatism and managerialism in UK higher education, the notion of 'University of Excellence' has been widely adopted by UK universities (ibid.).

Rolfe notes that the diminishing role and status of Enlightenment culture during the second half of the 20th century brought 'a crisis of legitimation' for UK universities (ibid.). In his view, 'the Enlightenment grand narratives of truth and emancipation' were superseded by 'the liberal capitalist grand narratives of efficiency and profitability' (ibid: 8). He argues that the promotion of the business values of 'excellence' ruined and diminished the role and status of university as an academic institution, and 'excellence' became 'an empty signifier bereft of any ideological intent, a unit of measurement rather than something to be measured' (ibid: 9).

From Rolfe's perspective, the notion of 'University of Excellence' defines 'excellence' merely in numerical terms (ibid.). The aspirations towards 'excellence' in the mission statements of contemporary UK universities are demonstrated through 'a crude quantification of targets', which in his view is 'the very antithesis of the quality of which these universities previously aspired' (ibid: 9). He points out that in the context of 'University of Excellence', 'excellence' in teaching is often measured by the number of 'good degrees' (i.e. first-class degrees or upper second degrees) awarded to students or by their attrition rate; 'excellence' in research is determined by the number of papers published in journals with 'high impact factors' (i.e. with large number of citations) or by the amount of grant income obtained or the output of those papers (ibid.). For instance, the research agenda of UK universities has become increasingly linked to finance and

profit and the introduction of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) in higher education institutions has elevated grant income to one of the major indicators for 'research quality' (ibid.). He states that 'academics feel compelled to take on projects not because they have a particular interest or expertise in the subject or methodology, not even necessarily because their university might make some money out of the project, but primarily because, in the post-historical bureaucratic corporation that the university has become, grant income is a major criterion used to assess research quality' (ibid: 11). He argues that the notion of 'University of Excellence' defines 'excellence' based on quantity rather than quality and brings 'excellence' into the realm of efficiency, profitability and administration. As a consequence, the 'delivery of excellence' is thought to have been replaced by the 'administration of excellence' and the maintenance and evaluation of the 'excellence' of university shifts from 'researcher and teacher accountability' to 'administration and accountancy' (ibid.). For instance, when the Teaching Quality Assessment (TQA) was introduced in the UK in 1990s, it relied on a very similar crude form of quantification of 'excellence' (ibid.). The implication was that the excellent lecturer is the one who efficiently met the numerical targets of TQA, such as 'time taken for the student to progress through the system, student retention rates, course completion rates and graduate employment data' (ibid: 10).

Rolfe argues that the notion of 'University of Excellence' is more concerned with 'defining, operationalizing, measuring and comparing the standards of researching and teaching' rather than 'the content of what is to be researched and taught' (ibid: 9). He notes that in the context of 'University of Excellence', the institutional review in the university is more likely to be concerned with examining the procedures put in place for the review of academic programmes rather than with the actual academic programmes, with examining student assessment processes rather than directly with the student assessment (ibid.). As a result, the 'excellence' of university is therefore achieved and demonstrated though 'the effective management or administration of quality and standards' rather than 'directly attempting to assess quality itself' (ibid: 10).

Rolfe states that to save the university as an academic institution, it is necessary to challenge the notion of 'University of Excellence' and create what he calls 'paraversity' – that is 'an invisible, subversive, virtual institution populated by teachers, researchers and students thinking alongside one another in dissensus' (ibid: 35). From his perspective, the 'paraversity' is not concerned 'with convergence on a single unified and universal truth, but with parallel lines of thought that never meet' (ibid: 35). He points out that 'thinking together' in the 'paraversity' is 'thinking in dissensus', not to 'arrive at agreement, not to resolve or shut down discussion and debate, but to keep it open and alive' (ibid: 36). The 'paraversity' is nothing more or less than a 'radical critique' of the notion of 'University of Excellence' and runs unseen or unnoticed alongside and in parallel with the visible 'University of Excellence' (ibid: 36).

In this section, I reviewed Rolfe's (2013) notions of 'University of Excellence' and 'paraversity'. Rolfe's notion of 'University of Excellence' provided a theoretical lens for me to analyse the rise of corporatism and managerialism in UK higher education and its impacts on the ways in which university executives formulate university policies and strategies. It is useful to note that Rolfe's notion of 'paraversity' challenges the concept of 'University of Excellence' and highlights the importance for people working in universities to think alongside one another in dissensus. His notion of 'paraversity' provided a theoretical lens for me to analyse the alternative attitudes and beliefs that academics might have towards university policies and strategies.

3.5.2 'Symbolic' and 'transformative' internationalisation

In addition to Rolfe's (2013) notions of 'University of Excellence' and 'paraversity', Turner and Robson's (2008) notions of 'symbolic' and 'transformative' internationalisation also provided a theoretical lens for me to analyse university policies and strategies. Bartell (2003) suggests that an institution's stance on 'internationalisation' can be viewed as occurring on a continuum. He states:

'At one end, internationalisation is limited and essentially symbolic, for example, internationalisation may be reflected, in this case, by a relative handful of students from several distant countries having a presence on a campus. At the other end of the continuum, the process of internationalisation is conceptualised as a synergistic, transformative process, involving the curriculum and the research programs, that influences the role and activities of all stakeholders including faculty, students, administrators, and the community-at-large' (ibid: 51).

Building on Bartell's notions of 'symbolic' and 'transformative' internationalisation, Turner and Robson (2008) have developed a continuum of positions from 'symbolic' to 'transformative' internationalisation to analyse university policy approaches to internationalisation (see Table 3.5.2).

	Symbolic	Transformative
Stimulus	external	internal
International impetus	business-led	internationalist
Strategic management focus	markets/student recruitment	international partnerships/knowledge-sharing
Financial focus	cost-and-revenue-focused	investment-focused
External engagement	competitive	cooperative
Management style	designed/planned	emergent

Institutional characterization of internationalization	prescriptive	descriptive
Style of participation	compliance	commitment
Sustainability	short-term	long-term

Table 3.5.2 A continuum of positions on internationalisation (adapted from Turner and Robson, 2008: 28)

Turner and Robson suggest that universities that choose a more 'symbolic' approach look at 'internationalisation' as a strategic end, with accompanying expectations of tangible financial returns (ibid.). They point out that universities that adopt a 'symbolic' approach have a clear focus on promoting business-related activities and are concerned with cost minimisation to maximise financial returns (ibid.). For example, resource deployment for 'internationalisation' in these universities is limited to activities that are able to show a direct financial return – e.g. student recruitment (ibid.). According to Turner and Robson, these universities tend to look at 'internationalisation' from a competitive perspective and treat 'internationalisation' as a tool for the university to become competitive in the global market of higher education (ibid.). In these universities, policy and management approaches to internationalisation are more top-down (ibid.). They tend to formulate an internationalisation strategy where progress in achieving the objectives is tightly managed and little divergence is permitted (ibid.). Furthermore, these universities concentrate on clearly definable areas and work units and attach importance to the economic benefits generated from the activities in relation to 'internationalisation'; people working in the university are held accountable for achievements against those targets (ibid.).

By contrast, in a 'transformative' orientation, internationalisation activities in the institution are not exclusively business-focused in nature and universities have a much wider range of strategic objectives (ibid.). In the universities that choose a more 'transformative' approach, internationalisation activities such as scholar exchanges, international research collaborations and so on, are integrated into the broad educational and intellectual missions of the university, which are considered as long-term investments for the university and may not show direct financial return (ibid.). These universities look at 'internationalisation' from a cooperative perspective and focus on international knowledge-sharing, cooperation, and engagement (ibid.). In these universities, planning and management for 'internationalisation' are retrospective and university leaders and executives consider the bottom-up approaches to a greater degree, in order to coordinate and orchestrate diverse local initiatives and achieve institutional coherence (ibid.).

Turner and Robson suggest that universities that are positioned in the 'transformative' orientation are likely to adopt a more flexible approach to their international engagement (ibid.). Their articulation of objectives may be explicit, but achievements of these objectives are assessed in a more open-minded and qualitative way (ibid.). They point out that universities that choose a more 'transformative' approach tend to focus on building impetus for long-term, fundamental behavioural and values-based change within the institution (ibid.). More importantly, 'internationalisation' in the institution is considered 'as much about values of international reciprocity within the institutional ethical and belief system as it is about skilful teaching and learning practices, requiring individuals to move from an ethnocentric to an ethnorelative position' (ibid: 126).

In this section, I have reviewed Turner and Robson's (2008) notions of 'symbolic' and 'transformative' internationalisation. Their typology of university policy approaches to internationalisation provided a theoretical lens for me to analyse how 'internationalisation' is conceptualised in university policies and strategies and what kind of approach that university executives took to internationalise their university. Their

typology also provided a theoretical lens for me to analyse academics' approaches to internationalising the curriculum. I will discuss this point in Chapter 8, Section 8.3.

3.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I reviewed the theoretical concepts that I used to develop a conceptual framework for my study. Key to my framework are the concepts of 'culture as a verb' (Street, 1993), 'small cultures' (Holliday, 1999), 'cultural realities' (Holliday, 2011) and 'cultural arenas' (Holliday, 2011). The fluid and dynamic view of 'culture' suggested by Street (1993) and Holliday (1999, 2011) inspired me to adopt a different conceptual starting point from the dominant discourse on 'internationalisation' and 'culture' (see the integrative approach to internationalising the curriculum suggested by Joseph (2011) in Chapter 1, Section 1.3). It enabled me to move away from an essentialist view of 'culture' (which suggests that teachers can add more 'cultures' into the curriculum to make it international) to a new conceptual starting point of 'culture' being a fluid and ever-changing process. This more fluid and dynamic view of 'culture' also inspired me to explore the social contexts (e.g. disciplines, institutions, classrooms) in which academics work and teach and how their practices in these social contexts impact on their engagement in internationalising the curriculum.

In terms of disciplinary cultures, Becher and Trowler's (2001) typology of disciplines (i.e. 'hard pure', 'soft pure', etc.) provided a theoretical lens for me to select disciplines and academics. The view that 'disciplines' are partly identified by the existence of relevant departments/schools (Becher and Trowler, 2001; Henkel, 2000; Evans, 1995) led me to select academics from different departments/schools to make sure that they came from a range of disciplines. The phenomenological views on 'disciplinary cultures' as being socially constructed suggested by Becher and Trowler (2001) and Henkel (2000) connects with the notion of 'culture as a verb' (Street, 1993), which guided me in my analysis of

'disciplinary cultures' and academics' disciplinary identities not as a static outcome nor as fixed entities, but rather, as fluid and ongoing processes.

The theoretical debate on knowledge hierarchies in the academy is another important element in my conceptual framework. Said's (1978) notion of 'positional superiority' and Hall's (1992) notion of 'the West and the Rest' provided theoretical lenses for me to analyse the power/domination of 'Western' knowledge and epistemology in the academy. Said's (1978) notion of 'positional superiority' enabled me to interrogate academics' views on the hierarchical relationships between different knowledges. Hall's (1992) notion of 'the West and the Rest' provided a theoretical lens for me to explore academics' views on the world and knowledge and how their views of the world and knowledge impact on their approaches to internationalising the curriculum.

In terms of university aims and ethos, Rolfe's (2013) notion of 'University of Excellence' provided a theoretical lens for me to analyse the rise of corporatism and managerialism in UK higher education and its impacts on the ways in which university executives formulate university policies and strategies. His notion of 'paraversity' challenges the concept of 'University of Excellence' and provided a theoretical lens for me to analyse alternative attitudes and ideas that academics might have towards the university policies and strategies. Furthermore, Turner and Robson's (2008) notions of 'symbolic' and 'transformative' internationalisation were useful to analyse the values/ethos underlying the university's internationalisation policies and strategies, the ways in which university executives approached 'internationalisation', and academics' strategies and practices for internationalising the curriculum.

Chapter 4 Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to discuss my methodological orientations and decisions. I begin this chapter by explaining why and how I used an ethnographic-style case study approach to explore academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. I then describe the strategies that I used to select the case study university and research participants and reflect on the ethical challenges that I encountered. Thereafter, I discuss my data collection methods and the techniques that I adopted to analyse data and enhance the trustworthiness of this research. I close this chapter by critically reflecting on my fluid and ever-changing positionality as a researcher and its impact on the research process.

4.2 An ethnographic-style case study approach

The overarching research question of this study is: *How do academics working in different disciplines engage with internationalisation of the curriculum?* The sub-research questions are: (1) *How do academics working in different disciplines interpret the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum?* (2) *What are academics' strategies and practices for internationalising the curriculum?* (3) *How does the case study university's policy discourses on internationalisation shape academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum?*

As indicated in my research questions, this study explores how academics interpret the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum and how they engage with it in their practices. I chose a qualitative research design because I believe that to fully understand academics' understandings and practices of internationalising the curriculum, I needed to explore the meanings that are embedded in their conceptualisations regarding curriculum

internationalisation and how these conceptualisations have been shaped by the specific social contexts in which they teach and work. As Patton suggests,

> 'qualitative research is an effort to understand situations in their uniqueness as part of a particular context and the interactions there … it is not attempting to predict what may happen in the future necessarily, but to understand the nature of that setting – what it means for participants to be in that setting, what their lives are like, what is going on for them, what their meanings are, what the world looks like in that particular setting – and in the analysis to be able to communicate that faithfully to others who are interested in that setting' (Patton, 1985: 1, cited in Merriam, 1998: 6).

My decision to choose a qualitative research design for this study also aligns with my stances in terms of ontology and epistemology. Ontologically, I agree with the constructivist worldview that 'reality is a social construct' and 'multiple realities exist' (Newman, Benz and Ridenour, 1998: 2). Within the constructivist paradigm, 'social phenomena and their meanings are continually being accomplished by social actors' (Bryman, 2012: 33). I agree with this viewpoint because it recognises the role of social interactions in shaping 'realities' and how 'realities' are continually revised and shaped by different contexts and settings. I believe that the meanings that academics make around/about 'internationalisation of the curriculum' are constructed in specific contexts and subject to changes if the contexts change. Epistemologically, I lean towards the interpretivist paradigm which suggests that 'knowledge is jointly constructed between researchers and their collaborators' (Dunne, Pryor and Yates, 2005: 15). Within the interpretivist paradigm, 'the knower and the known are inter-dependent and fused together in such a way that the "findings" are the creation of a process of interaction between the two' (Sparkes and Smith, 2014: 13). I agree with this viewpoint because it recognises that knowledge is socially constructed and both the researcher and the researched play an important part in the work and process of constructing knowledge (Assalahi, 2015).

It should be noted that two qualitative research methodologies informed my research design and methods: ethnographic methodology and case study methodology. Central to my research questions is the idea of exploration: how academics interpret the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum and how they engage with it in their practices. As I discussed in Chapter 3, inspired by Holliday's (1999) 'small cultures' approach, I wanted to explore the social contexts in which academics teach and work and how their practices in these social contexts have impacted on their engagement in internationalising the curriculum. I found ethnographic methodology suitable for my research aims because it has been considered as 'an ongoing attempt to place specific encounters, events and understandings into a fuller, more meaningful context' (Tedlock, 2000: 455) and enabled me to explore academics' practices in specific social contexts. As Agar (1996: 9) notes, ethnographic methodology concentrates on 'practices of everyday life, the way those practices are built out of shared knowledge, plus all the other things that are relevant to the moment.' I chose ethnographic methodology because it helps to explore the 'interpretation of meanings, functions of human actions and institutional practices, and how these actions and practices are implicated in local, and perhaps also wider contexts' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 3). At the same time, due to the limited time that I was able to spend with the participants, this study cannot be viewed as traditional ethnographic research which is why I refer to it as 'ethnographic-style' research (Green and Bloome, 1997). Nevertheless, ethnographic methodology informed my research design and methods. For instance, it inspired me to use the method of participant observation to explore academics' practices of internationalising the curriculum in the classroom. I will discuss this method in Section 4.6.1.

In addition to ethnographic methodology, case study methodology also informed my research design and methods. Case study methodology is considered as 'the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances' (Stake, 1995: xi). It has been viewed as 'an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a bounded phenomenon such as a program, an institution, a person, a process or a social unit' (Merriam, 1998: xiii). As my third sub-research question

indicates, I wanted to explore how the university's policies and strategies on internationalisation impact on academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. I found the case study methodology suitable because it allowed me to explore the particularity and complexity of the case (in my study, the case being the university) and analyse academics' accounts and practices regarding internationalisation of the curriculum within the case study university. As Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011: 289) suggest, the strength of case study methodology is that it can provide 'a unique example of real people in real situations, enabling readers to understand ideas more clearly than simply by presenting them with abstract theories or principles.'

In sum, I adopted an ethnographic-style case study approach to explore academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum and both ethnographic methodology and case study methodology informed my research design and methods. In the next section, I will discuss how I selected the university and research participants for my study.

4.3 Selection of the university and participants

A key premise of case study research is thought to be the selection and construction of the 'case' (Simons, 2009). In the early stages of my research design, I had planned to employ a comparative case study approach and select two UK universities with different history, location, student/staff population, and internationalisation strategy to be the 'cases' to explore. The advantage of using a comparative case study approach is that it allows for comparisons/contrasts and for identifying similarities and/or differences between the selected universities. It also has the potential to produce richer data and findings. Hence, in the summer of 2018, I conducted a scoping review of UK universities' websites, to try to understand their history and their policies and strategies concerning internationalisation so that I could identify two case study universities to explore and compare. Yet as I was planning my fieldwork, I realised that I was keener to explore how academics working in different disciplines engage with internationalisation of the

curriculum (as indicated in my research questions) rather than comparing institutional differences. I then decided to focus on one university and explore the views and practices of academics working in different disciplines within that university.

In terms of selecting the case study university, I did not opt for a 'representative' or 'typical' case; instead, I leaned towards Mitchell's (1984: 239) notion of 'telling case' – which aims to 'establish theoretically valid connections between events and phenomena which previously were ineluctable.' When selecting the 'telling' case study university, I followed two criteria to make sure the characteristics of the university are suitable for my research design and aims. Firstly, as my first sub research question indicates, I wanted to explore the impact of disciplines on academics' beliefs and attitudes towards 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. I selected the university because it has schools/departments that consist of academic staff from a range of disciplines and offer programmes in a range of subject areas. This enabled me to select and recruit academic staff from a range of disciplines to be my respondents. Secondly, as my third sub research question indicates, I wanted to explore how the university's policies and strategies on internationalisation shaped academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum. Guided by this aim, I selected the university because it has a formal, published internationalisation strategy (see my analysis of the university's internationalisation strategy paper in Chapter 2, Section 2.4). In addition to these two criteria, my rationale for selecting the university was also based on some practical considerations. I selected this university partly because I had established networks with the faculty in the university and they helped me with gaining access to schools/departments of the university.

In terms of constructing/bounding the 'case', I made decisions as to who are included in the 'case'. As my first sub-research question suggests, I wanted to explore how academics working in different disciplines interpret the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum. Bearing this in mind, I adopted the method of 'purposive sampling' to 'select a sample from which the most can be learned' (Merriam, 1998: 61). As Becher and Trowler (2001: 41) suggest, 'disciplines' are 'in part identified by the existence of relevant

departments.' Drawing on Becher and Trowler's conceptualisation of 'disciplines', I went to different schools/departments to select the academics to make sure that academics came from a range of disciplines. When selecting the schools/departments, I drew on Becher and Trowler's typology of disciplines ('hard pure', 'soft pure', etc.) to make sure that the schools/departments that I selected came from a wide range of subject areas. In the end, I secured access to eight schools/departments, including School of Mathematics, School of Environmental Sciences, School of Education, School of Business, School of Languages, School of Politics, School of International Development, and School of Literature.

In terms of selecting the participants, I searched the profiles of academics via the university's website and tried to identify the ones who might be willing to participate in my research. When selecting the participants, I took account of factors such as gender, nationality/ethnicity, seniority of their position, and level of courses that they teach, to make sure that the participants came from a variety of backgrounds. After a series of email communications and negotiations, twenty-six academics from eight schools/departments agreed to participate in my research. Among the twenty-six academics, eleven academics are male, and fifteen academics are female; seven academics come from the UK, fourteen academics come from Europe, four academics come from Asia, and one academic comes from Africa; eleven academics are lecturers, and fifteen academics are senior lecturers (see Appendix A).

4.4 Gaining access to the field

Following the ethics committee's suggestions, I wrote letters to each Head of School that I identified in the case study university to request their permission to conduct research in their department (see Appendix B). At the beginning of my fieldwork, I was worried that I would not get a response because the topic of my study is sensitive, and Heads of School might not want me to observe how internationalisation of the curriculum is being

implemented in their department. Yet the process of gaining access to each school was smoother than I had thought. Some Heads of School asked me if I would anonymise the information about their school. When I replied to them that all the information about their school would be anonymised, they gave me permission to conduct my research in their department.

Having gained access to each school, I wrote letters to the academics that I had identified in each school and invited them to participate in my research (see Appendix C). In the invitation letter, I stated that I wanted to observe their teaching sessions before interviewing them and gave them the freedom to choose whether they wanted to be observed/interviewed or not. In the letter, I also attached the participant consent forms and the information sheets to make sure that the participants had sufficient information about my research and fully understood their involvement in the research (see Appendix D). In the end, of the twenty-six academics from eight different schools/departments who agreed to be interviewed, eleven academics expressed their willingness to be both observed and interviewed.

4.5 Ethical considerations

One of the ethical issues raised during my fieldwork was that when I asked the permission from the Head of School to approach the academics working in their school, some of them asked me to tell them the names of the academics who I intended to invite to participate in my research. At that point, I had to tell them (i.e. my gatekeepers) that I could not do so because I was not sure whether the participants would want to disclose their identity or not and I had to keep their identity confidential. This was a critical moment: I realised that it was vital for me to bear in mind that any behaviours that may lead to identifications of my participants' identity should be carefully avoided during and after my fieldwork.

I also faced difficulties in anonymising the case study university and my participants, even though I assigned pseudonyms to them. This is because some characteristics of the case

study university and my participants are too specific and unique to be anonymised. For example, the name of the school/department where my participants work, the name of the module/course that my participants teach, the nationality/ethnicity/position of my participants and so on. I felt that even though I did not name the university and I used pseudonyms to refer to my participants, people could still guess who they were by connecting the dots and searching for information via the internet. Hence, I had to be extremely careful when using the information/data that I gathered about both the university and my participants. When I found that the information/data was too specific and unique, I chose to fictionalise them to maintain my participants' anonymity.

In addition to ensuring the anonymity of my fieldwork site and participants, I felt that it was vital for me to adopt an 'ethical position' during and after my fieldwork, which is 'sensitive to interactions and imbalances of power between researchers and participants' and maintaining 'respectful connections among the researcher their research participants and the communities' (Palmer, 2016: 319). When communicating with my participants, I tried to adopt a reflexive ethical stance and encourage my participants to ask questions about my research and share any concerns about their involvement in my research. For example, when I approached the participants, some of them replied to me that they were not familiar with the term 'internationalisation of the curriculum' and were not sure if their views and experiences were therefore relevant to my research. In this situation, I shared with the participants my definition of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' in our emails and explained their involvement in my research, to build trust with them. I also followed Fetterman's (1998: 143) suggestion regarding 'reciprocity' as a way to strengthen my relationships with the participants. For instance, I offered to share my research findings with the participants and stated that I was willing to join their discussions in any meetings when the topic was close to my research focus. In doing that, I tried to give back the 'ownership of knowledge' to those participating in my research (Swartz, 2011: 49).

4.6 Research methods

The research methods that I used in this study were participant observation, semi-structured interview, and documentary analysis. I chose these three methods because they complement each other in collecting data. The data collection process consisted of two phases. The first phase started in November 2018 and ended in September 2019. During this period, I conducted participant observations in eleven academics' classes and conducted twenty-one one-to-one semi-structured interviews. For the participants who agreed to be both observed and interviewed, I chose to observe their classes first and then interview them. This is because I wanted to familiarise myself with the classroom contexts in which academics teach and develop some specific interview questions about their practices before I interviewed them. The second phase of data collection took place in July 2021. Stake (1995) notes that initial research questions provide the researcher with initial foci for data collection but do not exclude the possibility of a change of plan: the unanticipated can lead to a deeper understanding of the research problem. An event of this kind occurred in my study. As I was writing up my thesis, the decolonisation initiatives became prominent in the case study university and attracted a lot of attention due to the Black Lives Matter movement in May 2020 (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4). In that situation, I thought that it would be useful to explore academics' views on the decolonisation initiatives in the university, since the initiatives put great emphasis on the reform of the curriculum, and this was extremely relevant to my research. Hence, I renewed my ethics application and conducted interviews with five academic staff in July 2021 to explore their engagement in the decolonisation initiatives and their views on the links between the decolonisation initiatives and internationalisation of the curriculum. Because of Covid-19 in that period in the UK, I chose to conduct online interviews with these new participants to minimise risk and harm to them. The additional fieldwork in the second phase of data collection triggered my reflections on the relationships between internationalisation and decolonisation and resulted in some new themes regarding the university's policies and strategies. I will discuss these themes in Chapter 7. In the following sub sections, I discuss

the three research methods that I used in my study and reflect on the tensions that I faced in using them to collect data during my fieldwork.

4.6.1 Participant observation

As discussed in Section 4.2, informed by ethnographic methodology, I adopted the method of participant observation to collect data. I chose this method because it helped me to 'see things that might otherwise be unconsciously missed and discover things that participants might not freely talk about in interview situations' (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011: 456). Furthermore, it allowed me to develop 'a contextual understanding of people's actions, interactions, and emotions' (Smith and Caddick, 2012: 66). Whilst participant observation is considered as an effective way to collect data about research participants' behaviours and practices (Johnson and Christensen, 2014), in my study, it was not used to evaluate/assess whether the participants internationalised the curriculum or not or to examine whether what they said about their practices were congruent with what they did or not; instead, it was used to get more information about the participants' practices in the classroom so as to inform the interview questions I then asked. Patton (2015) notes that to understand a phenomenon in its true complexity, there is no substitute for the first-hand experience through participant observation. Following Patton's suggestions, I used participant observation to 'enter more closely into the setting under investigation' with the hope of gaining 'a deeper understanding of the context(s) of social action' (Lofland et al., 2006: 85).

As pointed out earlier, this study does not conform to a traditional ethnographic research design, mainly because I was not able to spend extended periods of time with the participants. Through a series of email communications with the participants, eleven academics agreed to be observed and the number of teaching sessions that I was able to join and observe for each participant ranged from four sessions (the most) to one session (the least) (see Appendix A). As 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is still a contested

concept and there is no agreed definition as to how it is implemented in practice, I drew on Leask's (2009) definition of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' to develop some observation guidelines as a starting point for my observation (see Appendix E). Based on these guidelines, I had some basic ideas as to what to observe when I joined the participants' classes, such as: 'What kinds of teaching examples does the lecturer use in the class?'; 'How does the lecturer encourage students to discuss issues from different cultural perspectives?'; and 'How does the lecturer engage students from different cultural backgrounds into group discussions?'.

The questions that I developed in the observation guidelines were just a starting point for my observation. During fieldwork, I had to also be open and fluid in deciding what to observe and what to note down in terms of incidents and dialogues that might be interesting and worthy for further exploration and analysis. For instance, what I observed in Jeremy's (mathematics) class was out of my observation plan. His class was more of a traditional lecture where the teacher stood in the front of the classroom and students sat in rows listening. I also noticed that there was not much discussion in the class and Jeremy did not use any real-life examples or case studies unlike other participants whom I observed, such as Alice in the School of Education and Paul in the School of Environmental Sciences. Instead, what Jeremy taught in class was pure mathematics: most time of time, he used chalk and blackboard to explain the mathematical theories/problems to the students; sometimes he checked if the students understood what he had taught or if they had any questions. After his class, I wrote down my thoughts as follows:

> Should all the courses/programmes/modules in the university be internationalised? What does 'internationalisation of the curriculum' mean to Jeremy's class/module? If what he teaches are pure mathematics, does his curriculum still need to be internationalised? What do I actually mean by 'internationalisation of the curriculum'? (Fieldnotes: 22/03/19)

As highlighted at the beginning of this section, the primary aim of using participant observation was to familiarise myself with the classroom context in which the participants taught and how they taught in the classroom. Thus, the incidents and dialogues that I

observed in the participants' classes were effectively used as reference points for my subsequent interviews with them. For instance, when I observed Lily's class (languages), I found that she always asked questions, such as: 'Can you do this in your language?'; 'How does it work in your own language?'; and 'What challenges did you face when you translate the text into your own language?'. In one lecture, she presented the students with two translated texts from the same source text and asked them to identify the differences of expression between the two translations. The texts were translated from Italian to English. After discussing the quality of these two translations, she introduced the differences between English and French in terms of sentence structure. While comparing the differences between English and French, she asked the students: 'What differences did you find between English and your native language in terms of sentence structures?' The students seemed to be challenged and it took a while for them to respond. When the students started to share their opinions, I noticed that Lily did not ask any further questions. After class, I wrote down my thoughts as follows:

> What difficulties did Lily face when she used the example of the translation between Italian and English? For the students who speak Italian and English, they can compare the quality of the translations. But for other students, how can they do that? When students discuss the linguistic features of their native language, how can she know whether they are correct or not? What tensions did she face in that situation? (Fieldnotes: 31/01/19)

When I interviewed Lily, I brought up the incident that I observed in her class and used it as a reference point to ask her the following questions: 'Why do you ask students to compare the language features between English and their native language?' and 'How do you deal with the situation where the students might say something that you do not know?'. Through asking such specific questions related to the participants' teaching practices, I not only built trust with the participants but also stimulated them to reflect on their own teaching practices. As the example of Lily (languages) shows, the information/data that I collected through participant observation was a useful dataset that helped me to design more specific interview questions, to understand the contexts

in which my interviewees taught, and to better explore their beliefs and practices regarding internationalisation of the curriculum.

Another point regarding participant observation that I want to discuss is my role as an observer in the class. Drawing on Gold's (1958) typology of four possible stances as an observer, I found that my role as an observer in the class shifted between 'participant as observer' and 'observer as participant', according to which participant's class I observed. When I observed classes in humanities and social sciences disciplines, such as Lily (language) and Alice (education), my role as an observer in the class was more of a 'participant as observer' (Gold, 1958: 220). I was able to understand most of the content taught in the class and participate in the group activities organised by the lecturers, without losing the focus of observing what was happening in the class. Nonetheless, my role as observer was subordinate to my role as a participant of the class. I was able to talk with the students in the class more freely and in some ways, I was like another student in the class. As understanding the curriculum content was not a task/burden to me, I was able to engage in the class and at the same time, quickly write down my thoughts about the participants' teaching practices. These notes provided a basis for me to type up my reflections and questions in detail after the class, as I did for Lily's (languages) class. By contrast, my role as an observer in the sciences disciplines, such as Jeremy (mathematics) and Linda (environmental sciences), was more of the so-called 'observer as participant' (Gold, 1958: 221). In these classes, most of the time I was trying to understand what the lecture was about, and it was very difficult for me to follow the participants' teaching pace. As I did not really understand what was taught in the class, I was reluctant to join in the group activities and barely talked to other students in the class. In most cases, I was more like an observer than a participant. As I did not really understand the curriculum content, I felt it was difficult for me to develop critical reflections and questions about the ways in which the participants taught.

In sum, adopting the method of participant observation to collect data enabled me to gain a better understanding about the classroom contexts in which the participants

taught as well as their classroom practices. Observing the participants' classes played an important role in helping me design more specific interview questions for them and explore in more depth their understandings and practices of internationalising the curriculum. My role as an observer in the classes shifted between 'participant as observer' and 'observer as participant' according to how familiar I was with the subject/topic that the participants taught.

4.6.2 Semi-structured interview

Semi-structured interview was another tool that I used to collect data. I used this method because it complemented the method of participant observation to 'obtain details of situations which the researcher did not witness' (Burgess, 1984: 87). Moreover, it helped me to obtain 'in-depth information about a participant's thoughts, beliefs, knowledge, reasoning, motivations, and feelings about a topic' (Johnson and Christensen, 2014: 233). Patton points to the advantages of using semi-structured interview to collect data as follows:

> 'We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe … We cannot observe feelings, thoughts, and intentions. We cannot observe behaviours that took place at some previous point in time. We cannot observe situations that preclude the presence of an observer. We cannot observe how people have organised the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on in the world. We have to ask people questions about those things. The purpose of interviewing, then, is to allow us to enter into the other person's perspective' (Patton, 1990: 196, cited in Merriam, 1998: 72).

Following Patton's suggestions, I used the semi-structured interview to 'enter into' the participants' perspectives and explore 'the meanings' they attached to their ideas and discourses. Using the semi-structured interview was congruent with my ontological and epistemological stances in that the process of interviewing can be considered as a 'social activity where two or more persons actively engage in embodied talk, collaboratively

constructing knowledge about the world and about themselves as they interact with each other over time and in certain contexts' (Smith and Caddick, 2012: 64).

Semi-structured interviews allowed me to 'respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic' (Merriam, 1998: 74). A list of topics and questions were prepared to help me recall the main topics (see Appendix F). At the same time, the questions that I asked were open-ended and the order of my questions was not fixed, allowing the conversation to develop and diverge (Smith and Sparkes, 2016). During the interview, I tried to ask more follow-up questions so that I could explore in more depth the participants' views and experiences as well as the new ideas and topics that emerged from our conversation. The interview usually took 30 to 60 minutes and usually took place in the participant's office as their choice. All interviews were audio recorded with the participants' consent. When signing the consent forms, participants were told that they would have the chance to review the interview transcripts and make modifications if they wished to. The opportunity that I offered to the participants to check and modify what they said helped me build trust with them and allowed them to feel freer to share their thoughts and opinions during our conversation.

As Merriam (1998: 75) suggests, 'the key to getting good data from interviewing is to ask good questions; asking good questions takes practice.' In my study, the questions that I asked and the way that I conducted the interviews, evolved as both my understanding of the research problem and my interview skills improved. For instance, in the early stages of my fieldwork, I believed that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' was an obscure concept and if I wanted to know how the participants interpreted the concept, I could not directly ask the question 'How do you understand internationalisation of the curriculum?' because it would be quite challenging for them. Hence, when I interviewed the very first three participants (Lisa – education, Paul – environmental sciences, and Alice – education), I asked them the questions based on my observation of their teaching sessions, such as: 'Why do you use international examples?'; 'How do you engage students from different

backgrounds into discussion?'; and 'How do you help students to develop a critical and global perspective on what they learnt?'.

Through asking the above questions, I gained some interesting insights regarding how the participants interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. Yet later, I realised that the questions that I asked to some extent influenced how the participants interpreted the concept because those questions already contained my assumptions of what 'internationalisation of the curriculum' was. Hence, in subsequent interviews, I used the question 'What does "internationalisation of the curriculum" mean to you?' as the first question to elicit their interpretations of the concept. However, during these interviews, some participants replied that they did not know what 'internationalisation of the curriculum' meant. In that situation, I had to change my question again and adjusted it to 'By Betty Leask's definition, "internationalisation of the curriculum" means including international and intercultural dimensions into the curriculum and the teaching process. I wondered what "internationalisation of the curriculum" means to you?'. I noticed that this revised question was easier for the participants to respond to and helped me obtain more interesting ideas from the participants than the previous versions.

Secondly, academics' experiences of working with international students was one of the themes that I wanted to explore during my interviews because I assumed that through questions around this theme, I could explore their understandings of 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. Hence, I asked questions, such as: 'What kinds of difficulties have you seen that most international students face when they study in the UK?'; 'Would you teach differently because of the presence of international students in the classroom?'; and 'What benefits and challenges do you think international students bring into the classroom?'. Yet after I had interviewed eight participants, I realised that these questions were not very good ones. On the one hand, I realised that such questions implicitly invited participants to view international students from a deficit perspective and assumed that international students faced difficulties when they studied in UK universities. On the other hand, I realised that using these questions to explore the participants' understandings of

'internationalisation of the curriculum' was not appropriate because these questions assumed that teaching international students was an important aspect/dimension of internationalising the curriculum. As many of the participants were not familiar with the term 'internationalisation of the curriculum', I realised that the way that I constructed the interview questions would have a significant impact on the participants' responses as well as how they interpreted the concept. Hence, in subsequent interviews, I changed the order of my questions—i.e., I first asked how they understood 'internationalisation of the curriculum' and if they raised any issues related to teaching international students, I would ask them some follow-up questions about that topic. I tried to be more reflexive about my own biases and assumptions when I constructed my interview questions to minimise the impact of these biases on how the participants responded to my questions.

Thirdly, as my fieldwork continued, new topics and themes emerged from my conversation with the participants. If I felt that these themes were worthy of further investigation, I would use them as reference points to develop new questions for subsequent interviews. For instance, when I interviewed James (politics), he mentioned that he found the literature in his field quite Eurocentric and 'Western-dominated'. He stated that he considered this as one of the difficulties with regard to internationalising the curriculum. I found that this issue was an interesting theme to pursue. Hence, I used James' words and experiences to develop some new questions for later interviews that I conducted – namely, 'When I interviewed academics in the discipline of politics, they told me that they found the literature in their field was quite Eurocentric and "Western-dominated". What is the situation in your discipline? Will that be considered as an issue?'. These new questions helped me to collect some interesting data on the participants' views regarding knowledge hierarchies and the issue of power and inequalities in the academy and the curriculum.

Another point regarding the process of interviewing that I want to discuss is the power dynamics between me (as a student) and the participants (as lecturers). Interviewing academics was not an easy task for me, particularly in the early stages of my fieldwork,

when I was not sure of how good my interview questions were and how the participants would respond to my questions. Whilst most of the participants were very nice to me, I could still feel the power hierarchies between us – i.e. the participants were in a higher and more powerful position than me because they were the experts in their field and experienced in teaching in higher education. During the interviews, I usually accepted whatever the participants told me and rarely challenged them, because of their knowledge and expertise not just about their subject but also about teaching and the curriculum. Another reason was that I sometimes did not understand their replies, particularly when they said something specific to their subject or used terminologies to describe their subject. It took me time to digest our conversation and I could not always spot the 'problems' instantly. Often it was only when I read the interview transcripts that I realised I had not been critical enough about their responses to my questions.

But as my fieldwork carried on and my understanding of the research problem improved, I was able to ask more specific and challenging questions. For instance, when I interviewed Jeremy (mathematics) and Ryan (mathematics) in the early stages of my fieldwork, they articulated the view that the mathematics that they taught were 'universal'. At the same time, Ryan told me that he noticed that the ways of teaching and learning mathematics in Italy were different from that of the UK. Based on the accounts that I gathered from Ryan and Jeremy, when I interviewed Andrew (mathematics) at a later stage of my fieldwork, I felt that I had more knowledge and confidence to ask some specific and challenging questions to explore his views on the cultural differences in teaching and learning mathematics. For instance, I asked Andrew: 'I wondered if the mathematics that you taught are universal? How do you internationalise the curriculum?' Through asking these more specific and challenging questions, I explored not only how the participants interpreted the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum but also their teaching beliefs and philosophy.

In sum, semi-structured interview was the primary method that I adopted to collect data in this study. The construction of my interview questions was a continuing process. I

became more flexible in the ways that I asked questions in the later stages of my fieldwork than in the earlier stages. Some questions that I asked later on in my fieldwork were based on new topics and themes that emerged from my conversation with participants in the earlier stages. Because of the power hierarchies between me (as a student) and the participants (as lecturers), I was less confident to challenge participants' responses. But this changed as my fieldwork carried on and my understanding of the research problem improved.

4.6.3 Documentary analysis

The third tool that I used to collect data was documentary analysis. Official documents available to the researcher are considered as 'a ready-made source of data' (Merriam, 1998: 112) and serve as 'substitutes for records of activity that the researcher could not observe directly' (Stake, 1995: 68). Fitzgerald (2007: 279) notes that documents offer a lens for the researcher to 'interpret events in order to gain insights into the relationship between the written and unwritten, spoken and virtual, public and private, past and present.'

In my study, I collected data from a range of documentary sources, such as: the profiles and biographies of the participants; the handbook and outline of the modules that the participants taught; the internationalisation strategy paper of the university; and the policy documents related to the decolonisation initiatives and anti-racism taskforce. The data that I collected from these documentary sources were used for different purposes. For instance, the profiles and biographies of the participants helped me select participants and familiarise myself with their backgrounds. The handbook and outline of the modules that the participants taught helped me gain ideas about their curriculum and prepare my interview questions. The internationalisation strategy paper and the documents related to the decolonisation initiatives and anti-racism taskforce allowed me

to explore and analyse the university's policy discourses on internationalisation and decolonisation.

4.7 Data analysis and writing-up

My approach to data analysis can be referred to as thematic analysis (see Braun and Clarke, 2006). As Namey et al. (2008: 138) suggest, key to thematic analysis is the focus on 'identifying and describing both implicit and explicit ideas.' In my study, I followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase model to analyse data, including: data familiarisation, coding, developing themes, refining themes, naming themes, and writing up. According to Braun, Clarke and Weate (2016), the process of data analysis is not a linear and simple step-by-step procedure but on-going and iterative. My data analysis began while I was collecting data, which helped me to 'cycle back and forth between thinking about the existing data and generating strategies for collecting new, often better, data' (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 50). After collecting all the data (including transcribing the interviews, organising the field notes, and accumulating documentary sources), I started to immerse myself in the data by reading and re-reading all data items and writing analytical memos. Through continuous reading and being engaged with all data items, I became familiar with the content of the data.

Thereafter, I started coding data using the software NVivo 12 (see Appendix G). Following Miles, Huberman and Saldana (2014), I used two types of codes to describe the data: descriptive codes (i.e. labels that summarise the data in words and phrases) and in vivo codes (i.e. the exact words used by the participants). Codes were developed in both an inductive (i.e. data driven) and deductive (i.e. theory driven) manner (Braun, Clarke and Weate, 2016). The combination of the inductive and deductive coding procedures can be described as an abductive approach, which emphasises the iterative and recursive nature of data analysis through a reciprocal dialogue between theory and data (Blaikie, 2010).

As the coding procedure progressed, I grouped codes into sub-themes and overarching themes (see Appendix G). A theme is generally considered as a collection of codes which 'captures something important about the data in relation to the research question and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set' (Braun and Clarke, 2006: 82). At this stage, I transformed codes into emerging themes and looked for connections between the emerging themes, 'grouping them together according to conceptual similarities, and providing each cluster with a descriptive label' (Pietkiewicz and Smith, 2014: 12). In a similar manner to the coding process, I checked across the emerging themes to ensure that data within each theme cohered meaningfully and some of the themes were dropped at this stage if they 'did not fit well with the emerging structure or because they have a weak evidential base' (ibid: 12). Following a thorough review, three overarching themes were developed, refined, and named appropriately, and each overarching theme was combined in a cluster of sub-themes so as to ensure a coherent account and accurate representation (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

Finally, in writing the research report and presenting the data, I followed the strategies suggested by Braun and Clarke, such as: providing enough data extracts to demonstrate the prevalence of the theme; choosing vivid examples and extracts that capture the essence of the points that I am making; going beyond description of the data when telling a story; and relating the analysis of the data back to the literature and research questions (ibid.). The aim was to provide 'a concise, coherent, logical, non-repetitive and interesting account of the story the data tell – within and across themes' (ibid: 93).

4.8 Trustworthiness and generalisability

Compared to the criteria for assessing the validity and reliability of findings in quantitative research, in qualitative research, findings are considered more in terms of how trustworthy they are by reviewing whether they are sustained by sufficient data (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995). As Stake (1995: 112) notes,

the primary concern of qualitative research is 'to gain the needed confirmation, to increase credence in the interpretation, to demonstrate commonality of an assertion.' In this study, research trustworthiness was sought through transparency and the researcher's honesty. To strengthen research trustworthiness, I have attempted to be transparent about the research process throughout this chapter, such as how I set up the research plan, how I selected the university and participants, how I gained access to the research site, and how I collected and analysed data. To engage my participants in an active process of checking the accuracy of our conversations, I returned the interview transcripts to them to ask for clarification and verification once I completed transcription. This strategy gave participants the opportunity to clarify their ideas and helped increase the accuracy of data that I collected. When writing the research report and presenting the data, I have attempted to be transparent about the data source and include verbatim written accounts from interview transcripts rather than a reconstruction from research notes, to allow readers to make their own interpretations of the findings (see research findings in Chapters 5, 6 and 7). I have also attempted to be reflexive, to make my positionality as a researcher transparent and to critically reflect on how my biases and subjectivity might affect the ways in which this research was conducted (see my reflections in Section 4.9).

In terms of generalisability, this research aims to achieve 'naturalistic generalisation' as suggested by Stake (1995: 86). According to Stake, readers can make their own conclusions when reflecting on the rich descriptions presented in a qualitative case study and feel 'as if it happened to themselves' (ibid.). Following Stake's notion of 'naturalistic generalisation', I sought to describe the case study and its contexts in a rich and detailed manner, so as to empower readers to make inferences in relation to their own contexts and experiences. As Simons (2014: 20) notes, 'if we are able to capture and report the uniqueness, the essence, of the case in all its particularity and present this in a way we can all recognise, we will discover something of universal significance.'

4.9 Positionality and reflexivity

Reflexivity is considered to be one of the most significant features of qualitative research (Braun and Clarke, 2013). It provides rich insight into the relationship between the researcher and the research process and promotes an understanding of 'how identities are negotiated, and how social categories, boundaries, hierarchies and processes of domination are experienced and maintained' (Wright and Nelson, 1995: 48). From a social constructivist point of view, reflexivity entails recognising that research is a social process in which knowledge is co-constructed by the researcher and research participants, and reflexive accounts need to explicitly articulate the impacts of the researcher's social positions and theoretical perspectives on the research process (Mauthner and Doucet, 2003). Pillow notes that:

> 'self-reflexivity acknowledges the researcher's role(s) in the construction of the research problem, the research setting, and research findings, and highlights the importance of researcher becoming consciously aware of these factors and thinking through the implications of these factors for her/his research' (Pillow, 2003: 179).

I was aware that as the researcher, I was not 'objective, value-free and neutral but having a subjectivity and a positionality, that is, 'a social, cultural, political and economic location' (Jackson, 2006: 534). I have mentioned at the beginning of this thesis that I am a Chinese citizen and was a postgraduate student studying in a UK university. My positionality as a Chinese international student studying in the UK made me aware of the limitations of the UK higher education curriculum and motivated me to step into the research field of internationalisation of the curriculum. I recognised that as a student studying in both Chinese and UK universities, I have developed my personal interests in the research topic. My positionality and experiences also limited what I saw during the research process and how I reacted to my participants. As discussed in Sections 4.6.1 and 4.6.2, my positionality as a student impacted on the ways that I collected data. For instance, my subject background made me shift between 'participant as observer' and 'observer as participant' when I observed the participants' classes. Moreover, the power hierarchies between me

(as a student) and my participants (as lecturers) impacted on not only what questions I asked but also how I responded to their replies. Yet at the same time, my positionality as an international student also empowered me to draw on my own experiences to develop interview questions and sometimes challenge the participants' assumptions about international students and their learning needs and interests.

Pillow (2003) suggests that the researcher's positionality and subjectivity shape his/her relationships with the participants, and he/she may negotiate both insider and outsider positions throughout the research process. In this research, I considered my positionality as beyond the dichotomous positions as an insider versus outsider researcher, but rather as McNess, Arthur and Crossley (2016: 21) suggest, a researcher's identity is 'multiple, flexible and changing such that the boundary between the inside and the outside is permeable, less stable and less easy to draw.' I agreed with the viewpoint of McNess, Arthur and Crossley that a researcher's identity can shift as per the situation and that there are a multitude of factors shaping the insider and/or outsider research positions, such as ethnicity, language, gender, age, academic status, and personal and professional experience.

For instance, compared to my participants who come from different countries and ethnicities, work in different disciplines, and are lecturers in a UK university, I, as a Chinese international student, could be reasonably categorised as an 'outsider', distant from the group of my participants. Yet during our interview and conversations, many participants expressed that they faced challenges in engaging students from different cultural backgrounds into group discussions and experienced some degree of 'cultural shock' when they lived and worked in a different country. At those moments, I felt that I was an 'insider' of the group of my participants too, as we had similar experiences of negotiating the 'cultural differences' and navigating in an environment that was unfamiliar. I recognised that my research identity was much more fluid than the dichotomous positions evoked by insider versus outsider researcher. My positionality also changed

depending on which aspect of my identity I engaged with. With regard to the insider-outsider debates, Robinson-Pant warns against an essentialist view of 'culture' and states:

> 'Like other dualisms common in this field (such as researcher/researched, informal/formal, quantitative/qualitative, literature/illiterate), the insider/outsider distinction pushes us to categorise and polarise people's identities, roles and knowledges. It can close down rather than open up debate and investigation' (Robinson-Pant, 2016: 40).

This insight is in line with how I looked at 'culture' in my study – i.e. 'culture' is neither fixed nor static – and this helped me avoid essentialising 'culture' during my research process and helped me to consider the insider-outsider debates from a more nuanced perspective.

Moreover, as a researcher, I was aware of the influences of my own social, cultural, political, and economic positions on how the research was conducted. During the research process, I tried as much as I could to be reflexive: I critically reflected on how my personal experiences, values, and ideas affected my relationships with the participants and the ways in which I analysed the research findings. Millora, Maimunah and Still (2020) suggest that the reflective practice can be a collaborative process rather than an individual pursuit. I agreed with their viewpoint: I found that sharing my thoughts and writing with my supervisors and PhD colleagues was a good opportunity for me to get an 'outsider' perspective and monitor my own biases and subjectivities. Ultimately, these individuals became my critical friends who challenged my thinking and offered me alternative ways of understanding my research.

4.10 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have explained my methodological decisions and the procedures of designing and conducting this research. I have explained why and how I adopted an ethnographic-style case study approach to explore academics' engagement with

internationalisation of the curriculum; how I selected the case study university and participants; how I gained access to the field; the ethical challenges that I encountered; and how I collected and analysed data. This fieldwork experience has expanded my view of 'fieldwork' and made me realise that it is not just a distinct stage of the PhD process in which I am supposed to collect data but a process of learning and co-constructing knowledge with my participants. I learnt that I would never be ready to start my fieldwork until I actually went into the field and navigated the different situations, dealing with the challenges as they arose. I also learnt that a successful interview is supported by establishing trust with the participants: 'confession' from the participants did come when they felt safe to share their thoughts and feelings. Hence I think that it is necessary for the researcher to be thoroughly prepared and spend time familiarising themselves with the interviewee's background. I found that open-ended questions mitigated the power imbalances between the interviewer and interviewee and led to 'confession' being more freely offered. Yet the open-ended questions and semi-structured style of interviewing also led to a more challenging process of analysing the data because codes and themes did not follow in a clear sequence or train of thought.

Chapter 5 Conceptions of Internationalisation of the Curriculum

5.1 Introduction

At this point, I begin to present the findings of this study. My aim in this chapter is to map the participants' definitions of 'internationalisation of the curriculum', mainly based on the interview data collected. Each sub-section of this chapter is structured around a theme that emerged from the definitions of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' given by participants. In each sub-section, I choose specific participants (Emily, etc.) to illustrate each theme, not because they are the 'representatives' but because their accounts are more detailed and can be most effectively used to compare with other participants who shared a similar or different view.

5.2 Broadening the curriculum content

The first theme that I identified from some participants' definitions of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' focuses on broadening the curriculum content. They articulated the view that internationalising the curriculum means including what happens in different cultures/countries into the curriculum content. It is useful to note that these participants look at the world/countries in different ways and this shaped their approach to selecting teaching examples.

Emily, a lecturer in the School of Environmental Sciences, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'teaching with examples from around the world'. She had been a research fellow in a US university and later moved to the UK. She held the view that it is important for her to teach examples from what she saw as 'developed countries' and 'developing countries'. She stated:

'I suppose in the lectures one thing I tried to do is to make sure I have examples from the around the world. I tried not to choose developing countries as examples of bad practice where the environment is deteriorating. I tried to look for some examples of good practices from the developing world. In the lecture the other day, I mentioned everywhere in the world has a pollution problem. It is not just the developing world problem. This made me try to think more about using examples and being fair in acknowledging good practice if it is in Germany or if it is in China' (Emily, environmental sciences).

This extract suggests that Emily questions the binary views of the world/countries ('developed' and 'developing' world/countries) which I reviewed in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1. It is important to note that she also attempts to dismantle the polarisation between 'developed' and 'developing' world/countries and the discourse that 'developed' world/countries are better/superior to 'developing' world/countries. This echoes what Hall (1992) argues in his notion of 'the West and the Rest'. Emily also pays attention to the 'hidden curriculum' (Kelly, 2009) when she is teaching. This can be seen in the way that she selects examples for her teaching. For instance, she is aware that the examples that she uses in her teaching have implications for how students understand the subject/topic and their knowledge about the 'developing' and 'developed' world/countries. Paying attention to the effects of the 'hidden curriculum' (Kelly, 2009) on students, Emily is very careful when she selects examples for her teaching to make sure that she is critical and reflexive enough about the examples that she uses in her class.

Hailey, a senior lecturer in the School of Mathematics, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'changing the curriculum to include developments that were discovered outside of the boundaries of the country where teaching is on'. She pointed out that she adopted the notion of internationalisation when she taught the module on the history of mathematics. She stated:

'I think internationalisation is a much easier concept to understand a subject such as the history of mathematics rather than simply mathematics. Certainly, when I was teaching the history of mathematics, I was very careful to include developments of mathematics from not only Europe but everywhere. It is important for students to know that calculus was not exactly developed in Europe for the first time, by Newton and Leibniz, as we tend to think. Actually, it was developed two hundred years before in India. It is important that they know it. This forms their opinion of the world' (Hailey, mathematics).

She distinguished the module on the history of mathematics from the module on pure mathematics. Her interview suggests that she embraces the notion of internationalisation of the curriculum. Like Emily (environmental sciences), she pays attention to the 'hidden curriculum' (Kelly, 2009). She believes that the curriculum content shapes how students understand the subject as well as their opinions about the world/countries. This belief has made her develop her own way of preparing the curriculum content for the students. She believes that it is important for her to stress to the students the fact that knowledge is not attached to any cultural group or geographical context; instead, it is something that the human race has constructed and developed as a whole.

Alice, a senior lecturer in the School of Education, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'teaching globally'. She chose to internationalise the curriculum because she wanted to teach the subject from a global/international perspective so that students could understand the subject from cross-cultural perspectives. She stated:

'Internationalising the curriculum is very important because education to me is something that needs to broaden our horizons. But it can also potentially be a way of connecting people in different countries and building mutual understanding … Everything is so interconnected that we do need to understand. Do you know what happens in England? Because what happens in England might be borrowed and happen in schools in Malaysia. We can learn from different cultures' (Alice, education).

Compared to Emily (environmental sciences) who questioned the binary views of the world/countries, Alice views countries as being interconnected. In her view,

internationalisation of the curriculum is about knowledge exchange and sharing between different countries and cultures. She describes how she introduces different educational systems (including the UK, China, Malaysia, and Finland) to the students in her class and asks the students to compare the similarities and/or differences between different countries' educational models and policies and discuss the advantages and disadvantages of those models and policies.

Linda, a senior lecturer in the School of Environmental Sciences, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'teaching with international examples'. She has experience of teaching in both UK and the US universities. Compared to Emily (environmental sciences), Hailey (mathematics), and Alice (education), she is less interested in the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum. For instance, she said that 'I guess I automatically pick up some international examples but a lot of the examples I use are UK examples. It is not something that I deliberately set out to think about such as the examples I am using or how international they are.' She holds the view that 'the basics of sciences' behind the examples are more important than the locations of the examples for her teaching. She stated:

> 'I do not think we should just stick with what we know. I think we should teach outside that as well. But if I were to truly internationalise the curriculum, I think it would become very boring. Because I would be looking at an issue for example nitrogen pollution and explain how it works in the UK, how it works in Germany, how it works in South Africa. I think there would be a lot of commonalities. I can imagine comparing one or two. But if I were to truly internationalise it, I think it would become very boring. I think we need to teach the basics of science well enough, and the students can think about it from the perspectives of the country where they come from' (Linda, environmental sciences).

It is interesting to note that Linda believes that there would be more 'commonalities' than 'differences' between examples from different countries. She appears to hold the view that 'internationalising the curriculum' is not the goal of her teaching. What she cares about most is whether 'the basics of science' behind the examples are taught well to the

students. This suggests that she has her own beliefs regarding what should be taught to the students and how to teach them to students. These beliefs have shaped her views and attitudes towards 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. Moreover, it is interesting to note that she attributes the purpose of internationalising the curriculum to the diverse student population in the classroom. For instance, she stated that 'We have students in the class who are not from the UK. So, to just base entirely on the UK and keep it closed would not make sense. It makes a lot of sense to use some international examples.' It appears that 'internationalisation of the curriculum', in her view, is designed only for international students.

The participants' definitions of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' listed in this section provide some insights into how lecturers might go about internationalising their curriculum content. Whilst their rationales for internationalising the curriculum content seem different, they all highlight the importance of including what happens in different cultures/countries into the curriculum content. Their responses also suggest that they look at the world/countries in different ways. For instance, Emily (environmental sciences) attempts to deconstruct the binary views of the world/countries ('developed' versus 'developing') through her teaching; Hailey (mathematics) views the world/countries as a whole; and Alice (education) considers countries as being interconnected. The way that the participants look at the world/countries also shapes their approach to selecting teaching examples. For instance, Emily (environmental sciences) selected examples from what she sees as 'developed countries' and 'developing countries' for her teaching; Hailey (mathematics) and Alice (education) try to include what happens in different cultures/countries into their curriculum content.

5.3 Responding to the diversity of students in the classroom

Compared to the participants I introduced in Section 5.2, the participants I introduce in this section extended the meaning of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' to include

teaching practices. Their definitions of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' emphasise the importance of adjusting teaching methods, assessment methods, and/or a philosophical approach to education to the diversity of students in the classroom.

Sarah, a lecturer in the School of Politics, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'making something work for students from different countries'. For instance, she stated:

> 'I try to find examples from other countries and from the countries where I know my students are coming from. I try to remember, in terms of the examples that I use, that I might need to explain a bit more context … When I am teaching media, I have to remember that people come from media systems where the media is largely state controlled. This is the part that I have been teaching in the past few years. We talk about that. We talk about its benefits for society, commercial interests, etc. There are different things that we talk about. We try to not only talk about Western media' (Sarah, politics).

Her account suggests that she adapts her teaching to the students from different countries and societies that are in front of her. She articulates the view that this approach is the best way to teach and serve students' learning needs and interests. Whilst she takes account of the diversity of students in her classroom, it appears that she makes assumptions about students' learning needs and interests and the kind of examples that are suitable for them.

Jason, a senior lecturer in the School of Business, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as synonymous with the term 'diversity in the curriculum'. He has been teaching in the case study university for nearly ten years. He holds the view that students from different countries have different learning interests and needs. 'Internationalisation of the curriculum' for him means adjusting teaching methods and assessment methods to those interests and needs. For instance, he explained how he adjusted the assessment methods to the diversity of students in the classroom:

'In terms of internationalisation of the curriculum, I take account of the diversity of students, particularly regarding the assessment. The assessment will include case studies based on brands from different countries and cultures. Last year, students could choose Tesla which is a US brand; they could choose Air Asia which is a Malaysian brand; they could choose Haribo which is a German brand; and they could choose Superdry which is a UK brand. So, I purposely chose brands that are from different sectors and from the countries where the students come from. By doing this, I have taken into account students' diverse learning needs' (Jason, business).

Jason's account suggests that he also made assumptions about the students in his class: firstly, he assumed that students from different countries have different learning interests and needs; secondly, he assumed that allowing the students to choose the case studies from the countries where they come from can meet their learning interests and needs.

Andrew, a senior lecturer in the School of Mathematics, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as adjusting his teaching methods to students' different theoretical backgrounds and learning styles. He has taught mathematics in both UK and Chinese universities. Because of this experience, he noticed that the mathematics curricula in UK universities are different from those in Chinese universities and that there are different ways of teaching mathematics. He pointed out that the curricula in UK and Chinese universities are based on different choices of mathematics theories. For instance, the theories in a standard second-year course on algebra in UK universities are often based on developments in mathematics in the 1950s, 60s and 70s in Europe; by contrast, the same course in Chinese universities starts from different viewpoints, based on more classical mathematics development in the late 19th century. He stated:

'It is accepted that mathematics should emphasise the universal principles so that one should not distinguish French mathematics from American mathematics … However, at the same time, we need to be aware that Chinese students come from a different educational system where they learnt different mathematics in school. Therefore, they come to the same subject matter with different pre-knowledge and different skills … Very

often, they can approach the subject by doing computational routines, which help them understand the thing. This would not be available to German students for instance because they do not have that background' (Andrew, mathematics).

In his view, students in his class not only come from different educational backgrounds but also have developed different theoretical backgrounds and learning styles. He argues that teachers need to be aware of the diversity of students in the classroom and adjust their teaching methods accordingly. Yet it is also worth noting that he tends to homogenise Chinese students and German students in terms of their learning styles and the ways in which they approach the subject. His account suggests that he does not view students as individuals; rather, he tends to 'essentialise' their educational and theoretical backgrounds. In Holliday's (1999) view, the attempt to 'essentialise' culture might result in cultural stereotyping as it tends to see 'culture' as inherent and prescriptive and related to notions of nation and ethnicity. The way in which Andrew views Chinese students and German students runs the risk of homogenising their learning styles and theoretical backgrounds.

Andrew also interprets 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as knowledge exchange and sharing between different countries and cultures. In his view, people from different countries and cultures can exchange their knowledge with each other and learn from each other. He stated:

> 'I think internationalisation of the curriculum is a kind of sharing between different cultures. I am not saying that it has to be all the same. Internationalisation should not mean that we all must do the same thing. But we should think about sharing and be aware of different traditions' (Andrew, mathematics).

In this sense there are parallels between Andrew's definition of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' and Alice's (education) that was introduced in the previous section. They both see the world/countries as interconnected and view 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as one way to connect people from different countries/cultures and build

mutual understanding. Nevertheless, Andrew's statements alerted me to the realisation that 'internationalisation' might be understood as a synonym for 'uniformity' and that therefore, 'internationalisation of the curriculum' might be understood as making the curriculum in different countries the same/uniform.

Ella, a senior lecturer in the School of Business, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as adjusting not only the 'mechanics of teaching' but also the 'philosophical approach to education' to the diverse student population in the classroom. She came to the UK in 2000 to pursue a full-time MBA degree and after getting her PhD degree, she started to teach in UK higher education. Before coming to study in the UK, she had a lot of experience of working in the media industry in India. She identified the 'mechanics of teaching' as the curriculum content, the teaching methods, and the assessment methods and the 'philosophical approach to education' as the philosophy and approach that underpins their educational systems. In her view, 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is 'an aspirational goal' that has not been achieved in the institution. She stated:

> 'For me, sitting where I am as an international staff and having come from a different educational system, I would say that there is a huge gap in the way that we meet internationalisation … I still think that there is a very one-direction approach and there are certain entrenched methods in terms of the way that the curriculum is structured and the way that the teaching and assessment methods are developed and implemented. The philosophy of what education should be is very much ideologically driven and grounded in a Western and European philosophical approach. I think that it does not serve the needs of at least half of the student population because in the higher education sector in Britain, more than half of the student population is made of international students' (Ella, business).

Her account suggests that she is aware of the hierarchies regarding teaching methods, assessment methods, and philosophical approaches to education in the institution and calls for challenging the hierarchies through internationalising the curriculum. It is interesting to note that she considered the 'Western'/European philosophical approach to education as not serving the learning needs of international students. Her statements

led me to consider the following questions: 1) What kinds of philosophical approaches to education are suitable for international students? 2) What kinds of curriculum content, teaching methods and assessment methods are suitable for international students? It seems to me that Ella tends to homogenise/generalise the groups of international students in terms of their learning needs and learning styles and makes assumptions about the 'Western'/European philosophical approach to education not fitting with the learning needs of international students.

The participants introduced in this section extend the meaning of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' to include teaching practices. In their view, internationalising the curriculum means adjusting teaching methods, assessment methods, and/or a philosophical approach to education to the diversity of students in their classrooms. Their definitions of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' led me to think about the questions: 1) Is internationalising the curriculum an individual teaching choice or a response to the diversity of students in the classroom? 2) If there were only UK students in the classroom, would lecturers choose to internationalise the curriculum? 3) Internationalising the curriculum for whom?

The participants' accounts suggest that they attempted to adjust their teaching practices to students' diverse learning interests and needs. Yet it seems to me that they made assumptions about students' learning interests and needs and it is these assumptions that shaped their teaching approaches and practices. It is useful to note that the participants' international/overseas teaching experiences exposed them to different ways of thinking and doing education. Their statements indicate that they took account of students' different learning styles and theoretical backgrounds when they taught them. Yet they also tend to homogenise/generalise the groups of international students in terms of their learning needs and learning styles.

5.4 Internationalisation as universalisation

In contrast to the participants in Section 5.2 and Section 5.3, Ryan and Jeremy viewed 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as an irrelevant term for their curriculum and teaching. Ryan, a senior lecturer in the School of Mathematics, had been teaching in the case study university for seven years. In his view, the mathematics that he teaches is 'universal' and thus he does not need to think about how to 'internationalise' the curriculum. He stated:

> 'I have never really asked myself the question of how to internationalise the things that I teach. Honestly, in any other module that I teach here in the School of Mathematics. I have never asked myself the question. Because I have the perception that math is universal somehow. It is very objective. So, it is probably taught in the same way in all the areas of the world' (Ryan, mathematics).

Ryan believes that mathematics is taught in the same way in all the areas of the world, a view that has been challenged in Andrew's (mathematics) account in the previous section. Andrew's international teaching experience (in both Chinese and UK universities) enabled him to notice the cultural/national differences in teaching mathematics. Andrew's experience highlights how academics working in the same discipline can still have different understandings and knowledge about their discipline. This echoes Becher and Trowler's (2001) point that 'disciplinary cultures' can be shaped by social factors and processes (see Chapter 3, Section 3.3.2).

Like Ryan, Jeremy, a senior lecturer in the School of Mathematics, articulated the view that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is irrelevant to his curriculum and teaching. He stated:

> 'I guess by its own nature the things that I am teaching are pretty much universal. For example, I have colleagues from all various kinds of places, and we pick this common language. I am a set theorist, and this is my area of research. The way I present things is pretty much standard. We are doing things in a similar style. It is not like that there is a British set theory

as opposed to a Japanese set theory or American set theory. It is a global
community and I try to speak the language of the global community. So, it
is already international by its nature, and this is pretty much the same in
any area of at least pure mathematics' (Jeremy, mathematics).

Like Ryan, Jeremy considers what he teaches about mathematics as 'universal'. The words
that Ryan and Jeremy use to describe their discipline – such as 'universal', 'objective', and
'standard' – are in line with the epistemological characteristics of the so-called 'hard pure'
disciplines that Becher and Trowler (2001) identified. As Becher and Trowler (2001: 36)
suggest, the 'hard pure' disciplines are concerned with 'universals, quantities and
simplification' and the enquiry procedures in the 'hard pure' disciplines are 'impersonal
and value-free.' The statements of Ryan and Jeremy suggest that their disciplinary
knowledge and how they look at their discipline played an important role in shaping their
conceptualisations of internationalisation of the curriculum.

5.5 Decolonising the curriculum

Compared to the participants in the previous sections in this chapter, some participants
adopted a more politicised way of interpreting the concept of internationalisation of the
curriculum, associating their definitions of the term with 'decolonising the curriculum'.

Michael, a senior lecturer in the School of Education, held the view that the current
curricula in his university and other UK universities 'start and stop at the English-speaking
world' and are ignorant about the developments in other countries and in other
languages. He pointed out that the literature and reading list that teachers use for their
teaching does not include many 'non-Western' perspectives. He pointed to the
domination of English language in academic publishing and called for broadening the
curriculum content through including more diverse perspectives into the curriculum.
Nevertheless, he argued that if teachers attempt to internationalise the curriculum, they
need to decolonise the curriculum first. He stated:

'I think internationalisation of the curriculum has to go through the phase of decolonisation. Nobody forces us to do that. We have to openly talk about the legacy of colonialism. We have not decolonised knowledge. We have not decolonised the curriculum. I think we have to be bold and open and decolonise our epistemology and curriculum' (Michael, education).

In this quote, Michael discusses his views on how to internationalise the curriculum and the role of teachers in higher education institutions. In his view, there are knowledge hierarchies in the academy and the role of the teacher is to challenge and dismantle those hierarchies and inequalities in terms of knowledge production. His account suggests that for him, 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is not only about including more diverse perspectives into the curriculum but also about dismantling the domination of the Eurocentric canon and acknowledging the impact of colonialism on university education, knowledge production, and the curriculum.

Moreover, he holds the view that internationalising/decolonising the curriculum has not been achieved in his university or other UK universities. He believes that people who are willing to internationalise/decolonise the curriculum might face a lot of tensions and challenges. He stated:

'In actual practice, if we end up extending the curriculum we wish for internationalisation and fully embed different ways of thinking, acting and interacting into the curriculum, we have to challenge power relationships in our daily lives, such as our relationships with our managers and with our co-workers' (Michael, education).

In his view, internationalising/decolonising the curriculum is an ideological stance that teachers have on issues such as power and inequalities, not just in the classroom but also in their daily lives. He believes that internationalising/decolonising the curriculum can be perceived as an act of confrontation because people who are willing to internationalise/decolonise the curriculum need to challenge the domination of the Eurocentric canon and dismantle knowledge hierarchies in the academy. This might involve actions that challenge the perspectives of academics who have more power and

embrace the perspectives of those who are marginalised in the academy.

Amy, a lecturer in the School of Politics, also associated her definition of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' with the term 'decolonising the curriculum'. She explained that her approach to internationalising the curriculum was through 'questioning the hierarchy of knowledge production'. She pointed out that students (especially those from the Global South) often come to the UK with the perception that what they learn in the UK is better than what they learn in their home country. She said that she tries to equip the students with critical thinking skills and encourage them to challenge the domination of the Eurocentric canon. To do this, she encourages the students to bring their knowledge, examples, and experiences to the class and she includes those materials as part of her curriculum to show the students that what she teaches in the class is not better/superior to the knowledge they bring to the class. She stated:

> 'My internationalisation in a pedagogical sense is more decolonising the curriculum. But decolonisation is a process. The lecturer has to be willing to decolonise himself or herself. It is not something that happens out there. It is a change of mind ... Being in Britain is difficult because it is not a decolonised country. There is an emphasis to bring you back to the colonial mind or British superiority. You have to constantly work against that mind and think about decolonising yourself as a lecturer' (Amy, politics).

Like Michael (education), she held the view that internationalising/decolonising the curriculum is an ideological stance that teachers have on issues of power and inequalities. She highlights the importance for teachers to reflect on the colonial legacy in the institution and its impact on education, knowledge production, and the curriculum. When talking about her approaches to decolonising the curriculum, she states that she keeps reflecting on her identity/positionality and how her identity/positionality shapes the ways that she understands the world and teaches. This is what she means by 'decolonising yourself as a lecturer'. She explains that she tries to bring this kind of reflexivity into her practices. For example, she teaches students that the narratives that she introduces in

the class can be biased and that they (the students) need to be aware of critical thinking skills and learn to deconstruct people's narratives.

By contrast, Lily, a senior lecturer in the School of Languages, said that she does not like the term 'decolonising the curriculum'. She defined it as 'broadening the curriculum to be more inclusive of nationalities, cultures and genders' and considered the term as a 'policy buzzword'. She holds the view that the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum' might 'end up generalising things to the contexts which are not necessarily useful to be applied'. This view relates to Andrew's (mathematics) point that 'internationalisation' might be understood as a synonym for 'uniformity' (see Section 5.3). She expressed concerns that the 'decolonising the curriculum' initiative might become institutionalised/normalised rather than letting academics themselves decide what to teach and how to teach.

Lily stated that she introduces theories and texts written from 'Western' perspectives to her students and her ambition is to 'equip the students to be critical and to develop their views on things' and encourage them to 'debunk the Western perspectives'. She pointed out that she was not desperate to teach students the perspectives that she does not understand. She argued that she cannot include the perspectives of academics from various places in the world into her curriculum due to the language barrier. She emphasised that 'voices in the literature do not have equal weight' and what she wanted to do was to draw students' attention to that.

It is important to note that Lily's definition of 'decolonising the curriculum' does not include the dimension of challenging the colonial power over knowledge and knowledge production which was highlighted by Michael (education) and Amy (politics). However, her statements suggest that she is aware of the domination of 'Western' perspectives in the literature, and she tries to equip the students to deconstruct those perspectives and challenge the domination. It is interesting to note that she does not consider what she does as 'decolonising the curriculum'. This suggests that there is not yet an agreed definition of 'decolonising the curriculum' among the participants. That Lily considers the

'decolonising the curriculum' initiative as a 'policy buzzword' suggests that she questions how the initiative has been used by the university executives.

Lily was not the only participant who said that they do not like the term 'decolonising the curriculum'. Steven, a lecturer in the School of Politics, also questioned the aim of the 'decolonising the curriculum' initiative in the university. He stated:

> 'Personally, I do not like the term 'decolonising the curriculum'. I think it is a massive PR (Public Relations) tool in a lot of ways. It sounds very good. It is politically correct. It is very proper to talk about decolonising the curriculum in the current context. But I do not know if there is a way of decoupling it from the university's commercial drive to recruit more students and retain more students. I think there is still much to do to make things fairer and more interesting for students. So, I question that term to a large extent' (Steven, politics).

In Steven's view, there is a gap between the university's policy statements regarding the 'decolonising the curriculum' initiative and how it is implemented in practice. From his perspective, the university executives had instrumentalised the initiative and used it as a marketing tool to recruit students. His point that the university executives treat the initiative as a 'PR tool' is similar to the point that some participants made about how the university executives had instrumentalised the notion of internationalisation, using it merely as a tool to recruit students. I will explore this point further in Chapter 7, Section 7.2.

Moreover, Steven pointed out that the term 'decolonising the curriculum' might be perceived as 'wiping off the Western perspectives from the curriculum'. He stated that he cannot do that because 'Western' perspectives are important and relevant for his teaching as well. Like other participants (e.g. Michael, Amy, Lily), he is aware of the domination of 'Western' perspectives in the literature and tries to embed the criticality into his teaching so that students themselves are equipped to challenge the Eurocentric canon and deconstruct 'Western' perspectives in the literature and the curriculum.

This section has revealed that some participants associate 'internationalisation of the curriculum' with the term 'decolonising the curriculum'. The participants interpreted the term 'decolonising the curriculum' in different ways. For some participants (e.g. Lily, Steven), it means adding more diverse perspectives to the curriculum content; for other participants (e.g. Michael, Amy), it means dismantling the domination of the Eurocentric canon and questioning knowledge hierarchies in the academy, while including more diverse perspectives into the curriculum. It is worth noting that some participants (e.g. Michael, Amy) emphasised that internationalising/decolonising the curriculum is actually an ideological stance that teachers have on issues of power and inequalities, not only in the classroom but also in their daily lives. It is also worth noting that some participants (e.g. Lily, Steven) question how the 'decolonising the curriculum' initiative has been used by the university executives. From their perspective, the university executives had instrumentalised the 'decolonising the curriculum' initiative.

5.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have analysed how academics working in different disciplines interpreted the concept of 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. I discovered that the participants had different understandings of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' and their understandings are related to a series of factors, such as how they look at the world and different country experiences, what they understand to be the purpose of university education, how they look at their discipline/subject, their approach to teaching, and how they perceive knowledge hierarchies in the academy.

I discovered that disciplinary culture played an important role in shaping academics' understandings of 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. For instance, Ryan and Jeremy are academics working in the discipline of mathematics. They both argued that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is an irrelevant concept for their discipline, and they believed that what they taught about mathematics was 'universal'. The ways in

which Ryan and Jeremy described their discipline are in line with the epistemological characteristics of the so-called 'hard pure' disciplines identified by Becher and Trolwer (2001). Yet it is worth noting that discipline seems not to be the only factor influencing how academics interpret 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as academics working in the same discipline might have different understandings of 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. I will discuss this point further in Chapter 8, Section 8.2.

I also discovered that academics took two distinct approaches to internationalising the curriculum: some participants (e.g. Emily, Alice) took a non-political approach, whereas other participants (e.g. Michael, Amy) took a political approach. For participants like Emily (environmental sciences) and Alice (education), 'internationalisation of the curriculum' means broadening the curriculum content to include what happens in different countries and cultures. Their approach is 'non-political' in the sense that it is not concerned with issues of power and inequalities in terms of knowledge production. By contrast, participants like Michael (education) and Amy (politics) associated their definition of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' with the term 'decolonising the curriculum'. From their perspective, internationalising/decolonising the curriculum is more of an ideological stance that teachers have on issues such as power and inequalities, not just in the classroom but also in their daily lives. Their approach to internationalising the curriculum involves not only including diverse perspectives into the curriculum content but also challenging and dismantling knowledge hierarchies in the academy, the classroom, and the curriculum.

In the next chapter, I will continue to present the findings of this study and move on to explore academics' strategies and practices for internationalising the curriculum in the classroom.

Chapter 6 Internationalisation in the Classroom: Teaching Methods, Beliefs and Practices

6.1 Introduction

In Chapter 5, I showed that academics interpreted the concept of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' in different ways. My aim in this chapter is to discuss their strategies and practices for internationalising the curriculum in the classroom. My analysis is based on the interview and observation data collected. Each sub-section is structured around a theme that emerged from academics' accounts of their approaches to internationalising the curriculum.

6.2 Embedding cultural diversity in the curriculum content

When talking about their approaches to internationalising the curriculum, some participants expressed that they focused on teaching with examples from different cultural/national contexts. Their strategy was to include diverse cultural perspectives into the curriculum content and teach the subject from an international and intercultural perspective.

Emily (environmental sciences) interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'teaching with examples from the world'. She stated that she included examples from what she saw as 'developed countries' and 'developing countries' into her curriculum content. When selecting the examples for her teaching, she tried to make sure the examples are representative and the examples from what she saw as 'developing countries' are not only examples of bad practice but also of good practice. She stated that 'I need to make sure the examples are fair'. Her statement suggests that she questioned the binary views of world/countries ('developed countries' and 'developing countries').

She showed an engagement with the commitment to deconstruct the discourse that 'developed countries' are better/superior to 'developing countries' through her teaching. She was careful in selecting teaching examples, being aware of and taking into account the impacts of the examples on students and how her teaching might shape students' opinions about what she saw as 'developed countries' and 'developing countries'.

In one class that I observed, she explained to the students how to use the cost-benefit theory to evaluate environmental resource costs and management. After explaining the theory, she asked the students to use the theory to analyse the methods that were proposed in three different case studies to reduce flood risk in the city, case studies based in the Southwest of England (UK), Tucson (US) and Leeds (UK). I noticed that all the three case studies were based in 'developed countries'. In the interview, I asked her why she had selected these case studies as examples. She stated that 'These examples are the things that I have known about and I can talk with confidence.' Her response suggested that she prefers to draw on her expertise/experience and things that she is familiar with in her teaching. Whilst she said that she tried to teach with examples from both 'developed countries' and 'developing countries', she admitted that she may not always succeed in achieving that balance. She stated:

> 'It is a balance, and I may not have the balance of showing how applicable this (the theory) is in all over the places. I try to choose maybe twelve examples that I can keep talking about. So, there is not always new information that students have not learnt' (Emily, environmental sciences).

Her account suggests that she has her own beliefs about what to teach and how to teach. For instance, she wants to teach with examples that she can 'keep talking about' so that she can make sure that there is not always 'new information' for students to digest and learn.

Paul, a senior lecturer in the School of Environmental Sciences, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'teaching with examples from different countries'. He has been teaching in the case study university for nearly twenty years.

Compared with Emily (environmental sciences) who said that she used examples from both 'developed countries' and 'developing countries', Paul stated that he chose to teach with examples from different countries around the world. He held the view that teaching with examples from different countries can provide a chance for students to compare/contrast different ideas and practices and think about what works well and what does not. He stated that 'If you want to examine a particular field and improve practice, you need to look at examples around the world and identify the best practice and see what is transferable.' This belief led him to embrace the notion of 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. He articulated the view that internationalising the curriculum can enable students to learn ideas and practices from different countries. Yet at the same time, much like Emily, he stressed that he preferred to teach with examples that he was familiar with. He stated:

> 'The difficulty for me is how much and what I know about the law in other countries. I know the law in the United Kingdom and the European Union so when people ask me difficult questions, I can answer them. If I pick an example somewhere else, I would not be able to do that. So, I make the best job and say what is transferable but ensure that I have the skills and expertise to properly teach' (Paul, environmental sciences).

This quote suggests that Paul prefers drawing on his existing expertise/experience to teach and is less comfortable with using examples from countries that he is not familiar with. He tries to be fully prepared for his teaching and worries that his authority as a teacher might be challenged by his students if they ask questions about contexts that he is not familiar with. He seems to have ideas about the kind of curriculum content that is 'transferable' and appropriate for the students. For instance, he stated that:

> 'If you got students from many different countries, people would always think how the example is directly relevant to them. Our job is trying to make sure the transferable point is understood. So, the examples could be anywhere' (Paul, environmental sciences).

While Paul said that he preferred to use the examples from the UK and the EU for his teaching, he also did include examples from other countries into his curriculum. For example, during my observations, I noticed that he introduced the project of rice irrigation in Senegal and used it as a case study to explain how to use a political approach to assess the impacts of human projects on the environment. In another lecture, I noticed that he used the example of Japanese buildings and the trans-Alaskan pipeline in the US as case studies to explain the history of social impact on the environment. These findings suggest that Paul has perhaps a conflicted stance on how to select examples for his teaching: on the one hand, he wants to teach with examples from a range of different countries so that he can help the students know more about different ideas/practices; on the other hand, he is somewhat reluctant to select examples from countries that he does not know first-hand and thus chooses to teach using examples he is familiar with. At the same time, I found that what Paul did in practice was not always in line with how he described his teaching. He did in fact use a wider range of examples, according to the specific topic that he was teaching.

Jenny, a senior lecturer in the School of Environmental Sciences, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'integrating international elements and perspectives into the curriculum'. She held the view that teaching with examples from different cultural/national contexts can provide a chance for students to compare/contrast different practices and reflect on how to apply the theories they had learnt to different cultural/national contexts. She stated:

> 'In the first-year module, we talk a little bit about the implementation of sustainability and how we would be able to categorise and evaluate programmes that focus on sustainability. We use an example from central America round Costa Rica and then we compare that with another example from Norway. So, students need to think about what the dilemmas and difficulties in thinking around sustainability in different ways are' (Jenny, environmental sciences).

During the interview, I asked Jenny whether it would matter or not if she only taught with examples from a single country. She replied that international examples can show the students that the principles they learnt in class are not limited to a particular geographical situation. She stated that 'If I used UK examples all the time, then the students would ask if the principles were just applicable in the UK?' Her statement suggests that she considered how the students would react to the examples that she used for her teaching. Like Emily (environmental sciences) who considered whether her teaching would shape students' views on 'developed countries' and 'developing countries', Jenny also paid attention to the 'hidden curriculum' (Kelly, 2009) and how the examples that she used in class would influence students' understanding of the subject.

This section reveals that teaching with examples from different cultural/national contexts was considered by some participants as their approach to internationalising the curriculum. It appears that these participants have different rationales for teaching with international examples: some participants (e.g. Emily) chose to teach with international examples because they wanted to deconstruct the polarisation between 'developed countries' and 'developing countries' and challenge the discourse that 'developed countries' are better/superior to the 'developing countries'. Other participants (e.g. Paul, Jenny) chose to teach with international examples because they thought international examples can provide new ideas and perspectives for discussion. They saw value in students comparing/contrasting these different perspectives and reflecting on how to apply what they had learnt to different cultural/national contexts. It is useful to note that these participants had their own beliefs on what to teach and how to teach, which shaped the way that they selected teaching examples. For instance, Emily (environmental sciences) and Paul (environmental sciences) both preferred to draw on their particular expertise/experience to teach so that they could teach confidently and answer difficult questions from the students.

6.3 Adjusting teaching methods to the diversity of students

When talking about their approaches to internationalising the curriculum, some participants pointed to the diverse student populations in their class and stressed that they consequently made efforts to adjust their teaching methods to that diversity. They did this by paying attention to the relevance and accessibility of their teaching to students from different cultural and educational backgrounds.

Jason (business) interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as synonymous with the term 'diversity in the curriculum'. He stated that students in his class come from a wide range of cultural and educational backgrounds. In response to students' different knowledge backgrounds and learning styles, he said that he adjusted his teaching methods. He stated that he invited students to analyse the theories and concepts that he introduced in class and encouraged them to reflect on how to apply these theories and concepts in the cultural/national contexts they are familiar with. For instance, he stated that he asked Chinese students in his class to compare the 'Western' concept of 'marketing relationship' with the Chinese concept 'guanxi'. To engage the students with his teaching, he acknowledged not only students' different cultural backgrounds but also the knowledge backgrounds they have. He did this by using examples that students would have background knowledge of and would be able to relate to. The pedagogical assumption was that students would be better able to engage with the materials introduced in class if they could be related to their prior knowledge. When talking about the tensions and difficulties that he faced in adjusting his teaching methods to students from different cultural and educational backgrounds, he stated:

> 'I suppose sometimes academics perhaps do not have the cultural understanding they need. For example, if you have taught a large homogenous group of students who are UK or home based and when you are teaching 50% or 60% non-home students, that presents some challenges. Sometimes, how you pitch something to students could be challenging. One of the things I am trying to do is to speak clearly. If I use a term or phrase some students may not understand, I need to explain it.

It is not just for international students but also home students. I need to take account of their learning needs' (Jason, business).

Jason's account suggests that he is mindful of the terminologies that he uses in class and the obstacles that might create for students' understanding and comprehension of his teaching content. It is important to note that he saw linguistic needs as not just about international students but also home students. In his view, home students and international students face similar problems in understanding the teaching materials and terminology specific to the discipline. His account also suggests that he consciously distanced himself from binary views of students ('home students' and 'international students') and believed that students from different cultural and educational backgrounds might nonetheless share similar experiences/difficulties in learning. He highlighted the importance for teachers to understand the learning needs and learning styles that students from different cultural/national backgrounds bring with them. Yet it is worth noting that he also classified students into groups of 'home students' and 'international students' and seemed to homogenise the groups of 'home students' and/or 'international students'. In my view, any attempt to homogenise groups of 'home students' and/or 'international students' can be problematic because it overlooks the fact that such groupings a are homogenous; there will be substantial heterogeneity and commonalities will cut across groupings based on geographical provenance. As Jones (2017) suggests, an uncritical distinction between 'home students' and 'international students' can create a falsely dichotomous view of student groups in terms of their learning needs and experiences.

Ella (business) interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as not so much about content but about adjusting the teaching methods, the assessment methods, and the philosophical approach to education to the diversity of students in the classroom. Within her teaching about marketing management and consumer behaviours, she holds the view that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is an important concept for her discipline. She explained that when she worked in the media industry in India, she noticed that many international companies failed in the Indian market because they did not understand the

local cultures and consumer behaviours. Yet when she came to study in the UK, all her marketing textbooks wrote about UK and US companies and tended to teach one way of doing marketing. She highlighted the limitations of those textbooks, stating that when she started to teach in university, she tried to include more diverse cultural perspectives into her curriculum to let the students understand that there are different ways to do marketing. She believes that the students need to learn the subject of marketing from an international and intercultural perspective.

Ella also saw 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'an aspirational goal' that has not been achieved in UK universities. To achieve this goal, she said that she tried to understand the learning interests and needs of students from different cultural and educational backgrounds and adjust her teaching methods accordingly. One of her classroom practices was using examples from the countries where her students came from. She stated:

> 'Sometimes I will bring examples of companies in Vietnam or Kenya for instance. I always do that with my students. If there is one student from Kenya or Vietnam or Myanmar, at least in one or two lectures, I will ensure that I include the examples of companies from their country. Suddenly, you can see the students talking with each other and saying, 'oh my god, that is my city'. That is a huge recognition and a huge sense of acknowledgement for the students, instead of only talking about the examples of UK companies such as Tesco or Sainsbury's and so on' (Ella, business).

Ella's account suggests that she recognises the value and importance of drawing on different cultural contexts in the examples that she uses in her class and the impact these have on students and their learning. She cares about how her students will react to the teaching examples that she used in her class. From her perspective, using examples from the countries where her students come from is a way of stimulating students' learning interest and engaging them in her teaching because students understand and resonate with examples from their own context.

Moreover, she believes that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is not only about adjusting the teaching methods and assessment methods to the diverse student populations in the classroom but also what she calls 'the philosophical approach to education'. She refers to 'the philosophical approach to education' as the philosophy underlying educational systems and pedagogical approaches. She articulated the view that the 'Western' philosophical approach to education (e.g. emphasises the importance of critical thinking and challenging, etc.) might not be suitable for 'international students' who come from a different society and culture. Because of this, she argues that teachers need to revisit the philosophy underlying their teaching methods when they teach students from different cultural/national backgrounds. Her statement suggests that she is aware that the purposes of education in different countries and education systems might be different from one another. Her personal experiences of studying in different countries (i.e. India and the UK) have raised her awareness that there are different ways of thinking/doing education. As a result, she is able to be reflexive about the different values and beliefs that underpin teaching and education. Yet her account also suggests a tendency to homogenise/generalise the 'Western' philosophical approach to education and the learning interests and needs of international students.

Lily (languages) emphasised that to internationalise the curriculum, one must have an 'open mind to consider different perspectives'. She teaches translation skills and theories and most of the theories that she introduces in class are written by scholars from 'Western' countries. She stated that she wants to include more diverse perspectives into her curriculum – for instance, by including texts written by Chinese academics – but those texts are often written in languages that she does not understand. She explained that she cannot introduce texts written by scholars who do not read and write in English. At the same time, she sees her purpose in teaching as equipping students with critical thinking skills. So, while her curriculum does not include diverse perspectives, she always asks her students to reflect on the perspectives that she has introduced in class and analyse them based on their personal experiences in their country and society. She also said that she

encourages her students to bring their own examples and experiences to class and discuss what they have observed in their own cultural and linguistic contexts with the rest of class.

The way in which Lily described her teaching practices very much reflected what I observed in her classes. For instance, in one of her teaching sessions that I joined, I observed her introducing differences between English and French in terms of sentence structures. After comparing these differences, she asked students to compare differences between English and their native language in terms of sentence structures. I noticed that students were challenged by the question that she asked since it took a while for them to respond. When the students started to share their opinions, I noticed that Lily did not ask further questions. During the interview, I brought this event to Lily's attention and asked how she dealt with a situation where students talk about aspects she does not know. She stated:

> 'In fact, I do not necessarily want an answer. What I want is for them to think about it. The answer is difficult to formulate but they are actually taking it home and thinking about it. Do you see what I mean? Teachers ask questions not necessarily to get answers … I think it is probably quite challenging for some people to teach with something they do not know. But I find it interesting to use a generic example of what I know to try and create a more interesting dynamic of teaching and learning in the classroom' (Lily, languages).

Lily's account suggests that she is confident when dealing with situations where students have more knowledge of a topic than her. This is slightly different from Emily (environmental sciences) and Paul (environmental sciences) who prefer to teach with examples that they have experience/expertise of and worry that students will ask difficult questions. By contrast, Lily emphasised that she takes her cue from her students when teaching. She stated:

> 'I always teach open-mindedly with things that I do not know because it creates a genuine dialogue. If I do not know something, I need my students to tell me. It creates a genuine situation of communication. I find it quite fun to adapt to whatever may be thrown at my way. It is not something that worries me' (Lily, languages).

Lily's comment above also suggests that she is aware of the power hierarchies between teachers and students in the classroom and how authoritative teachers can be a lot of time. She went on to explain that students from different cultural/national backgrounds might bring perspectives that she does not understand or perhaps does not agree with. She stated that she must be open to those different perspectives and allow them to exist and be discussed. Her account suggests that she considers teaching can be a mutual exchange where teachers and students learn from one another.

This section reveals that notions such as openness, respect, and inclusiveness are emphasised in some participants' accounts of their approaches to internationalising the curriculum. Their responses suggest that on the whole many do try to adjust their teaching methods and not just content, to the diverse student populations in their classrooms, and see the value of diversity and open-mindedness in their teaching practices. Yet it is also worth noting that some participants (e.g. Jason, Ella) seem to make assumptions about home/international students' learning needs and what kind of curriculum content is suitable for them. There is also a tendency to homogenise/generalise students into 'home students' and 'international students' in terms of their learning interests, learning needs, and learning styles. It is also worth noting that some participants (e.g. Lily) is mindful of the power hierarchies between teachers and students in the classroom and consciously adopt practices that can challenge or dismantle these power hierarchies through valuing students' views and their input to the curriculum content. I will explore this point further in the next section.

6.4 Democratising the classroom

When talking about their approaches to internationalising the curriculum, some participants pointed to the limited knowledge that they have about the situation in some countries and cultures and the difficulties that they face in including an international/intercultural dimension into the curriculum content because of their limited knowledge. In these situations, one strategy is to encourage students to bring their knowledge and perspectives to the class for everyone to discuss.

Lisa, a senior lecturer in the School of Education, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as teaching the subject from an international/intercultural perspective. She teaches mathematics education. During our interview, she emphasised the importance of teaching students about cultural differences in terms of teaching/learning mathematics around the world. She views her discipline, mathematics, as a social construct and the product of civilisation, hence the differences in understanding mathematics and teaching mathematics between different cultures and countries. Because of this, she believes that it is crucial to show students the different ways of teaching and learning mathematics. The way that she includes cultural diversity in her curriculum is to encourage students to bring their stories and experiences from their home country to the class and share them with their peers. She stated:

> 'I give you one of my favourite examples from last year. I asked students to bring an item from their own recollections of mathematical learning. It was actually when we did the political and anthropological dimension of mathematical culture and how that fits us into mathematics education. One of my students is from Guyana. She brought an example from the way that women used to do the weaving of basket in her area in Guyana. That relates to some obvious use of mathematical formula. It was absolutely wonderful to see it. I did not know it and of course it will fit into the examples I use next year' (Lisa, education).

One can see in this account that Lisa approaches teaching as a mutual process where both teachers and students can be learners. Her account suggests that she is open to students'

knowledge and perspectives and considers them as important resources for the construction of the curriculum. In one teaching session that I observed, the students were asked to bring a small data sample from their teaching and/or learning experience in relation to the anthropological theory of the didactic (ATD). In their data sample, they needed to tell one story in relation to one mathematical problem they had encountered before. The class was quite small, including one student from Brazil, three students from China, and one student from Saudi Arabia, and they were asked to share their personal story. I observed that the session was led by both Lisa and her students and not in the traditional didactic mode. During the session, Lisa worked as a facilitator to engage students in the group discussions. The students were asked to apply key concepts from the anthropological theory of the didactic (ATD) such as 'task', 'technique', 'technology', and 'theory' to explain their ideas and arguments. Sometimes they could not explain their ideas clearly by using these concepts. At these times, I observed that Lisa did not take charge of the conversation but instead, asked the students a couple of supportive questions to remind them of the meanings of the concepts and to encourage them to carry on. In other words, Lisa was not simply transmitting knowledge to the students but was facilitating the conversation in the class and learning alongside the students. The way in which Lisa taught in class and saw her role as a teacher is similar to the ways in which Lily (languages) described her teaching, in the sense that they both consider that teaching can be a mutual process in which teachers and students learn from each other.

James, a lecturer in the School of Politics, associated his understandings of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' with the term 'decolonising the curriculum'. He pointed out that the available literature is sometimes limited in terms of scope and sometimes is not up to date, particularly with regard to the current situation in the countries that his students come from. Like Lisa (education), what he does is to invite students to bring their own examples and experiences to the class and introduce the situation in their countries. He stated:

'For the module on European Union, I have some Japanese students, American students, and some students from different countries of the EU. In class, I always ask their perspectives. If you are from Spain, how do people see the EU in Spain? How do people see the European Commission? For the American students, I tell them the EU looks a bit like the federal system in the US. Is it really the same? How would you compare the EU with the federal system? … This year, I have a student from Slovakia who brings perspectives from Slovakia which is a central European country. That is interesting. I was learning as much as the other students when he was telling us about Slovakia politics which relates to the EU. It is great and I like it very much' (James, Politics).

James' account suggests that he treats the knowledge and perspectives of students as valuable resources when constructing the curriculum. He points out that the different cultural perspectives that students bring to the class generate new ideas, stimulate discussions, and enrich his curriculum content. Like Lisa (education), he approaches teaching as a mutual process in which both teachers and students are learners. For him, listening to the examples and experiences that students bring to the classroom is a learning experience and he welcomes it because he cannot know the current political situation in every country. He also believes that encouraging students to bring their knowledge and perspectives to class is a good way to engage the students in his teaching because they can more easily relate to the rest of the curriculum content. He sees cultural diversity as a resource and enriching for everyone: the diverse cultural/national backgrounds of students provided a good opportunity for everyone in the class to hear different perspectives, compare different perspectives, and critically reflect on their assumptions about other cultures/countries.

This section reveals that some lecturers' approach to internationalising the curriculum involves inviting students from different cultural/national backgrounds to share their examples and experiences in class. These lecturers' practices can be seen as attempts to democratise the classroom and dismantle the power hierarchies between teachers and students. Their accounts and practices suggest that they treat teaching as a mutual process in which both teachers and students can learn from each other. They articulate

the view that the knowledge and perspectives of students are important resources in the construction of the curriculum and are equally important as the knowledge and resources that teachers bring. Their view of the 'curriculum' echoes Kelly's (2009) view of the 'curriculum' as not a given but rather, constructed through the interactions between teachers and students in the classroom.

6.5 Facilitating intercultural communication/learning

In addition to teaching with examples from different cultural/national contexts (see Sections 6.2 and 6.3) and inviting students from different cultural/national backgrounds to share their examples and experiences in the class (see Section 6.4), designing group discussion activities is another method that some of the participants adopted to help their students enhance their intercultural awareness and competence. These two areas - enhancing students' intercultural awareness and competence – were seen as important learning outcomes of internationalising the curriculum.

Eddie, a lecturer in the School of Languages, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'dealing with other countries' history and not just with the UK'. He emphasised the importance of adding international and intercultural perspectives to the curriculum content to make the curriculum international. It is interesting to note that his definition of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' singled out 'the UK' and 'other countries'. This might suggest that he has a binary view of the world – i.e. viewing the world as the combination of 'the UK' and 'other countries'.

Eddie teaches about how communication styles vary across different cultures/countries. A key teaching objective of his module is to help students to become more aware of language/communication issues across different cultures/countries. He stated that he organises group discussion activities in class to create opportunities for students to compare language/communication issues in different cultural/national contexts. He explained that he often asks students to use the English language and British culture as

the main point of discussion because they are all studying in the UK and therefore, experiencing cultural practices here. What he does is to ask students to analyse the cultural practices in the UK and compare them with those of their home country. He stated:

> 'Because I am not British, I can bring another culture to the discussion. The students are people from Asia like China, Japan, Thailand, or people from Europe like the UK, Norway, Germany. Sometimes, we have American students as well. The fact that we discuss how we see a particular cultural practice in the UK, how it is seen by different cultures and how it is done in different cultures gives the students a global perspective. It is not just about I am comparing my culture with the English culture. Because we are people from so many different places, we can compare the different cultural practices and learn from that' (Eddie, languages).

I noticed that Eddie tended to essentialise 'culture' in his conversation. For instance, the way that he described 'culture', such as 'another culture', 'my culture', 'English culture', indicates that he tended to focus on the differences between 'cultures'. Implicit to this view is the idea that 'culture' is static and distinct, which is different to how Holliday (1999, 2011) defines 'culture'. Yet Eddie's account also suggests that he consciously sets out to promote students' intercultural awareness and competence and equip them with the knowledge and skills to challenge cultural stereotyping. The fact that he essentialises 'culture' in conversation and yet facilitates intercultural communication/learning through his teaching practice resonates with Holliday's (2011) assertion that we all essentialise 'culture' in everyday conversation. It is not that we should censor our language but rather, recognise this tendency and the inherent contradictions. It is also important to note that Eddie is mindful of the cultural biases that he might have and its impact on his teaching. For example, he stated:

> 'I guess the main tension for internationalising the curriculum can be preparing topics and reading materials. I guess it would be trying to get rid of the Western bias because many things about language and communication issues are written from the Western perspectives. Sometimes it is hard to know that if I choose these articles and theories, is

it going to lead the students to stereotypes or is it going to lead them to taking their own ways? Sometimes when I read something about China for example, I am not sure if the paper I bring to the class is truthful or is going to be perceived as not true by the Chinese students. Because there is hierarchical distance, they are not going to tell you if something is not right. But I encourage them to speak what they feel about the materials we read in class' (Eddie, Languages).

The quote suggests that Eddie is critically reflective when it comes to his own identity/positionality and how this might impact on his teaching. Yet he also tends to polarise the literature and scholars' perspectives by referring to 'Western bias' and 'Western perspectives'. His account also suggests that he is aware of the power hierarchies between teachers and students and tries to dismantle these hierarchies by empowering the students to express their views, as Lily (languages), Lisa (education) and James (politics) do. His responses indicate that he is reflexive about the materials that he uses for his teaching and tries to challenge cultural stereotyping through his teaching.

Paul (environmental sciences) considers intercultural awareness as an important learning outcome of internationalising the curriculum. To promote students' intercultural awareness and competence, he designs group discussion activities in the classroom to encourage students from different cultural/national backgrounds to work together. He stated:

'I use software tools to randomly assign groups every week. I am trying to keep the group size down and it depends on the activity. Ideally, I will be looking at six or seven students in each group. So, I make sure you don't have a group of Chinese students for example always working together. It's a random mix and it is a different mix every week. Because each group is having to come up with the presentation or deliver something, they need to work together on it' (Paul, environmental sciences).

Paul went on to explain that students tended to sit next to people they were already familiar with and did not want to work with people whom they did not know. To help the students develop their intercultural awareness and competence, he used software tools

to regroup the students, inviting and encouraging them to step outside of their comfort zone. He tries to mix students from different cultural/national backgrounds into group discussion activities so that they have to interact with each other, usually to complete a task. The description of this practice was not entirely reflected in what I observed. I noticed that peer interaction between students from different cultural/national backgrounds did not happen, even when teachers assigned them to the same group and encouraged them to work together.

For instance, in one lecture that I observed, Paul played a video about the environmental pollution caused by an Orimulsion-burning power station in Wales. After watching the video, he split the students into three groups and asked them to discuss with their group members about the impacts of opening the Orimulsion-burning power station on the environment, people's health, and employability issues. As indicated in his account, the students were indeed assigned to different groups randomly and each group consisted of students from different cultural/national backgrounds. Yet when the discussion started, I noticed that not every student in the group spoke and shared their opinions. For instance, in the group that I joined, I noticed that the three Chinese students did not join in the discussions at all. At the end of the discussion activity, one British student represented our group and reported the discussion results. This group discussion experience made me realise that not every student is confident in using English to share their views and experiences with others in these discussion activities. Hence, using the software tools to put students from different cultural/national backgrounds in the same group and make them work together might not achieve the goal of helping students to interact with each other and facilitating intercultural communication and learning.

Leo, a lecturer in the School of Languages, interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as adding different cultural perspectives to the curriculum and treating different cultural perspectives as equally important. He considered promoting students' intercultural awareness and competence as an important learning outcome of internationalising the curriculum. Like Eddie (languages) and Paul (environmental

sciences), he organised group discussion activities in class to facilitate intercultural communication and learning. He stated:

> 'I do try to get everybody engaged as much as I can, often by breaking down the class into smaller pairs or groups where they discuss things and get back to me. So, everybody has something to say in seminars. But it is difficult. Clearly the home/UK students are much more vocal and participatory than the others. It is to be expected. They are on familiar ground and their linguistic proficiency is much higher as well. I know when we talk about internationalisation, we are told we should not see language as a stumbling block. But inevitably it is there, and some students do not have or feel they do not have the language skills' (Leo, languages).

When I observed Leo's class, I witnessed some students struggling to communicate in English when they were asked to join a group and discuss issues with their peers. This scenario made me reflect on whether it would be possible to give students the freedom to choose their own partners, rather than assigning them to groups where they might feel intimidated and less confident about sharing their opinions. I noticed that some students were reluctant to join group discussions because they were less confident in communicating in English. This situation became even worse when teachers intervened and asked them to work with people from different cultural/national backgrounds. In my view, if teachers let the students choose their own partners, they might have the opportunity to work with people who can communicate with them in their native language. In that case, different language skills will become a resource rather than a barrier for the students, as they could use their mother tongue to discuss issues in greater depth than would be possible in English.

This section reveals that some participants consider group discussion activities as an opportunity to internationalise the curriculum by creating groups of students from different cultural/national backgrounds for group discussions. The aim of these group discussions from the lecturers' perspective is to promote students' intercultural awareness and competence. Their accounts of the group discussion activities also suggest that they mixed students from different cultural/national backgrounds because they

wanted students to be challenged and interact with students from countries and cultures other than their own. Yet simply putting students from different cultural/national backgrounds in the same group might not facilitate intercultural communication and learning because students do not interact/communicate with each other, as teachers expect, due to their lack of confidence in communicating in English. Compared with Lisa (education) and James (politics) who adopted strategies that democratised the classroom, it appears that some participants in this section (e.g. Paul, Leo) are less reflexive about the power hierarchies between teachers and students in the classroom, as they tended to control and decide who is in which group rather than letting students themselves choose their working partners.

6.6 Questioning cultural hierarchies in knowledge production

Compared to the participants in the previous sections, some participants also raised the issue of cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production when talking about their approach to internationalising the curriculum. Their approach included questioning the power and privileging of the Eurocentric canon in the literature and the curriculum.

Sarah (politics) interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'making something work for students from different countries'. She pointed out that the literature in her subject area has been dominated by 'Western' perspectives. She stated:

> 'When I teach the module, I am trying to talk about international comparisons. It is hard to find stuff that is written about media and political communication from another perspective. A lot of the time you have Western scholars writing about media in a non-Western environment, but they still look at it from Western perspectives. It is not just about finding literature about Chinese media, South African media and Indian media. It is also about finding literature from scholars from those places because they will have a different perspective' (Sarah, politics).

Sarah's account suggests that she is aware that the literature in her subject area is dominated by the perspectives of scholars from 'Western' countries. She tries to challenge this dominance by including the perspectives of scholars from other cultures/countries into her curriculum to make the curriculum more international. Yet it is worth noting that the way that she categorises/selects the literature indicates that she might have a binary view of literature and knowledge. This is because she makes a clear distinction between 'Western' perspectives and 'non-Western' perspectives and assumes that they are innately different from each other. The way that she classifies the literature and scholars' perspectives into 'Western' and 'non-Western' echoes the discourse of 'the West and the Rest' identified by Hall (1999) which I reviewed in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1. As Hall suggests, the discourse of 'the West and the Rest' constructs the world in binary terms and can result in cultural stereotyping and splitting (ibid.). Similarly, the way in which Sarah categorises the literature in to 'Western' and 'non-Western' also runs the risk of polarising both the literature and the knowledge.

Jenny (environmental sciences) took a different approach to selecting the literature. She was against the binary approach to categorising the literature, questioning the way of using the cultural/national background of a scholar as the criterion for selecting the literature and compiling a reading list. She articulated the view that international research collaboration makes it difficult to use the national/cultural background of a scholar as the criterion for classifying the literature. She pointed out that sometimes a paper might be published by a scholar from a 'Western' country, but the co- authors are from the Global South. She stated:

> 'In another module, I do a session around environmental justice and how that relates to climate justice and climate change. One of the videos I use is produced by a Welsh academic but in it, she covers different aspects of climate change. So, in there, you have a strong element to internationalisation, although it is produced by a Welsh person. I think it is very difficult to say this is Western or Global North material or this is material from the Global South' (Jenny, environmental sciences).

She pointed to the limitations of simply categorising the literature into 'Western' and 'non-Western' and raised the question: 'What does the Western material refer to?'. She acknowledged the fact that the literature in her subject area has been dominated by the perspectives of scholars from 'the West'. At the same time, she stated that the understanding about how the world functions or develops has been mainly driven by the perspectives of scholars from 'Western' countries. She went on to talk about how indigenous knowledge and very localised understandings of climate change have not been sufficiently acknowledged in the literature, including how climate change is understood, how science operates, what is meant by climate change, and how we as human beings respond to climate change. Her response suggests that she is acutely aware of the cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production and is attempting to dismantle these knowledge hierarchies through internationalising the literature and the curriculum within her subject area.

Amy (politics) stated that her approach to internationalising the curriculum is through 'questioning the hierarchy of knowledge production'. Like Jenny (environmental sciences), she is aware of the cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production. Indeed, she called for the need to dismantle the dominance of the Eurocentric canon in the literature and the curriculum. She highlighted the importance for teachers to reflect on the impact of colonialism on education, knowledge production, and the curriculum. She herself did this by critically reflecting on her identity/positionality and this shaped the ways that she understands and sees the world and how she then teaches. She pointed out that students, especially those from the Global South, often come to the UK having the belief that they are inferior; therefore, she tries to 'decolonise' these students' minds through equipping them with critical thinking skills and encouraging them to deconstruct the dominant imperial and colonial narratives. She views 'decolonisation' as the process of dismantling hierarchies and inequalities not only in the academy but also in a range of other areas, such as gender inequalities, power relationships between teachers and students and so on. She stated:

'When I teach, I pay attention to gender. If women are not speaking, I am going to fetch them. It is easy for men to dominate in the classroom. I try to rebalance the classroom dynamics to let everybody speak, particularly for women from the Global South. The pedagogy I do is that I rebalance the positions of women in the discussions. So, everybody is valued with everything they bring to the class' (Amy, politics).

Amy's account suggests that she not only speaks out about issues such as decolonisation and gender inequalities but also models what she advocates in theory in her classroom practices. For example, being aware of gender inequalities between men and women, and she tries to challenge and eradicate such inequalities through her teaching arrangements in the classroom, as the quote above indicates. She stated that 'I know I am a lecturer, but I am a facilitator as well. So, I put myself a little bit down and bring the students up a little bit in the classroom because they feel inferior.' Her statement suggests that she is very aware of the power hierarchies not only between men and women but also between teachers and students. She articulated the view that teachers can have higher status than students in the classroom, so she actively encourages the students to bring their knowledge and perspectives to the class. She is careful to make clear to the students that their knowledge and perspectives are not inferior but are as important as those of teachers and other scholars. In adopting these practices, Amy's approach is similar to the teaching methods adopted by Lisa (education) and James (politics) who view teaching as a mutual process in which both teachers and students are learners. In addition, Amy views decolonising/internationalising the curriculum as an ideological stance that teachers take on issues of power and inequalities. In her view, teachers need to bring this reflexivity into their teaching practices and continuously challenge the superiority of the colonial mindset and the power of the Eurocentric canon in the academy and in the curriculum.

Compared to participants who question cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production, Hailey (mathematics) does not consider that knowledge hierarchies exist in her discipline. She stated that she does not look at the cultural/national background of authors when selecting the literature and the reading list. Here is a dialogue between me and Hailey:

Me: When I interviewed staff in the Department of Politics, they pointed out that the literature in their discipline is dominated by scholars from the 'Western' world/countries. What is the situation in your discipline? Will that be considered as an issue?

Hailey: I do not ever look at the background of the writer of the book. I only look at what is in the books. For me, it is just totally unimportant. So, I would never change the reading list according to any artificial criteria. I am a modern mathematician and often under pressure to do something to represent our commitment to diversity. But I do not approve artificial efforts. I think the most ethical thing is to tell the truth. So, if this particular theorem or this particular part of mathematics was done in China, then I will talk about China. If it was done in India, I will talk about India. It is very important not to appropriate it.

Hailey articulates the view that to artificially include authors from different cultures/countries into the curriculum for the purpose of diversifying the curriculum is neither ethical nor meaningful. It is interesting to note how she responded to my questions. She seemed not to consider the dominance of the perspectives of scholars from 'the West' in the literature of her discipline to be an issue. In addition, unlike other participants (e.g. Sarah, Jenny, Amy), she did not pay a lot attention to issues of power and inequalities in knowledge production. This might indicate that the disciplinary background of an academic can shape how they teach and the way in which they look at knowledge hierarchies in the academy.

The interview with Andrew also provides evidence to support this argument. Andrew (mathematics) interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as adjusting his teaching methods for students' different theoretical backgrounds and learning styles. He stated that he does not look at the cultural/national background of the author when he selects texts. I asked him the same question that I asked Hailey and here is our dialogue:

Me: When I interviewed staff in the Department of Politics, they pointed out that the literature in their discipline is dominated by scholars from the 'Western' world/countries. What is the situation in your discipline? Will that be considered as an issue?

Andrew: This is quite interesting. The mathematics led by the mathematics textbooks has been completely Western dominated. I think it is also becoming dominant in China, in India and in the rest of world. You can trace the history. The first most important book in mathematics was the translation of Euclid's Elements. This cannot be underestimated in any way. It is the foundation of the modern world as far as science is concerned … So, is it a problem that mathematics is dominated by the Western literature? I don't think so at all. It is because we are not interested in one kind of mathematics over another kind of mathematics. This is not going to happen. If there are Chinese researchers who are exceptionally strong, they will follow the same mathematics. They do not make Chinese mathematics. They make the same mathematics.

Like Hailey (mathematics), Andrew does not consider the dominance of the perspectives of scholars from 'the West' in the literature as an issue. These responses suggest the belief that the procedures for knowledge production in their discipline are 'impersonal' and 'value free' and that mathematics content is not influenced by the cultural/national background of the people who create it. They do not think that there are knowledge hierarchies in their discipline because they believe that mathematicians around the world make the 'same' mathematics. This view is quite different from the views of Sarah (politics), Jenny (environmental sciences), and Amy (politics) who see knowledge as socially constructed so that they need to be aware of the cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production and challenge/dismantle them whenever they can.

This section shows that participants took different approaches to dismantling the dominance of the Eurocentric canon in the literature and the curriculum. Some participants (e.g. Sarah) took a binary view of knowledge, classifying the literature into 'Western' and 'non-Western'. For these lecturers, challenging the dominance of 'Western' and Eurocentric canon meant including the perspectives of scholars from diverse cultural/national contexts into the curriculum content. Some participants (e.g. Jenny) questioned the binary approach to categorising the literature and the knowledge. They called for dismantling the domination of Eurocentric canon in the literature while adding more diverse perspectives to the curriculum. Some participants (e.g. Amy) not only spoke

about issues such as decolonisation and gender inequalities, but also modelled what they advocated in theory in their classroom practices. These practices involved empowering students to bring their own examples, knowledge, and experiences to the class and valuing their perspectives as equally important as those of their teachers. It seems that academic discipline impacts on how academics look at issues of cultural hierarchies in knowledge production. For instance, Hailey (mathematics) and Andrew (mathematics) believe that the enquiry procedures for knowledge production in their discipline are 'impersonal' and 'value free' and therefore, there are no cultural hierarchies in knowledge production in their discipline.

6.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have analysed academics' approaches to internationalising the curriculum, such as how they selected teaching examples, how they selected the literature and reading list, how they interacted with students in the classroom, and how they organised group discussion activities in the classroom. As with the findings discussed in Chapter 5, I discovered that academics' approaches to internationalising the curriculum are not just related to how they interpret the notion of 'internationalisation' but also to how they look at the world, what they understand to be the purpose of university education, how they look at their discipline/subject, and how they perceive knowledge hierarchies in the academy.

I discovered that within the different approaches to internationalising the curriculum, academics also positioned themselves differently in relation to students and this was reflected in different classroom practices. For example, some participants (e.g. Emily, Paul) were less comfortable/confident with using examples from the countries that they were not familiar with because they were worried that students might ask questions they could not answer. Instead, they preferred to draw on their expertise/experience to teach. By contrast, some participants (e.g. Lily, Lisa, James) chose to take cues from their students.

They treated teaching as a mutual process in which both teachers and students are learners. They were less worried when dealing with situations in which students had more knowledge of the topic than them. Because of this, they were more open to students' knowledge and perspectives and encouraged the students to bring their examples, knowledge, and experiences to the class. Their views on the 'curriculum' echo Kelly's (2009) notion of the 'curriculum' being constructed through the interactions between teachers and students in the classroom, rather than being a given.

I also discovered that the ways in which academics viewed their role/responsibility as a teacher was another factor that explained their different approaches to internationalising the curriculum. For example, some participants (e.g. Sarah, Jenny, Amy) viewed their role within internationalisation as challenging and dismantling inequalities and hierarchies. The aim of their teaching was to let students be aware of the issues of inequalities and hierarchies in various areas, such as gender inequalities, power relationships between teachers and students, cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production and so on. They tried to teach students to challenge and dismantle these inequalities and hierarchies in their lives. By contrast, some participants (e.g. Hailey, Andrew) saw their role as conveying and transferring knowledge to the students rather than challenging and dismantling inequalities and hierarchies. They seemed to pay less attention to issues of power and inequality in knowledge production because they see the procedures of knowledge production in their discipline as 'impersonal' and 'value free' rather than socially constructed. This might suggest that an academic's disciplinary background plays an important role in shaping how they look at issues of power and inequalities in knowledge production.

In the next chapter, I move my focus from the classroom context to the institutional context of the case study university by exploring the university's strategies, policies, and initiatives on internationalisation.

Chapter 7 Internationalisation in the Institution: University Strategies, Policies and Initiatives

7.1 Introduction

In Chapters 5 and 6, I analysed academics' understandings and practices with regard to internationalising the curriculum. I discovered that these understandings and practices are not just related to how academics interpret the notion of 'internationalisation' but also how they look at the world, what they understand to be the purpose of university education, how they look at their discipline/subject and so on. In this chapter, my focus shifts from the classroom context to the institutional context of the case study university. My aim in this chapter is to explore how, during the period of my research, the institutional context of the case study university changed due to social movements and campaigns of decolonisation and the impact these had on the university's internationalisation strategies and policies. My analysis is based on the interviews with academic staff and on a review of the case study university's policy documents on internationalisation. Each sub-section of this chapter is structured around a theme that emerged from the participants' accounts of the university strategies, policies, and initiatives around internationalisation.

7.2 An internationalisation strategy with market-driven goals

In my analysis of the case study university's internationalisation strategy paper, I found that the strategy is largely market-driven and shaped by the market discourses and practices that permeate the UK higher education sector (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4). As I was keen to explore how the university's policy discourses on internationalisation shaped academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum (see my third sub-research

question in Chapter 1, Section 1.3), when I talked to the participants, I tried to explore how they feel about the university's internationalisation strategy. To my surprise, many participants said that they knew very little about the university's internationalisation strategy so that they did not want to comment. Some participants held the view that the university's internationalisation strategy treats 'internationalisation' instrumentally and is 'cost-benefit' driven. Here are quotes from some of these participants:

> 'I think a lot of internationalisation strategies in this university and the universities in the UK are treated instrumentally. It is not something that is enriching beyond getting lots of money from international students or getting reputation' (Alice, education).

> 'I think the university tries to reach international students and recruit international students because it is good for the diversity of cohort of students and good for reputation. For the university, it is also good for money. Students pay fees and fees contribute to the functioning of the university' (James, politics).

> 'It is wonderful to have people from different contexts on the MSc course. I hope that always continues … But the university's internationalisation strategy is very cost-benefit driven. China is the focus of the university strategy because there are a lot of potential students there' (Paul, environmental sciences).

As discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.4, the three major objectives of the university's internationalisation strategy that I identified are: enhancing the university's international reputation; promoting international student recruitment; and raising the visibility of the university's research strength. It is worth noting that the accounts of Alice (education), James (politics), and Paul (environmental sciences) on the university's internationalisation strategy mirror my analysis. Both their accounts and my analyses suggest that the university's internationalisation strategy is market-driven and primarily focuses on the economic and reputational outcomes of internationalisation.

Michael (education) and Amy (politics), who associated 'internationalisation of the curriculum' with the notion of 'decolonising the curriculum', critiqued the university's internationalisation strategy, as illustrated in the following quotes:

> 'The university's internationalisation strategy comes down to three things: money, money and money. What the university does is to get more students in, keep them happy and send them away. It is a very simple strategy … The university opens offices in China to bring more students. That is what mainly the university perceives as the internationalisation strategy. It makes links with countries and sets up associations and they talk good words about the university and the university's profile and reputation is enhanced. It is a very commercial strategy and effective because it brings in students' (Michael, education).

> 'Internationalisation is used in a corporate sense by the university to go and get more foreign students. When I arrived here, I was asked to be the director of internationalisation. I said: 'okay but what does that mean?' They said: 'you go and try to get students from elsewhere in the world.' … I went to Kenya with people who do recruitment to do some internationalisation. That is how the university understands it. We went to Kenya and I did some talks and public speech in schools to do recruitment. By that stage, I understood that it really is student recruitment' (Amy, politics).

Michael and Amy were both critical of the university's internationalisation strategy, seeing it as purely 'commercial' and 'corporate' driven. From their critique, it can be deduced that they had a broader view of 'internationalisation', seeing it as going beyond student recruitment to a re-examination of the values, beliefs, and practices enacted in the institution. Their accounts of the university internationalisation strategy mirror my analysis of the university internationalisation strategy paper – i.e. central to the strategy was the recruitment of international students.

Leo (languages) questioned the university's recruitment strategy. He held the view that the standards for recruiting international students have been lowered because of the commercial nature of the university's internationalisation strategy. He pointed out that

he had experience of teaching international students who are not ready to study in UK higher education and whose English language proficiency is not sufficient for them to cope with the learning tasks of the programme. He attributed this situation to the university's internationalisation strategy that aims to recruit more international students. He stated:

> 'For some international students who somehow are not quite ready, they are here mainly because they contributed to the university financially. We have got to be honest with these things. For both lecturers and students, this state of affairs does create tensions … We cannot just sweep these issues under carpet' (Leo, languages).

Lisa (education) shared the same concern. She held the view that the university's internationalisation strategy is mainly driven by the economic benefits of recruiting international students. She pointed out that the university recruited international students whose English language proficiency is not sufficient for them to study in the UK higher education. From her perspective, the commercial nature of the university's internationalisation strategy undermines the quality of teaching and learning in the university. She stated:

> 'I fully understand the marketing argument. If there is at least one university that actually keeps dropping the level of English requirement, everybody has to drop the level … We are making our lives difficult when we have to work with students whose level of English is not sufficient for studying at the graduate level in the UK. I am not going to be pessimistic about what may happen in the future. But I actually think sometimes we need to raise our standard in order to be honest with the students' (Lisa, education).

She argued that as the course that students embark on is short (this is particularly the case with MA students), they need to meet a certain level of English language proficiency before they come to study the course; otherwise, they cannot achieve the learning outcomes that the course sets for them, since within the timeframe, there is not sufficient time to improve their English. In her view, lowering the English language requirements

for international students has not been good for students' learning experiences and creates challenges and tensions for teachers when designing the curriculum and arranging the teaching and learning activities for the students. Teachers find themselves reducing the difficulty of the topics/materials that they prepare for teaching so as to engage students whose English language proficiency is not sufficient.

To summarise, the above participants' accounts of the university's internationalisation strategy mirror my own analysis, which shows that the university's internationalisation strategy is largely market-driven and shaped by the market discourses and practices currently permeating UK higher education. This can be seen in the three major objectives of the university's internationalisation strategy that I identified: enhancing the university's international reputation; promoting international student recruitment; and raising the visibility of the university's research strength. It is worth noting that these participants not only thought that the strategy was too focused on international student recruitment but also that this objective had led to the lowering of English language requirements, which in turn has created tensions for teachers when arranging teaching content and learning activities for students.

7.3 Decolonisation: an unpublished institutional strategy?

As discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.4, during the period of my research, the institutional context of the case study university changed. In the wake of the Black Lives Matter movement, the decolonisation movement became prominent in the case study university. As I mentioned earlier in this thesis, the decolonisation movement in the case study university can be dated to 2019 when a Black History Month event was organised by the Student Union. As a result of this event, more academic staff and students in the university became involved in the decolonisation movement. Later, driven by the Black Lives Matter movement in May 2020, decolonisation initiatives became a top priority to both academic staff and university executives working in the case study university.

It is worth noting that at the beginning of the decolonisation movement in the case study university, decolonisation initiatives were more bottom-up and grassroots in nature – i.e. the decolonisation initiatives were led by students and academic staff. Back then, the Student Union started a decolonisation campaign to improve the wellbeing of BAME students in the institution and called for more representation of BAME staff at the university. At the same time, a society called Decolonising the University was formed by a group of postgraduate research students and academic staff. The society organised events and activities to promote the idea of 'decolonising the university and the curriculum' and aimed to create a more inclusive teaching and learning environment in the university. In the wake of the Black Lives Matter movement, these decolonisation initiatives led by students and academic staff were institutionalised in some schools of the university and were included/mainstreamed into the university's equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) initiative/policy.

Gina, a lecturer in the School of International Development, was actively engaged in the decolonisation initiatives in her school. She pointed out that in response to the university executives' suggestions, her school appointed academic staff to be decolonisation champions. The decolonisation champions are taking a lead on the decolonisation initiatives in her school and are members of the school's diversity committee. The diversity committee in her school is a committee that engages with different types of diversity and equality matters in the institution. As the decolonisation movement became more prominent in the university, the diversity committee began to discuss matters to do with 'decolonisation' and the decolonisation champions also reported their work to the diversity committee. Yet she pointed out that there has been a lack of communication/sharing between different schools in the university about how they carry out these decolonisation initiatives. She stated:

> 'But with the discussion last week and by email this week, the decolonising champions in our school found that even though there are decolonising champions now in a number of different schools, they don't know whether all schools across the university have them. In our school, there are some

148

workload allocation points for the role, but we don't know whether that is the same in other schools. We don't know whether each school or each champion made their own agenda' (Gina, international development).

Cindy, a lecturer in the School of Politics, pointed out that there was no clear distinction between the decolonisation initiatives and the equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) initiatives in her school. She explained that the person who is leading the EDI initiatives also takes on the role of leading the decolonisation initiatives in her school. The arrangements regarding the decolonisation initiatives that Cindy described in her school are similar to those that exist in the School of International Development where the decolonisation champions are also members of the diversity committee and report their work to the diversity committee. Both Gina (international development) and Cindy (politics) believe that there is the danger that decolonisation initiatives will be conflated with the EDI initiatives in the university.

Furthermore, the university's EDI committee published its annual report in February 2021 on its progress on the matters of equality, diversity, and inclusion in the university. The report confirms the observations of Gina (international development) and Cindy (politics) on the conflation of the decolonisation initiatives with the EDI initiatives. In the report, the EDI committee has piggybacked onto the decolonisation initiatives led by students and academic staff in the university, such as the Decolonising Network, the Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Ambassador Scheme, and the BAME Staff Network. In my view, the conflation of the decolonisation initiatives with the EDI initiatives is problematic because it tends to depoliticise the decolonisation initiatives, thereby diluting the meaning of these initiatives led by students and academic staff in the university. I will explore this point further in the next section (see Section 7.4).

As there is no published institutional strategy of decolonisation in the university, students and academic staff in individual schools pursue their own decolonisation agendas, depending on how they interpret the decolonisation initiatives. For instance, in Gina's (international development) school, academic staff and postgraduate research students

have organised research seminars on topics such as 'decolonising the academia' and 'decolonising the curriculum'. The decolonisation champions in her school are also involved in the BAME ambassador scheme and work with their school's BAME ambassadors. The BAME ambassador scheme is led by the Student Union and supported by the university's executives to tackle the degree awarding gap that continues to affect students from BAME backgrounds. The BAME ambassadors are recruited by the Student Union and their role is to work with BAME students to make sure their experiences are heard and can contribute to the closing of the degree awarding gap. In the academic year of 2019/20, the scheme was piloted in four schools at the university and in each school, there were academic staff who mentored and worked with the recruited BAME ambassadors. In Gina's (international development) school, the decolonisation champions are responsible for mentoring their school's BAME ambassadors.

Yet Gina pointed out that the decolonisation initiatives that she engaged with in her school appeared to only reach out to those who already have an interest in the topic of 'decolonisation' rather than a wider audience. She stated that: 'Both at the committee and the seminars, I think the preaching to the choir phenomenon is quite common.' She observed that people who participate in the discussions and seminars on 'decolonisation' that academic staff and students organise in her school are the ones who are already convinced about the relevance/importance of the decolonisation movement for the university and themselves.

This section reveals that compared to the internationalisation initiative/strategy that is developed and implemented by the university executives, the decolonisation initiatives in the case study university had more grassroots origins, being led by students and academic staff. Yet it is worth noting that in the wake of the Black Lives Matter movement, the decolonisation initiatives led by students and academic staff have been institutionalised in some schools of the university. For instance, some schools have appointed academic staff to be their school's decolonisation champions and academic staff are allocated time to do the decolonisation work. Moreover, as there is no published

institutional strategy of decolonisation in the university, students and academic staff in individual schools pursue their own decolonisation agendas, depending on how they interpret the decolonisation initiatives. It is also worth noting that some academic staff (e.g. Gina, Cindy) observed a tendancy to conflate decolonisation initiatives with the university's EDI initiatives.

7.4 Conflation of decolonisation with equality, diversity and inclusion

Based on an analysis of the participants' accounts about the decolonisation initiatives in the case study university, I found that there is no agreement on what 'decolonisation' means among the students and academic staff who participated in and carried out these initiatives. There were a range of different interpretations and discourses around the term 'decolonisation' in the university. For instance, the following quote is how the School of Literature talked about decolonisation initiatives on its website:

> 'We believe in the importance of teaching which includes a plurality of world views and ways of knowing and, to this end, we are seeking to decolonise our curriculum by engaging with leading research and pedagogical perspectives that reflect the diversity and plurality of all our disciplines … We have already undertaken a number of actions, including building up scholarly and pedagogical resources, consulting and supporting our BAME students, gathering and sharing examples of best practice, established fruitful collaborations with students, sector organisations, the Student Union and university's Equality and Diversity office, and organised public events' (School of Literature).

The above statement links the term 'decolonisation' with phrases such as 'the diversity and plurality of all our disciplines', 'building up scholarly and pedagogical resources', 'consulting and supporting our BAME students', etc. But I cannot not find a clear definition of 'decolonisation' in this statement. I see this statement as depoliticising the term 'decolonisation' to some extent by conflating it with 'equality', 'diversity', and 'inclusion', thereby implying that they are the same/similar things.

Another definition of 'decolonisation' that I found is from the website of the Student Union, as shown in the following quote:

> 'We use decolonisation to describe how higher education has been shaped by histories and legacies of colonialism and racism that have led to structural inequalities that remain today. The decolonising project is about acknowledging this past and addressing its lasting effects' (Student Union).

In addition to the definition, the Student Union listed what they hoped to achieve with the decolonisation initiatives as follows:

> '1) A truly diverse, global curriculum and anti-racist learning environment. 2) All university services (and especially mental health services) designed with BAME students in mind. 3) Better BAME representation at all levels of the university and the Student Union. 4) Preventing and educating the wider student body about racism. 5) BAME students feel a sense of belonging at the university where everyone is a proactive ally. 6) Dismantling of hierarchical power structures and Western superiority at the university' (Student Union).

Compared to the stance on 'decolonisation' from the executives in the School of Literature, I found that the Student Union's definition indicates a more politicised stance. For example, words such as 'legacies of colonialism and racism', 'structural inequalities', and 'dismantling of hierarchical power structures and Western superiority' are used. Their definition of 'decolonisation' points to the deep-level problems that they perceive in the structures and operations of universities. They call for attention to the 'structural inequalities' that remain in higher education and the impact of 'histories and legacies of colonialism and racism' on higher education. In the objectives of the decolonisation initiatives listed above, they stress the need to dismantle the 'hierarchical power structures' and the 'Western superiority' in the institution. I see the Student Union's definition of decolonisation as challenging the power/domination of 'Western' ideologies in the institution rather than co-opting 'decolonisation' into the discourses on 'equality', 'diversity', and 'inclusion'. This might indicate that compared to academic staff, the

Student Union has greater autonomy in terms of starting decolonisation initiatives and is not constrained by the management hierarchies in the university.

It is worth noting that some participants also challenged the way that the term 'decolonisation' is used in the university. Liz, a lecturer in the School of International Development, stated:

> 'I do not think decolonisation equals diversity. The equality and diversity initiatives can serve as the empty rhetoric and mask the structural problems. I think for me, there needs to be a radical thinking about decolonisation … I really think decolonisation is concerned about something fundamental. It is about what the university is for, how we are thinking about fees, how we are thinking about access and how we are thinking about migration. Otherwise, it becomes an empty word' (Liz, international development).

Liz contests the conflation of 'decolonising' with 'equality', 'diversity', and 'inclusion'. In her view, the EDI initiatives do not solve the 'structural problems' in the university. She is worried that the conflation of the decolonisation initiatives with the EDI initiatives renders 'decolonisation' an 'empty word'. Hence, she calls for a radical thinking/definition of 'decolonisation'. In her view, the decolonisation initiatives are not just related to the curriculum and the teaching and learning activities within the classroom but to realities beyond the classroom. Like the Student Union's definition of 'decolonisation', she emphasises the pollical implications of 'decolonisation' for the university – i.e. solving the 'structural problems' in the university, such as racial inequalities, who has more power/privilege than others, and so on. It is worth noting that her statements about the meaning of 'decolonisation' resonate with some participants' view that university executives have instrumentalised the notion of 'decolonisation' and used it as a marketing tool to recruit more students (see the statements of Steven, in Chapter 5, Section 5.5).

Gina (international development) observed that some academic staff who engage with the decolonisation initiatives do not want to use the term 'decolonisation'. She stated that some academic staff in her school have developed a 'decolonising toolkit' for

teaching and learning activities and arrangements in the university. But these academic staff members have opted to call the toolkit 'anti-racism toolkit' rather than 'decolonising toolkit' because of the concern that 'decolonisation' might be perceived as problematic for some people and inhibit them from joining the initiative.

Eve, a lecturer in the School of Literature, was also aware that some academic staff were hesitant to use the term 'decolonisation'. She stated that some academic staff started a network called Inclusivity Network in the university to engage people in the decolonisation initiatives, choosing to use the term 'inclusivity' rather than 'decolonisation'. She stated:

> 'The Inclusivity Network is part of the Decolonising Network. I feel that their intention is similar. But everybody is being careful of the words they are using. I am not saying that they do not believe in it (decolonisation). It is just that it (decolonisation) drives a certain group of people away. So, people keep it under other labels, for instance inclusivity' (Eve, literature).

It is interesting to note that some academic staff prefer to use the term 'anti-racism' and 'inclusivity' rather than 'decolonisation' to refer to the decolonisation initiatives that they engage with. The fact that they have replaced the term 'decolonisation' with 'anti-racism' and 'inclusivity' might suggest that they view the term 'decolonisation' as too 'political' and by calling them 'anti-racism' and 'inclusivity' are wanting to defuse this political element of the decolonisation initiative. As Gina and Eve's accounts suggest, these academic staff members recognise that 'decolonisation' can be perceived as problematic and can drive those people away. Moreover, Gina pointed to the broad nature of and the lack of agreement about the meaning of 'decolonisation' and has raised her concerns that decolonisation initiatives might become a 'performative' agenda if people reject the political dimensions of 'decolonisation'. She stated:

> 'Decolonisation is a very ambiguous concept which has different meanings to different people. Linked to this, it is difficult to define a clear decolonising agenda, as different people interpret it differently. There is a

risk that 'decolonisation' becomes a performative rather than action-driven agenda' (Gina, international development).

This section reveals that there is no consensus regarding the meaning of 'decolonisation' in the university. The ways in which schools, academic staff, and students engage with the decolonisation initiatives are diverse and varied. In some schools, some academic staff tend to conflate the decolonisation initiatives with the EDI initiatives and co-opt 'decolonisation' into the discourses of 'equality', 'diversity', and 'inclusion'. In my view, the conflation of decolonisation initiatives with EDI initiatives might give the impression that 'decolonisation' is the same as or similar to 'equality', 'diversity', and 'inclusion', thereby depoliticising decolonisation initiatives in the university. This conflation can result in making 'decolonisation' an 'empty word' and will fail to bring about more fundamental changes to the university that solve the 'structural problems' that some participants (e.g. Liz, Gina) in this section have pointed to.

7.5 Anti-racism taskforce: another policy rhetoric?

As discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.4, in the wake of the Black Lives Matter movement, the Vice-Chancellor of the university launched an anti-racism taskforce to address the issue of racial inequality and harassment in the university. It is useful to note that the anti-racism initiative started by the Vice-Chancellor was included in the university's equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) policy. The university's EDI committee considered the anti-racism initiative as an important objective of the university's EDI initiative, as the following quote indicates:

> 'The university commits to be an anti-racist organisation and stands against any type of racism and racist activity. This means that we recognise that, as an organisation, and as individuals who make up that organisation, we are part of a society in which racial inequality is systemic and institutional, and any action we take is determined by this fact' (EDI Annual Report 2020: 16).

Yet when I asked the participants how they felt about the implementation of the anti-racism initiative started by the Vice-Chancellor in the university, there were some interesting responses. For instance, Eve (literature) stated that she did not know what the anti-racism taskforce had done. She said that she was in one of the meetings of the anti-racism taskforce, but she did not see how the taskforce would solve the 'structural problems' in the university. She stated:

> 'It was still white people leading everything. There was not proper dialogue. It was just tick, tick and tick. It was pretty much reproducing what colonialist scientists did years ago: going to a place, taking all the experiences, jotting them down in data, facts and figures, with the hope that this will create a tangible result that the university can show to the outside world that we have done all of it. It was not just my opinion. I discussed it with a few other members. Those who attended the meeting also felt the same thing. That is why I would never attend that meeting again' (Eve, literature).

Eve is an international staff member, originally from India. The words she uses such as 'white people' and 'colonialist scientist' indicate that she connects the anti-racism initiative with the decolonisation initiative. From the extract, it is clear that she is not satisfied with the work carried out by the anti-racism taskforce. In her view, university executives have instrumentalised the anti-racism initiative, merely using it as a tool to raise the university's reputation. It is an instrumentalisation that has strong parallels with how the university's internationalisation strategy is conceived and implemented. For example, she pointed out that the meeting of the anti-racism taskforce was more like information gathering exercise so that the university executives could create 'a tangible result' to show what the university had done in terms of addressing the issue of racial inequality and harassment. Eve's observations on the anti-racism taskforce mirror my analysis of the university's EDI annual report – i.e. the university's EDI committee piggybacked on the decolonisation initiatives led by students and academic staff to show how the university was addressing issues such as EDI and anti-racism.

It is worth noting that Liz (international development), Gina (international development), and Cindy (politics) shared similar views and experiences with Eve (literature) regarding the anti-racism taskforce meetings that they had attended. They were dissatisfied with the anti-racism taskforce and questioned the purpose of the anti-racism initiative started by the Vice-Chancellor. For instance, Liz (international development) held the view that the anti-racism taskforce might be nothing more than 'policy rhetoric' and would not bring about any actual changes to the university. She stated:

> 'I might be more sceptical of an initiative that is led from the top. I think what I want to see and what I want to support are student-led movements. If you think of the decolonisation movement within the university, it was student-led. That is where the momentum has arisen. It is not that I am opposed to, of course, the management and to the Vice-Chancellor. But if they are not fundamentally committed to transforming the institution, then I am not necessarily sure that I have the time and energy for that' (Liz, international development).

Like Eve (literature), Liz is sceptical about the purpose of the anti-racism initiative started by the Vice-Chancellor. From the extract, it would appear that she is aware of the management hierarchies in the university. She states that she does not trust initiatives led from the top (i.e. university executives and managers) as such initiatives are not about solving the 'structural problems' in the university. By contrast, she views bottom-up and grassroots-level initiatives led by students to have the potential to bring about real changes to the institution as they are not constrained by the university's management hierarchies. Moreover, in her view, there can be a gap between how university executives talk about their actions and what they do in their practices.

This section reveals that some participants questioned the purpose of the anti-racism initiative started by the Vice-Chancellor and were dissatisfied with the work of the anti-racism taskforce. They are sceptical about the anti-racism initiative, seeing it as policy rhetoric that will not bring about any real changes to the university. It seems that initiatives led from the top (i.e. the university executives and managers) are viewed with scepticism by academic staff. There are parallels with the arguments some participants

(e.g. Alice, James, Michael, Amy) made that were critical of the internationalisation strategy developed and implemented by the university executives. Just like the anti-racism initiative, the internationalisation strategy, in their view, is instrumentalised by university executives in that it is used as a tool to raise the university's reputation and recruit more international students. Academics seem more interested in joining the bottom-up and grassroots-level initiatives as they view these initiatives led by students and academic staff as potentially bringing about real change in the university.

7.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have explored how during the period of my research, the institutional context of the case study university changed due to the social movements and campaigns of decolonisation. In the wake of the Black Lives Matter movement, the decolonisation movement became prominent in the case study university. It is useful to note that this was a critical moment for 'internationalisation of the curriculum' in the case study university, since more attention was being given to the curriculum by academic staff and university executives alike – an area that was missing in the university's internationalisation strategy paper.

Compared to the top-down internationalisation strategy developed and implemented by the university executives, the decolonisation initiatives in the case study university were more bottom-up and grassroots initiatives led by students and academic staff. Unlike the university's internationalisation strategy which focuses on raising the university's international reputation and promoting international student recruitment, the decolonisation initiatives led by students and academic staff have drawn people's attention to the ethnocentric behaviours and ideologies in the university and called for challenging/dismantling racial inequalities and hierarchies in the university. In my view, the decolonisation initiatives led by some students and academic staff have adopted a 'transformative' approach to internationalisation suggested by Turner and Robson (2008)

which I reviewed in Chapter 3, Section 3.5.2. As I discussed in Chapter 3, the 'transformative' approach to internationalisation focuses on fundamental behavioural and values-based change in the university and requires 'individuals to move from ethnocentric to an ethnorelative position' (ibid: 126). In my view, the decolonisation initiatives led by students and academic staff provided an opportunity for academic staff to revisit the meaning of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' since it highlighted the political dimension of knowledge and curriculum and led academic staff to pay attention to issues such as cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production and the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the academy and the curriculum.

This chapter also reveals that in the wake of the Black Lives Matter movement, the decolonisation initiatives led by students and academic staff have been institutionalised in some schools of the university and have been included/mainstreamed into the university's equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) policy. I discovered that decolonisation initiatives tend to be depoliticised once they become part of university policy. The evidence is that some academic staff (e.g. Gina, Cindy, Liz) observed a tendancy for decolonisation initiatives to be conflated with the EDI initiatives in the university. Moreover, I observed that the university's EDI committee piggybacked on the decolonisation initiatives led by students and academic staff to show how the university addressed issues such as EDI and anti-racism. In my view, the conflation of the decolonisation initiatives with the EDI initiatives is problematic because it depoliticises the decolonisation initiatives and dilutes the meaning of these initiatives led by students and academic staff – i.e. 'decolonisation' is then wrongly perceived as an initiative to make the university more diverse and inclusive rather than critically evaluating the structural problems that remain in the university and dismantling the legacies of colonialism and racism in the institution. At the same time, it is worth noting that the combination of the decolonisation initiatives and EDI initiatives might also provide an opportunity to mobilise resources for the EDI initiatives, since the decolonisation initiatives have grown in prominence and become more attractive/visible than the EDI initiatives in the current context of UK higher education.

The last point that I want to discuss is the paradoxes that reside within the decolonising efforts in UK higher education and globally. A paradox that haunts the decolonising efforts in higher education is that although initiatives of decolonising the university/curriculum have been active, the Eurocentric hegemony and privilege in terms of knowledge production has not been fundamentally changed and dismantled in universities (Heleta, 2016; Arday, Belluigi and Thomas, 2021). The accounts of participants (e.g. Michael, Amy, Eve, Liz) speak to this paradox and point to the need and urgency to change the Eurocentric institutional structures and cultures in order to bring fundamental epistemological change to universities and the academy. Another paradox worthy of attention is that recent decolonising movements and other anti-racism movements (e.g. Black Lives Matter) are most active in 'Western' countries such as the UK and the US. Yet universities in 'non-Western' countries (e.g. South Africa) are reported to continue to reproduce an epistemological hierarchy wherein 'Western' knowledge is privileged over other bodies and traditions of knowledge (Heleta, 2016). This suggests that calls for dismantling the Eurocentric hegemony and coloniality – which refer to the structures of power and influence that survive the formal end of colonialism and continue to shape all spheres of life of people, including education (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013) – are highly relevant for universities in both 'Western' and 'non-Western' countries.

Chapter 8 Discussion

8.1 Introduction

This study has sought to understand how academics working in different disciplines engage with internationalisation of the curriculum. To do this, I have drawn on Holliday's (1999) 'small cultures' approach to explore how the social contexts in which academics work and teach shape their understandings and practices of internationalising the curriculum. In the findings chapters (Chapters 5, 6 and 7), I have explored academics' definitions of 'internationalisation of the curriculum', their practices of internationalising the curriculum in the classroom, and the university's strategies, policies, and initiatives on internationalisation. My aim in this chapter is to interrogate the factors that I found to be significant in shaping academics' understandings and practices of internationalising the curriculum. The key themes that I will discuss in this chapter include disciplinary cultures, academics' approaches to internationalising the curriculum, and the university's policy discourses on internationalisation. To deepen the analysis, I will discuss these themes by relating them to the conceptual debates that I have reviewed in the preliminary chapters of the thesis, particularly Chapter 3.

8.2 The fluidity of disciplinary cultures

As my first sub research question suggests, my research set out to explore how academics working in different disciplines interpret the concept of 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. To answer this question, I selected academics from different schools/departments as the research participants. My research reveals that there are disciplinary differences in terms of how academics engage with internationalisation of the curriculum – including how they interpret and implement it in their practices. This finding is in line with Clifford's (2009) work which explores disciplinary understandings of the

concept of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' and the ways in which academics engage with the concept. Using Becher's (1989) categorisation of the disciplines to explore disciplinary differences in academics' interpretations of curriculum internationalisation, Clifford (2009) found that academics in what Becher (1989) termed the 'hard pure' disciplines were more resistant to engaging in the discourse of internationalisation, while academics in all other disciplinary areas were found to embrace the notion of curriculum internationalisation. She observed that the academics in the so-called 'hard pure' disciplines had a strong belief that their disciplines by nature are already international and that therefore, they do not need to engage in the debate around internationalisation of the curriculum. But can we generalise that all academics in the so-called 'hard pure' disciplines do not engage with internationalisation of the curriculum?

According to the findings of my study, the answer is no. Like Clifford's (2009) work, my research found that some academics in what Becher (1989) terms the 'hard pure' disciplines were indeed resistant to the notion of curriculum internationalisation because they believe that knowledge and ways of teaching and learning in their discipline are 'universal' and 'culturally neutral' – for instance, see the statements of Ryan (mathematics) and Jeremy (mathematics) in Chapter 5, Section 5.4. Yet, at the same time, some academics working in the discipline of mathematics embrace the notion of curriculum internationalisation and think that it is an important concept for their curriculum. The first example is Hailey (mathematics) who teaches a module on the history of mathematics. She stated that it is important for her to include the developments of mathematics not only in Europe but everywhere around the world (see her accounts in Chapter 5, Section 5.2). The second example is Andrew (mathematics) who challenges the notion that ways of teaching and learning mathematics are 'universal'. His international teaching experiences (teaching mathematics in both UK and Chinese universities) enabled him to be aware that the mathematics curricula in UK universities and Chinese universities are based on different choices in terms of mathematical theories and developments and therefore, students develop different theoretical backgrounds

and learning styles regarding mathematics. Because of this, he embraces the notion of curriculum internationalisation, arguing that it is important for teachers to adjust their teaching methods to take into account students' different theoretical backgrounds and learning styles (see his statements in Chapter 5, Section 5.3). These examples suggest that it is not appropriate to generalise that all academics working in the so-called 'hard pure' disciplines do not engage with internationalising the curriculum.

As I discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.3.1, Becher and Trowler take up the metaphor of 'academic tribes' to refer to 'disciplines' and state that:

> 'the ways in which academics engage with their subject matter, and the narratives they develop about this, are important structural factors in the formulation of disciplinary cultures. Together they represent features that lend coherence and relative permanence to academics' social practices, values and attitudes across time and places' (Becher and Trowler, 2001: 23).

They emphasise the differences between disciplinary cultures and categorise 'disciplines' into four groups: 'hard pure', 'soft pure', 'hard applied', and 'soft applied'. But are there any limitations to using their typology of disciplines to conceptualise disciplines and disciplinary cultures and using their typology as the framework to analyse academics' understandings and practices of internationalising the curriculum?

In my opinion, the way that Becher and Trowler (2001) refer to 'disciplines' as 'academic tribes' and categorise 'disciplines' into so-called 'hard pure' groups and so on tends to conceptualise 'disciplines' and 'disciplinary cultures' as fixed and static entities. The result is that they essentialise disciplines and disciplinary cultures. This is because their categorisation/typology of disciplines is primarily based on the epistemological and cognitive aspects of disciplines and disciplinary cultures and do not fully consider that social contexts can impact on the construction and re-construction of disciplines and disciplinary cultures. As Leask and Bridge (2013) suggest, disciplinary knowledge is nested within and shaped by institutional, local, national, regional, and global contexts. This means that while academics working in the same discipline may share ways of

understanding the world and knowledge about their subject, differences in how they look at their subject and how they teach can still arise due to the dynamic interrelationships between the contextual layers. Moreover, the increasing fluidity of disciplinary boundaries also makes the classification of disciplines into fixed categories difficult, as Becher and Trowler (2001) themselves noted.

Given the limitations of Becher and Trowler's (2001) categorisation of the disciplines, I suggest that we should think of 'disciplines' as 'cultural arenas' (Holliday, 2011) and consider disciplines and disciplinary cultures as fluid and ever-changing processes rather than static and fixed entities. As I discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.2, Holliday defines 'cultural reality' as 'something which is going around the individual which carries broad cultural meaning' and 'cultural arena' as 'a setting, environment or context within which cultural realities are situated' (ibid: 55). He suggests that 'cultural realities' can 'form around and be carried with individuals as they move from one cultural arena to another' and individuals have the capacity to 'feel a belonging to several cultural realities simultaneously' (ibid.). In my view, using the notion of 'cultural arenas' as a new lens through which to look at 'disciplines' and 'disciplinary cultures' makes it possible to view academics' disciplinary identities as fluid processes, shaped by the specific social contexts (e.g. nation, institution, department) in which they teach and work. This avoids the assigning of homogenous disciplinary identity to academics according to the discipline in which they work, treating their disciplinary identity as fixed and static, or generalising/homogenising specific groups of academics in terms of their teaching beliefs and practices.

Another point that I want to discuss is about the relationships between a discipline and a school/department in university. As Becher and Trowler (2001: 40) suggest, 'disciplines' are 'in part identified by the existence of relevant departments; but it does not follow that every department represents a discipline.' In this study, I followed Becher and Trowler's conceptualisation of discipline and went to select academics from different schools/departments as my research participants. To my surprise, I found that the

academics whom I interviewed came from different disciplinary backgrounds, even though they work in the same school/department. For example, in the School of Environmental Sciences, Emily has a degree in economics, whereas Linda has a degree in botany. In the School of Education, Lisa has a degree in mathematics, whereas Michael has a degree in sociology. In the light of my observation, I argue that it is useful to think of schools/departments as 'cultural arenas' too. This is because academics will inevitably import cultural norms, values, and practices deriving from their experiences in other 'cultural areas' (e.g. nation, institution, department, discipline) to their school/department, thereby contributing to shaping the 'cultural realities' of their school/department both consciously and unconsciously.

8.3 Diverse approaches to internationalising the curriculum

My research has shown that academics take different approaches to internationalising the curriculum. In this section, I will draw on Turner and Robson's (2008) typology of university policy approaches to internationalisation as the overarching theoretical lens to analyse academics' approaches to internationalising the curriculum.

As I discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.5.2, Turner and Robson (2008) suggest that university policy approaches to internationalisation can be conceptualised as situated on a continuum from a 'symbolic' approach to a 'transformative' approach. In the 'symbolic' orientation, 'internationalisation' is understood as a handful of students and staff from different countries having a presence on campus; moreover, university policies and strategies on internationalisation primarily focus on business-related activities and view 'internationalisation' as an economic imperative with accompanying expectations of financial returns (ibid.). By contrast, in the 'transformative' orientation, university policies and strategies on internationalisation tend to focus on building impetus for long-term, fundamental behavioural and values-based change within the institution; 'internationalisation' is understood 'as much about values of international reciprocity

within the institutional ethical and belief system as it is about skilful teaching and learning practices, requiring individuals to move from ethnocentric to an ethnorelative position' (ibid: 126). Drawing on Turner and Robson's (2008) typology of university policy approaches to internationalisation, I conceptualise the ways that academics engaged with curriculum internationalisation as a spectrum, ranging from a 'symbolic' approach to a 'transformative' approach. The 'symbolic' approach can be understood as integrating more diverse cultural perspectives into the curriculum content, whereas the 'transformative' approach focuses on interrogating/challenging/dismantling the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the academy and the curriculum and bringing values-based changes to the curriculum. Compared to the 'symbolic' approach, the 'transformative' approach draws attention to the cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production and the issues of power and inequalities in the academy and the curriculum. In my view, the ways in which academics in this study engaged with curriculum internationalisation can be situated at different points along the spectrum that I have identified. For example, Emily (environmental sciences) and Paul (environmental sciences) can be considered as representatives at one end of the spectrum (taking a 'symbolic' approach), whereas Michael (education) and Amy (politics) can be situated at the other end of the spectrum (taking a 'transformative' approach).

It is worth noting that the notion of cultural diversity is an important dimension of the 'symbolic' approach that academics in this study adopted. For instance, Emily (environmental sciences) interpreted the concept of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'teaching with examples from the world'. Paul (environmental sciences) interpreted the concept of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as 'teaching with examples from different countries'. They both hold the view that the curriculum can be internationalised through integrating different cultural perspectives and experiences into the curriculum content. They viewed a focus on international examples and experiences and developing international/intercultural perspectives in the students as essential to internationalising the curriculum.

Their accounts of their approaches to internationalising the curriculum suggest a tendency to interpret the notion of 'culture' as one that is distinct and static and linked to social dimensions such as nationality and ethnicity. In this sense, the way that they interpret 'culture' is similar to Hofstede's (2001) conceptualisation of 'culture' – that is, emphasising cultural differences and viewing 'culture' as innate/prescriptive and related to notions of nationality and ethnicity. From this perspective, adding more 'cultures' to the curriculum content can make the curriculum international/internationalised. A depoliticised understanding of cultural differences is inherent within this viewpoint. As Joseph (2011: 247) suggests, 'such a depoliticised understanding of cultural differences as represented through the public discourse of cultural diversity does not interrogate the privileging and marginalization of knowledges as located within social, educational and economic hierarchies.' Their accounts suggest an understanding of cultural differences that is positioned within discourses of equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) that silence the issue of power and hierarchies between cultural differences.

By contrast, the academics in this study who adopted a 'transformative' approach to internationalising the curriculum support the idea of 'decolonising the curriculum' and call for attention to the issue of cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production. For instance, Michael (education) associated his understandings of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' with the term 'decolonising the curriculum'. He pointed to the impact of colonialism on university education, knowledge production, and the curriculum and called for decolonising knowledge and the curriculum. Similarly, Amy (politics) was aware of the knowledge hierarchies in the academy and the classroom. She explained that her approach to internationalising the curriculum was through 'questioning the hierarchy of knowledge production'. Compared to the participants who took a 'symbolic' approach for internationalising the curriculum (e.g. Emily, Paul), the participants who adopted a 'transformative' approach drew attention to the 'positional superiority' (Said, 1978) of 'Western' knowledge/epistemology and called for dismantling the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the academy and the curriculum. To internationalise the curriculum, they try to interrogate the politics of knowledge

production and critically examine the privileging and marginalisation of different knowledges in the curriculum. Their accounts of their approaches suggest that they make conscious efforts to challenge/dismantle cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production and pay more attention to issues of power and hierarchies when they teach and interact with students in the classroom.

In discussing how participants embedded the notion of 'decolonisation' into their teaching practices to dismantle the domination of Eurocentric canon in the academy and the curriculum, I discovered that some participants took what could be seen as a depoliticised approach – that is, they saw decolonisation as simply about adding more diverse cultural perspectives to the curriculum content. For instance, Sarah (politics) pointed out that the literature in her subject area has been dominated by the perspectives of scholars from the 'Western' cultures/countries and that it is important for her to challenge this imbalance. What she did was to try to include perspectives of scholars from other cultures/countries to balance the views in the curriculum and make the curriculum more international/internationalised.

As I discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1, Hall (1992: 277) argues that the discourse of 'the West and the Rest' functions as a 'system of representation' and condenses complex characteristics of one society, culture, or place into one picture. He points out that the discourse of 'the West and the Rest' divides the world according to a simple dichotomy. In his view, this dichotomous view of the world constructs an over-simplified conception of difference and does not recognise the complex differences between and within 'the West' and 'the Rest'. For example, in the discourse of 'the West and the Rest', 'the West' appears unified and homogenous and 'the Rest' or 'the non-West' is considered as one place which is all different from 'the West'.

Drawing on Hall's (1992) notion of 'the West and the Rest', I found that some participants (e.g. Sarah) tended to adopt/promote binary views of the literature/knowledge and simply categorise the literature/knowledge into 'Western' and 'non-Western'. In my view, associating the literature/knowledge with the ethnicity/nationality of scholars and

classifying the literature/knowledge into 'Western' and 'non-Western' might polarise the literature/knowledge and reproduce the discourse of 'the West and the Rest'. I argue that this approach to challenging the domination of Eurocentric canon in the literature and the curriculum is 'symbolic' and 'tokenistic', as it does not fundamentally interrogate the issues of power and cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production but simply adds more diverse perspectives to the curriculum. I argue that adopting/promoting binary views of the literature/knowledge and simply classifying the literature/knowledge into 'Western' and 'non-Western' might run the risk of setting up oppositions, thereby exacerbating issues such as cultural stereotyping and splitting.

8.4 Internationalisation: a tool to recruit international students?

My research shows that some academics in this study were critical of the case study university's internationalisation strategy, arguing that it focuses too much on international student recruitment and neglects other aspects of internationalisation. Their perceptions of the university internationalisation strategy mirror my own analysis of the strategy paper. In an analysis of the university's internationalisation strategy paper, I identified three major objectives, namely, enhancing the university's international reputation; promoting international student recruitment; and raising the visibility of the university's research strengths. As the participants also observed, I have shown that international student recruitment is a key focus of the university's internationalisation strategy.

As I discussed in Chapter 1, Section 1.2 and Chapter 2, Section 2.2, the increasing dominance of market values and practices in the UK higher education sector has resulted in most UK universities aggressively competing with one another, both at home and abroad, for international student recruitment. Consequently, when formulating an internationalisation strategy for their university, university executives tend to prioritise the economic rationale for internationalisation (Warwick and Moogan, 2013; Robson,

2011; Turner and Robson, 2008). This is also true for the case study university where this study is based. Both the participants' accounts and my analysis of the university's internationalisation strategy suggest that the university is driven by the competition imperative and by the 'market mechanism' (Foskett, 2010) imposed by the UK government. University executives tend to treat 'internationalisation' instrumentally, using it as a tool to raise the university's international reputation and recruit more international students.

Drawing on Rolfe's (2013) notion of 'University of Excellence', I have shown that the university executives who formulate the internationalisation strategy for the case study university conceptualise 'internationalisation' using numerical terms and quantifiable objectives. As I discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.5.1, Rolfe notes that because of the rise of corporatism and managerialism in UK higher education, the notion of 'University of Excellence' has been widely adopted by UK universities (ibid.). He suggests that the notion of 'University of Excellence' defines 'excellence' based on quantity rather than quality and brings 'excellence' into the realm of efficiency, profitability, and administration (ibid.). Drawing on Rolfe's notion of 'University of Excellence', my analysis shows that the university executives of the case study university treat 'internationalisation' instrumentally and use simple quantifiable measures to evaluate the university's internationalisation progress. The evidence is that the university's ranking in the global university league table (e.g. Times Higher Education World Rankings) has been considered as the key indicator of the university's internationalisation progress (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4).

Yet it is also worth noting that the institutional culture in terms of internationalisation is much more fluid than the university's internationalisation strategy paper suggests. Whilst the teaching and learning aspects of internationalisation are not given sufficient attention in the university's internationalisation strategy paper, my research shows that academics working in the case study university have developed their own understandings of internationalisation and implemented them in their practices. For example, the

'transformative' approach to internationalising the curriculum adopted by some participants (e.g. Michael, Amy) provides an alternative interpretation of 'internationalisation' to that of the university executives. These participants contested the market discourses on internationalisation and were critical of the limited way in which university executives conceptualised and implemented 'internationalisation' as related mainly to raising the university's international reputation and promoting international student recruitment.

These findings connect closely with Rolfe's (2013: 35) notion of 'paraversity' – that is, 'an invisible, subversive, virtual institution populated by teachers, researchers and students thinking alongside one another in dissensus.' According to Rolfe, the 'paraversity' is nothing more or less than a 'radical critique' of the notion of 'University of Excellence' and runs unseen or unnoticed alongside and in parallel with the visible 'University of Excellence' (ibid: 36). The dissensus between the academic staff and university executives on the meaning of 'internationalisation' suggests that they have different beliefs on 'internationalisation' and its implications for the university's development. It seems that the academic staff's stance on 'internationalisation' is more political than that of the university executives – i.e. they view 'internationalisation' not in relation to international student recruitment but in terms of being the means to dismantle the inequalities and hierarchies in the institution and bring values-based change to the institution.

Drawing on Turner and Robson's (2008) typology of university policy approaches to internationalisation, I have argued that the internationalisation executives who formulate the internationalisation strategy for the case study university take a 'symbolic' rather than 'transformative' approach to internationalising the university. The evidence is that the three major objectives of the university's internationalisation strategy (enhancing the university's international reputation; promoting the university's international student recruitment; and raising the visibility of the university's research strengths) are primarily business-related activities rather than focusing on challenging the ethnocentric attitudes

and practices in the university and bringing fundamental behavioural and values-based change to the university.

At the same time, I have argued that the social movements and campaigns of decolonisation have brought changes to the university and shaped the institutional context of the university. In the wake of the Black Lives Matter movement in 2020, decolonisation initiatives became prominent in the case study university. A range of initiatives in relation to decolonisation took place in the university – for instance, the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum' run by student and academic staff, the anti-racism taskforce started by the Vice-Chancellor of the university, and so on. These initiatives drew staff and students' attention to the colonial legacies in the institution and issues of racism and inequalities. It should be noted that these initiatives impacted practices both in the classroom and in the wider to challenge ethnocentric ideologies, values, and behaviours, which in a way can be seen as taking a 'transformative' approach (Turner and Robson, 2008) to internationalising the university. This finding illustrates that the institutional culture regarding internationalisation is far more fluid than an analysis of the university's internationalisation strategy paper might suggest. In my view, the institution can be seen as a 'cultural arena' (Holliday, 2011) that offers a space for alternative practices being developed in the institution (such as internationalising the curriculum, decolonising the curriculum, and so on) to challenge the dominant market discourses on internationalisation in the UK higher education sector.

8.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed the factors influencing the ways in which academics engage with internationalisation of the curriculum. My research shows that discipline plays an important role in shaping academics' understandings and practices of internationalising the curriculum. However, using Holliday's (2011) notion of 'cultural arena' as a theoretical lens, I have also argued that Becher and Trowler's (2001) typology

of disciplines tends to conceptualise disciplines and disciplinary cultures as fixed and static entities, thereby essentialising disciplines and disciplinary cultures. Given the limitations of Becher and Trowler's (2001) categorisation of disciplines, I suggest that 'disciplines' can be more usefully thought of as 'cultural arenas' (Holliday, 2011) and disciplines and disciplinary cultures as fluid and ever-changing processes rather than static and fixed entities. This would avoid assigning homogenous disciplinary identities to academics according to the discipline in which they work. It would also avoid generalising/homogenising their beliefs and practices.

Drawing on Turner and Robson's (2008) typology of university policy approaches to internationalisation, I conceptualise the ways in which academics in this study engage with internationalisation of the curriculum as a spectrum, ranging from a 'symbolic' to a 'transformative' approach. It is worth noting that academics who adopted a 'transformative' approach (e.g. Michael, Amy) were more concerned with issues of power and knowledge hierarchies in the curriculum and their teaching practices. Compared to the participants who adopted a 'symbolic' approach to internationalising the curriculum, these participants drew attention to the 'positional superiority' (Said, 1978) of 'Western' knowledge/epistemology and called for dismantling the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the academy and the curriculum. Yet it is worth noting that the participants took different approaches to dismantling the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the curriculum. For example, some participants (e.g. Sarah) adopted binary views of the literature/knowledge and categorised the literature/knowledge into 'Western' and 'non-Western', as a way of challenging the imbalanced views in the curriculum. Drawing on Hall's (1992) notion of 'the West and the Rest', I have argued that adopting/promoting binary views of the literature/knowledge and simply classifying the literature/knowledge into 'Western' and 'non-Western' does not fundamentally interrogate the issues of power and cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production. Moreover, it runs the risk of setting up and strengthening oppositions, which can exacerbate issues such as cultural stereotyping and splitting.

Finally, I have discussed the dissensus between the academic staff and university executives on the meaning of 'internationalisation'. Drawing on Turner and Robson's (2008) typology of university policy approaches to internationalisation, I have argued that the university executives who formulate the internationalisation strategy for the case study university take a 'symbolic' rather than 'transformative' approach to internationalising the university. The evidence is that the three major objectives of the university's internationalisation strategy (enhancing the university's international reputation; promoting the university's international student recruitment; and raising the visibility of the university's research strengths) are primarily business-related activities rather than focusing on challenging the ethnocentric attitudes and practices in the university. Yet it is also worth noting that the Black Lives Matter movement and the decolonisation movement in the UK higher education sector has brought about changes to the case study university and has shaped the institutional context of the university. Using Holliday's (2011) notion of 'cultural arena' as a theoretical lens, I argue that the institutional culture regarding internationalisation is much more fluid than the university's internationalisation strategy paper suggests. The new initiatives in the institution, such as the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum' led by the students and academic staff and the anti-racism initiative started by the Vice-Chancellor of the university, can be seen as taking a 'transformative' approach (Turner and Robson, 2008) to internationalising the university, as they work on interrogating/dismantling the inequalities and hierarchies in the institution and bringing values-based change to the institution.

Chapter 9 Conclusion

9.1 Internationalising or decolonising the curriculum?

My starting point in this research was to explore how academics working in different disciplines engage with internationalisation of the curriculum. As I discussed at the beginning of this thesis, internationalisation of the curriculum is thought to be a concept which is poorly understood and developed in practice (Leask, 2015; Leask and Bridge, 2013; Jones and Killick, 2013; Sanderson, 2011; Clifford, 2009). While there are examples of how internationalisation of the curriculum has been implemented in UK higher education institutions (for instance, see Jones and Killick, 2013, 2007), they tend to be top-down in nature, analysing the initiative of internationalising the curriculum only at the policy level. To fill in this gap in the literature, I chose to take a bottom-up approach to explore how academics working in different disciplines engage with internationalisation of the curriculum, including how they interpret and implement it in practice. The primary aim of my study was to explore the meanings of and approaches to internationalising the curriculum from the perspectives of academics and how these might have changed due to the decolonisation movement in the UK higher education sector.

A key theme that emerged from my investigation on academics' experiences of internationalising the curriculum is 'decolonising the curriculum'. At the early stage of my study, I did not pay any attention to the relationships between internationalisation of the curriculum and decolonising the curriculum. Yet when interviewing the participants about their approaches to internationalising the curriculum, I noticed that some participants (e.g. Michael, Amy) associated their understandings of curriculum internationalisation with the term 'decolonising the curriculum'. From their perspective, internationalisation of the curriculum is not just about adding more diverse cultural perspectives to the curriculum but also acknowledging the cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge

production and dismantling the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the academy and the curriculum. They pointed to the cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production and the importance of decolonising knowledge and the curriculum. In terms of teaching practices, they try to equip students with critical thinking skills to deconstruct 'Western' perspectives in the literature and the curriculum. They not only teach about issues such as decolonisation and gender equality but also model what they advocate in theory in their own classroom. They were aware of the power hierarchies between different groups of people, such as men versus women, teachers versus students, and developed teaching approaches to address these power hierarchies in the classroom.

Upon finding that some participants associated their definition of internationalisation of the curriculum with the term 'decolonising the curriculum', I began to reflect on their links and revisit the meaning of 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. As I analysed their accounts of their approaches to internationalising the curriculum, my conceptualisation of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' evolved. At the beginning of this research, I, like some of the participants (e.g. Emily, Paul), interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' as adding more diverse cultural perspectives to the curriculum to make it international. Whilst I took a 'small cultures' (Holliday, 1999) approach and viewed 'culture' as fluid and ever-changing processes, I still had a depoliticised understanding of cultural differences and did not pay a lot of attention to the issues of power and cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production. Because of this, my conceptualisation of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' could be considered to have been apolitical. While I highlighted the importance of adding diverse cultural perspectives to the curriculum, I did not consider the power hierarchies between different cultures and knowledges and did not think about how to challenge the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the academy and the curriculum. Yet as my research continued, the decolonisation movement became increasingly prominent in the UK higher education sector and particularly impacted on the direction of university policies and strategies on 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. This was a critical moment when I started to reflect on the relationships between 'internationalisation of the curriculum' and

'decolonising the curriculum'. By the end of this study, my conceptualisation of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' has shifted from a depoliticised understanding (adding more diverse cultural perspectives and practices to the curriculum) to a politicised understanding (dismantling the domination of the Eurocentric canon and treating global perspectives and epistemologies as the central tenets of the curriculum).

In my view, the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum' provides us with opportunities to rethink and redefine the concept of 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. However, whilst the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum' has become prominent in UK universities, blockers to the decolonisation initiatives still exist within universities. For example, my research reveals that in some schools of the case study university, the decolonisation initiatives were conflated with equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) initiatives. The conflation of the decolonisation initiatives with the EDI initiatives indicates that some university executives recognise the political nature of the decolonisation initiatives and have decided not to go with the political approach to decolonising the university and the curriculum. This suggests that academic staff in universities may still face institutional constraints and challenges if they want to take a political approach to teaching and learning and decolonising the curriculum.

9.2 Internationalisation of higher education: a decolonial reflection

Nearly 20 years ago, Jane Knight (2004: 11) defined the internationalisation of higher education as 'the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education.' Although her definition has been widely cited in the field, she recently expressed her concern that 'Internationalisation has become a catch-all phrase used to describe anything and everything remotely linked to the global, intercultural or international dimensions of higher education and is thus losing its way' and proposed to reconsider 'the fundamental values underpinning it' (Knight, 2014: 76). In a similar vein, De Wit (2014: 97) argues that

'Internationalisation in higher education is at a turning point and the concept of internationalisation requires an update, refreshment and fine-turning taking into account the new world and higher education order.'

Beyond these more general concerns about the need to re-examine the meaning of 'internationalisation' in higher education, Buckner and Stein (2020: 13) analyse the Eurocentric definitions of internationalisation and note that the dominant Eurocentric approaches to internationalisation are primarily focused on 'aspects of technical implementation and largely avoid the ethical and political dimensions of international engagement.' In analysing discourses on internationalisation put forward by three of the largest international higher education professional associations: NAFSA, the International Association of Universities (IAU), and the European Association for International Education (EAIE), they find that all three associations share understandings of what counts as 'internationalisation', namely: international students, student and scholarly mobility, research partnerships and curricular reforms, and these associations tend to adopt 'a predominantly technical and often quantified approach to measuring internationalisation' (ibid: 2). They contend that the major effect of the dominant Eurocentric approaches to internationalisation is that 'internationalisation is framed as apolitical and largely divorced from broader discussions of historical or geopolitical inequalities, ethical responsibilities, and alternative possibilities for engaging with and across difference' (ibid.). They argue that the dominant Eurocentric approaches to internationalisation that avoid 'the ethical and political dimensions of international engagement' risk 'reproducing uneven relations of local and global power' (ibid: 11).

Buckner and Stein's (2020) observation of the dominant Eurocentric approaches to internationalisation mirrors my analysis of the internationalisation strategy of the case study university. In analysing the case study university's policy discourses on internationalisation, I find that university executives tend to define successful internationalisation in technical terms and emphasise the quantity of international activities, such as international student recruitment, international research partnerships,

and the university's international reputation, rather than a more qualitative consideration of the 'ethical and political possibilities' (Buckner and Stein, 2020) that are enabled by any specific international activities. A key finding is that there is an absence of engagement with political, historical and/or geopolitical dimensions of international relationships and knowledge production in the case study university's internationalisation strategy. This finding is in line with Buckner and Stein's (2020) observation that the dominant Eurocentric approaches to internationalisation tend to be depoliticised – that is, these approaches do not give sufficient attention to the link between internationalisation and broader conversations concerning 'how unequal power shapes relationships across racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and socio-economic difference' (ibid: 11).

It is useful to note that Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni also analyses the shortcomings of the Eurocentric definitions of internationalisation and suggests that the dominant Eurocentric approaches to internationalisation in higher education are based on 'colonial vertical conceptions of internationalisation', which views 'the international' as originating from Europe and North America, while the rest of the world does not have much to offer epistemologically (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2021: 78). He points out that the Eurocentric definitions of internationalisation and the practices that accompany them are based on the histories, realities and needs of academics, practitioners, and higher education systems in the Global North and 'devoid of epistemic and ideological thought' from other cultures (ibid: 79). Upon finding that the Global South has always been side-lined in modern conceptions of 'the international', he suggests that there should be 'a deeper question of which epistemology would anchor an internationalised higher education' (ibid: 85). To counter the dominant Eurocentric approaches to internationalisation, Ndlovu-Gatsheni calls for a 'horizontal non-colonial internationalisation of higher education' which is underpinned by the plurality of knowledges and a 'recognition of the diverse ways through which different people view and make sense of the world' (ibid: 79). He contends that there cannot be a 'genuinely international higher education without decolonisation of knowledge and education' (ibid: 78).

In the light of the shortcomings of the dominant Eurocentric approaches to internationalisation noted by Buckner and Stein (2020) and Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2021) and my observation of how internationalisation has been implemented in the case study university, I argue that it is time to rethink and redefine the project of internationalisation of higher education in the UK and globally from a decolonial and postcolonial perspective. This is because 'failure to engage critically with histories of international engagements makes it likely that existing inequalities in international engagements will simply be reproduced in the imperative to internationalise' (Buckner and Stein, 2020: 12). For example, Buckner and Stein state that 'the terms of international institutional partnerships can easily become dominated by more economically and geopolitically powerful partners, affecting knowledge production', if unequal political, economic, and cultural relations between countries are not acknowledged and critique (ibid: 13). Meanwhile, they suggest that the framings of international students 'not as subjects but as objects of internationalisation, in particular, as objects of Western development by way of education' can 'naturalise and reproduce Eurocentric hierarchies of knowledge and humanity' (ibid.).

Hence, in my view, recognising that internationalisation is never apolitical is important. As Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2021: 94) suggested, 'internationalisation of higher education cannot be a technical and procedural process, it has to be a liberatory and rehumanising project engaging with colonialism and dislocating it.' If the internationalisation of higher education in the UK and globally aims to be 'liberatory and rehumanising' (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2021), it requires 'critical unpacking of its colonial roots, its role in promotion of Euro-American knowledge as the hegemonic canon, and its contribution to the maintenance of coloniality' (Heleta, 2022: 11). It also requires 'a clear vision on how to go about dismantling the Eurocentric domination in knowledge, higher education and internationalisation, and the notion of university that centres the Euro-American knowledge as the only credible way of knowing and thinking that the other in the global South must replicate and follow' (ibid.).

9.3 Pedagogical implications

A key finding of this research is that academics interpreted 'internationalisation of the curriculum' in different ways and adopted different approaches to the endeavour. The diverse approaches to internationalising the curriculum that I have analysed in Chapter 6, in my view, have pedagogical implications for academics who engage with it. My research reveals that there is not a 'one-size-fits-all' approach to internationalising the curriculum. As Green and Merova (2016: 231) suggest, internationalisation of the curriculum can be conceptualised as 'a construct' rather than 'a set of prescribed practices'. In the light of my research findings, I argue that 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is more of an 'ethos' rooted in academics' beliefs and values and university policies and strategies should not prescribe how academics internationalise the curriculum. My aim in this section is not to give specific recommendations on how to internationalise the curriculum but to use the participants' accounts of their approaches to internationalising the curriculum that I analysed and discussed in this study as a basis to stimulate academics to reflect on their own conceptualisation of the curriculum and their teaching methods, beliefs, and practices.

My research reveals that the ways in which academics positioned themselves in relation to students were different and this impacted on their strategies and approaches to internationalising the curriculum. Some participants (e.g. Emily, Paul) preferred to draw on their expertise and experience to teach and were less comfortable and confident in teaching examples from the countries that they were not familiar with. They expressed their concern that students might challenge them and ask them questions that they could not answer. This indicates that they viewed themselves as the transmitters of knowledge to students and they worried that if they could not provide answers, their authority as the teacher would be challenged. By contrast, some participants (e.g. Lily, Lisa, James) were less worried of finding themselves in a situation where students had more knowledge of a topic than them. Indeed, they actively tried to democratise the classroom by encouraging students to bring their examples, perspectives, and experiences to the

class. They viewed the curriculum as not a given but constructed by the interactions between teachers and students in the classroom (Kelly, 2009). Furthermore, they treated teaching as a mutual process in which both teachers and students are learners.

My research reveals that the ways in which academics viewed the role/responsibility of teachers were also different and this impacted on their strategies and approaches to internationalising the curriculum. For example, some participants (e.g. Hailey, Andrew) viewed their role/responsibility as a teacher as conveying/transmitting knowledge to students. They paid less attention to cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production. They believed that the procedures for knowledge production in their discipline are 'impersonal' and 'value free'. By contrast, some participants (e.g. Sarah, Jenny, Michael, Amy) viewed their role/responsibility as a teacher as about challenging and dismantling power and inequalities in the academy. Their accounts of their approaches to internationalising the curriculum suggest that they paid attention to the cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production and the strategies and approaches they developed were about challenging and dismantling the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the curriculum.

It is worth noting that academics took different approaches to dismantling the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the curriculum. Some participants (e.g. Sarah) classified the literature into 'Western' and 'non-Western' and stated that they tried to add more non-'Western' perspectives to the curriculum content. By contrast, some participants (e.g. Amy) stated that they not only added more diverse cultural perspectives to the curriculum content but also tried to challenge the power of the Eurocentric canon in the academy and the curriculum. Their accounts suggest that they tried to embed the ethos of equality and social justice in every aspect of their teaching practices, including selecting the literature and reading list, interacting with students in the classroom, and assessing students' assignments and learning outcomes. For example, they stated that they paid attention to the power hierarchies between teachers and students. To challenge these power hierarchies, they actively sought to empower the students to bring

their knowledge and perspectives to class and made a point of letting the students know that their knowledge and perspectives are equally important as those of teachers.

To summarise, my findings suggest that academics' approaches to internationalising the curriculum are closely related to how they position themselves in relation to students, how they conceptualise the curriculum, how they look at teaching and learning, and how they view their role/responsibility as a teacher. I hope that the participants' approaches to internationalising the curriculum that I have discussed in this section can inspire academics to reflect on their conceptualisation of the curriculum and to develop their own ways of internationalising the curriculum.

9.4 Policy implications

My aim in this section is to reflect on the policy implications of my findings for the case study university and UK universities more generally. In the light of my findings, I make the following recommendations for university executives in the case study university and other UK universities to consider when they formulate their university's internationalisation strategies. The recommendations that I make are not intended as a checklist or model for university executives. Rather, I think it is important that university executives formulate internationalisation strategies as per the national and institutional context of their university, rather than seeking to adopt the approaches of other institutions. Leask (2022: 176) states that 'in this constantly changing, interconnected world, it is more important than ever that systems and institutions construct and live their own unique internationalisation story, whilst connecting with others' stories.' She suggests that university executives and managers should think outside of existing dominant paradigms of internationalisation and approach internationalisation as 'a complex endeavour, a journey towards specific goals relevant to the context of the university, its students and the nation' (ibid.). I agree with Leask's point that internationalisation of higher education is context sensitive. I frame the following

recommendations more as suggestions and hope that they can inspire university executives to reflect on their practices and develop a more dynamic approach to formulating internationalisation strategies that are suitable for their university. For each recommendation, I add my reflections on the challenges and constraints involved in implementing them in practice.

Firstly, I suggest that university executives treat 'internationalisation' as more than international student recruitment. My research reveals that the case study university's internationalisation strategy is largely shaped by the market discourses and practices currently permeating UK higher education. In an analysis of the university's internationalisation strategy paper, I discovered that the three major objectives of the university's internationalisation strategy (namely, enhancing the university's international reputation; promoting international student recruitment; and raising the visibility of the university's research strength) are primarily focused on the economic and reputational outcomes of internationalisation. This finding to some extent illustrates the impact of the marketisation of UK higher education on the formulation of internationalisation strategies in UK universities. As I discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.2, the decline in funding from the UK government for higher education has driven UK universities to seek expansion of their financial base and become aggressive in competing with universities both at home and abroad to recruit international students. In addition, the UK government policy on international student recruitment – notably the PMI and the PMI2 – has had a considerable and lasting impact on UK universities' policies and strategies. It is thus not surprising to see that the university executives in the case study university consider international student recruitment as a key aspect of their internationalisation strategy.

Driven by the globalisation of the higher education market and marketisation of UK higher education, recruiting more international students will continue to be a priority for UK universities. However, it is important to note that 'internationalisation' is not limited to international student recruitment but should encompass the teaching, research, and

service functions of university (Knight, 2004; Leask, 2015). It seems that university executives need to remember that 'internationalisation' is not equivalent to international student recruitment when they formulate university policies and strategies on internationalisation.

Secondly, I suggest that university executives treat 'transformative' internationalisation (Turner and Robson, 2008) as an important goal and tenet of their university's wider policies and strategies. According to Turner and Robson, 'transformative' internationalisation can be conceptualised as 'much about values of international reciprocity within the institutional ethical and belief system as it is about skillful teaching and learning practices, requiring individuals to move from ethnocentric to an ethnorelative position' (ibid: 126). My research reveals that the decolonisation movement in the UK higher education system has brought changes to the case study university and shaped the institutional context of the university. For example, bottom-up and grassroots initiatives of decolonisation led by students and academic staff have called for attention to issues of coloniality, racism, and inequality in the case study university and sought to challenge the ethnocentric ideologies and practices in the institution. In my view, the bottom-up and grassroots initiatives of decolonisation led by students and academic staff are in line with the 'transformative' approach to internationalising the university suggested by Turner and Robson (2008). This is because these decolonisation initiatives are concerned with building impetus for long-term, fundamental behavioral and values-based change within the university. Yet it is worth noting that the decolonisation initiatives are often not recognised as the means to internationalise the university by the university executives. I thus suggest that university executives should acknowledge the role of the bottom-up and grassroots initiatives of decolonisation in the process of internationalising the university and support a healthy, two-way flow between institution-led and student/academic staff-led initiatives to internationalise the university.

However, there is also a danger that university policies and strategies might defuse the political elements and intentions of the decolonisation initiatives led by students and

academic staff. My research reveals that bottom-up and grassroots initiatives of decolonisation tend to be 'depoliticised' once they are included into university's policies and strategies. The evidence is that some university executives have conflated the decolonisation initiatives with the equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) initiatives (see Chapter 7, Section 7.4). This finding reveals the challenges and constraints for including bottom-up and grassroots initiatives of decolonisation into university's wider policies and strategies – i.e. the political elements and intentions of the decolonisation initiatives might be defused and depoliticised when they are included into university's policies and strategies.

Finally, I suggest that university executives engage academic staff and students in the process of formulating university's internationalisation strategies and listen to their voices. My research reveals that the formulation of the internationalisation strategy in the case study university was not in collaboration with academic staff. Webb (2005: 109) notes that 'the need to explain why internationalisation is an important issue, and an especial one for an organization such as a university … Academics generally require compelling reason and argument before accepting any institutional strategy.' My research reveals that some academic staff in the case study university were not convinced by the ethos and values embedded in the university's internationalisation strategy. There is evidence that some academic staff are critical of the university's internationalisation strategy and view the way that university executives treat 'internationalisation' as merely instrumental, used as a tool to raise the university's reputation and recruit international students. To better engage academic staff in the process of internationalising the university, I suggest that university executives should engage academic staff in the process of formulating their university's internationalisation strategies and develop some shared goals for internationalisation with academic staff. Turner and Robson note that:

> 'personal engagement and positive motivations of individual people within an institution are not only essential in securing a shift to the ethnorelative position inherent in deep internationalisation orientation

but are also prerequisites for long-term international engagement at an institutional level' (Turner and Robson, 2008: 39).

As Turner and Robson suggest, I believe that to engage academic staff in the process of formulating university's internationalisation strategies can stimulate their interest in engaging with the institution-led initiative of internationalisation and enhance their trust in university's internationalisation strategies.

My research also reveals that the Student Union has a different stance on the meaning of 'decolonisation' from the university executives and academic staff in some schools of the case study university. This suggests that there should be more spaces not only for academic staff but also students to have a voice in the process of formulating university's internationalisation strategies. I suggest that university executives should listen to the voices of academic staff and students and engage them as partners in the formulation of their university's internationalisation strategies to ensure that the goals for university's internationalisation are both aspirational and achievable.

Yet as I pointed out earlier in this section, university executives and managers might defuse and neglect the political elements and intentions of the decolonisation initiatives led by students and academic staff. It is useful to note that there are management hierarchies in higher education institutions and academic staff can face more pressures than students in reporting their opinions to the university executives and managers. My research reveals that the perspectives of academic staff and students are not always taken seriously by university executives and managers, even though they are invited to meetings to discuss university policies and strategies (see Chapter 7, Section 7.5).

It is also worth noting that university executives and managers tend to use simple quantifiable measures to evaluate their university's internationalisation performance. This might be because, in the global university league tables, universities are ranked primarily according to quantitative data, and qualitative data is more likely to be disregarded in evaluating the university's success (Wihlborg and Robson, 2018). As I discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.5.1, Rolfe (2013: 9) suggests that there is a danger that

'excellence' under the notion of 'University of Excellence' is conceptualised as 'defining, operationalizing, measuring and operating the standards of researching and teaching' rather than 'the content of what is to be researched and taught.' He suggests that under the notion of 'University of Excellence', the 'delivery of excellence' through research and teaching is prone to be replaced by the 'administration of excellence', which results in a shift from 'researcher and teacher accountability' to 'administration and accountancy' as the means of maintenance and evaluation of the excellence of university (ibid.). In the light of my findings and Rolfe's point about the 'administration of excellence', I argue that there is a danger that university executives and managers might evaluate their university's internationalisation performance tightly based on quantifiable objectives. As a result, the evaluation of the internationalisation and decolonisation initiatives led by students and academic staff might become institutionalised and bureaucratic.

9.5 Original contribution of this study

As I explained at the beginning of this thesis (see Chapter 1, Section 1.2), the importance of incorporating an international and intercultural dimension into the curriculum has been recognised by scholars working in the higher education sector (see, for example, Leask, 2015; Trahar and Hyland, 2011; Luxon and Peelo, 2009; Turner and Robson, 2008). Yet there are still few examples in the literature about how 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is being implemented in the context of UK higher education. My study fills this gap in the literature by employing an ethnographic-style case study approach to explore how academics working in different disciplines in a UK university engage with internationalisation of the curriculum – including how they interpret and implement it in practice.

Findings of my study show that academics have different understandings of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' and take different approaches to internationalising the curriculum. More importantly, my study has found that academics'

understandings and practices with regard to internationalising the curriculum are closely related to a series of factors, such as how they look at the world and different country experiences, what they understand to be the purpose of university education, how they view their discipline/subject, their approach to teaching, and how they perceive knowledge hierarchies in the academy. This finding makes a significant contribution to the literature on how 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is being implemented in the context of UK higher education. It suggests that university policies and strategies should not prescribe how academics internationalise the curriculum because 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is more of an 'ethos' rooted in academics' beliefs and values than a simple syllabus or body of knowledge delivered to students.

The original contribution of my study also lies in the new theoretical lenses that I adopted to explore academics' engagement with internationalisation of the curriculum. Firstly, by taking Holliday's (1999, 2011) notions of 'small cultures', 'cultural realities' and 'cultural arenas' as the overarching theoretical lenses, my study moves beyond the dominant framing of 'culture' as fixed and static entities in university policy documents. Instead, 'culture' is considered to be fluid and ever-changing processes in this study. In this conceptual shift, my study has focused on how the social contexts in which academics work and teach shape their understandings and practices with regard to internationalising the curriculum. Drawing on Holliday's (1999, 2011) notions of 'small cultures', 'cultural realities' and 'cultural arenas', I argue that academics' engagement with internationalisation of the curriculum can be understood as a social and intercultural learning practice through which academics are constantly learning new cultural beliefs, values, and practices and negotiating them with the ones that they have learnt in other cultural contexts.

Secondly, the findings of my research have confirmed that discipline is an important factor influencing how academics engage with internationalisation of the curriculum (also see Leask and Bridge, 2013; Clifford, 2009; Sawir, 2011). Yet it is worth noting that a fluid and dynamic view of 'culture' suggested by Street (1993) and Holliday (1999, 2011)

complicates the notions of disciplines and disciplinary cultures. Using Holliday's (2011) notion of 'cultural arena' as a theoretical lens, I argue that Becher and Trowler's (2001) typology of disciplines tends to conceptualise disciplines and disciplinary cultures as fixed and static entities, thereby essentialising disciplines and disciplinary cultures. My findings suggest that it is not appropriate to generalise that all academics working in what Becher and Trolwer (2001) terms the 'hard pure' disciplines are more resistant to engaging in the discourse of internationalisation. Given the limitations of Becher and Trolwer's (2001) conceptualisation and categorisation of disciplines, I argue that 'disciplines' can be more usefully thought of as 'cultural arenas'. This would make it possible to view disciplines and disciplinary cultures as fluid and ever-changing processes and avoid the assigning of homogenous disciplinary identities to academics according to the discipline in which they work.

Thirdly, the findings of my study show that some participants tend to promote binary views of the literature/knowledge and categorise the literature/knowledge into 'Western' and 'non-Western'. Using Hall's (1992) notion of 'the West and the Rest' as a theoretical lens, I argue that associating the literature/knowledge with the ethnicity/nationality of scholars and classifying the literature/knowledge into 'Western' and 'non-Western' might polarise the literature/knowledge, with the result that the discourse of 'the West' and 'the Rest' is reproduced. I also argue that promoting these binary views and categorising the literature/knowledge into 'Western' and 'non-Western' as a way of challenging the imbalanced views in the curriculum does not fundamentally interrogate/solve the issues of power and cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production. Moreover, this approach runs the risk of setting up oppositions, which can exacerbate issues such as cultural stereotyping and splitting.

Finally, in this study, I have drawn on Turner and Robson's (2008) typology of university policy approaches to internationalisation not only to analyse university's internationalisation strategies but also to gain insights into academics' positions and practices with regard to internationalising the curriculum. I have conceptualised the ways

in which academics engage with internationalisation of the curriculum as a spectrum, ranging from a 'symbolic' approach to a 'transformative' approach. The 'symbolic' approach can be understood as integrating more diverse cultural perspectives and practices into the curriculum content to make the curriculum international, whereas the 'transformative' approach draws attention to the cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production and seeks to challenge/dismantle the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the academy and the curriculum. For me, using Turner and Robson's (2008) typology of university policy approaches to internationalisation as a theoretical lens through which to analyse academics' positions and practices provides original insights into the ongoing debates about the meanings of and approaches to internationalising the curriculum.

In sum, my study contributes to knowledge both empirically and theoretically on the topic of internationalisation of the curriculum. The findings of my study have important implications not only for academics' practices with regard to internationalising and decolonising the curriculum but also for university's future policies and strategies on internationalisation and decolonisation.

9.6 Limitations of this study and future research directions

My study is of course not without limitations. One limitation is that my understanding and interpretation of academics' practices of internationalising the curriculum were mainly based on what they said they did rather than what I saw them doing in the classroom. I did not conduct many observations of the participants' teaching sessions partly because it was difficult to gain access to their classrooms. As I explained in Chapter 4, Section 4.5, through a series of email communications with the participants, only eleven academics were willing to be observed. As for the eleven academic staff whom I observed, my observations ranged from four sessions (the most) to one session (the least), depending on which session they invited me to attend and observe (see Appendix A). The difficulty

of gaining access to the participants' class limited the opportunities to observe their practices in the classroom. Moreover, I did not conduct many observations also due to my lack of understanding and familiarity of some disciplines. As I explained in Chapter 4, Section 4.6.1, my strategy for observations was not to compare academics' practices and their accounts of their practices; instead, it was used to get more information about their practices in the classroom so as to inform the interview questions I then asked. Due to the limitations of my knowledge about some disciplines (e.g. mathematics), I decided not to focus too much on observing these academics' practices in the classroom.

Another limitation that I think is significant is that my understanding and interpretation of the case study university's internationalisation strategies were mainly based on documentary analysis of the university strategy papers on internationalisation and interviews with academic staff. In developing my documentary analysis, I did not interview university executives or managers, nor did I use their views to interrogate the statements of academic staff regarding the university's internationalisation strategies. This is a gap in my research sample and could have been improved if I had noticed it earlier. Yet I realised that this was a gap at a very late stage of my research when I had nearly completed my thesis.

Having reflected on the limitations of my study, I would like to make two recommendations for future research directions. Firstly, my study and previous studies (e.g. Clifford and Montgomery, 2017; Green and Mertova, 2016; Leask, 2015; Sawir, 2011; Clifford, 2009) both focus on exploring academics' perceptions and practices of internationalising the curriculum. It would be interesting to see how students perceive 'internationalisation of the curriculum' and their experiences in relation to 'internationalisation of the curriculum' in higher education institutions. When I analysed academics' approaches to internationalising the curriculum, I found that many academic staff made assumptions about students' learning interests and needs (for instance, see Chapter 6, Section 6.3). For future research, it would be worthwhile exploring students' views on their curriculum and the learning outcomes they expected from the

course/programme that they chose. A study of this kind would help academic staff reflect on their teaching practices and adjust the curriculum and their teaching methods to students' different learning interests and needs.

Another recommendation that I make for future research is to conduct comparative studies of universities in different countries. When reviewing the literature on 'internationalisation of the curriculum', I noticed that there are few comparative studies on the implementation of 'internationalisation of the curriculum' in universities across different countries. For future research, it would be worthwhile exploring more about how 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is implemented in different national and institutional contexts and how such contexts shape academics' engagement in internationalising the curriculum.

9.7 Concluding remarks

When I started my research in 2017, the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum' had not received widespread attention in the UK higher education sector. In the aftermath of the Black Lives Matter movement in 2020, the initiative has continued to gather momentum and has become strategically important for UK universities. My research findings about academics' beliefs and practices of internationalising the curriculum speak to various issues in relation to the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum', such as: 'What does 'decolonising the curriculum' mean in teaching practices?'; 'How do academic staff challenge the ethnocentrism in the curriculum?'; and 'What can university executives and managers do to support student and academic staff-led initiatives of 'decolonising the curriculum'?'. My findings reveal that the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum' led by students and academic staff is closely linked to the notion of 'transformative' internationalisation (Turner and Robson, 2008), which attempts to challenge the ethnocentric values and practices in the classroom and the institution.

Whilst the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum' continues to gather momentum and many UK universities have made public statements in which they make commitments to decolonisation, it is worth noting that the institutional cultures and epistemological traditions are not easily changed and the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum' may face a backlash in universities and fail to address issues of power and inequalities in the institution in any fundamental way. Arday, Belluigi and Thomas (2021) point out that the curriculum in UK higher education is to a large extent intertwined with aspects of cultural and racial inequalities in the UK academy. They articulate the view that the current institutional cultures and structures in UK higher education are not conducive to substantial curriculum reform because cultural, economic, political, and knowledge-based oppressions still exist throughout UK society, the academy, and institutions. They suggest that the pedagogical transformation of a more diverse curriculum will 'require a dismantling of the Master's House to ensure a pathway through for all who wish to engage in a more inclusive and less oppressive pedagogy' (ibid: 309).

It is worth noting that the institutional imperatives of a neoliberal university also pose challenges and constraints for those academics who engage with the initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum'. Joseph (2011) points out that in the neoliberal knowledge economy, disciplines/subjects such as feminist studies, ethnic and racial studies, and postcolonial studies which interrogate issues of power, inclusion/exclusion, and oppression are not as valued as those that locate themselves within mainstream knowledge traditions such as applied sciences and psychology. She argues that academics located at the margins are constrained by the material and social inequalities operating in the higher education sector; they face difficulties in engaging in discussions on cultural hierarchies operating in the academy and public spaces because different ways of knowing and being are not often acknowledged or rewarded within an institution in which academics are pushed to take on performative neoliberal subject positions.

The initiative of 'decolonising the curriculum' creates opportunities for critical examinations of the privileging of certain knowledges and the marginalisation of others

in the curriculum in UK universities. It offers possibilities for questioning the cultural hierarchies in the process of knowledge production that have largely remained unquestioned, not only in the UK academy but also globally. However, there is a danger that the university's strategic advancement of the 'decolonisation of the curriculum' initiative might contribute to an institutional taming or a dilution of the radical message of decolonisation, 'especially when top-down initiatives and strategies are pursued while leaving intact the structures and processes that perpetuate coloniality' (Shain et al., 2021: 921). Therefore, how to move away from a 'symbolic' to a 'transformative' approach (Turner and Robson, 2008) to internationalising and decolonising the curriculum and dismantling the institutional cultures and practices that perpetrate coloniality and racial inequalities, seems an important question for all those who engage with the work of internationalisation and decolonisation in the sector of higher education, to consider. It is an ongoing conversation and to achieve this goal requires time and the collective effort of university stakeholders.

References

Agar, M. (1996). *The Professional Stranger: An Informal Introduction to Ethnography*. (2nd Ed.). San Diego: Academic Press.

Ake, C. (1982). *Social Science as Imperialism: The Theory of Political Development*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Andrews, K. (2019). Blackness, Empire and Migration: How Black Studies Transform the Curriculum. *Area*, *10*, 1-7.

Arday, J., Belluigi, D. Z. & Thomas, D. (2021). Attempting to Break the Chain: Reimaging Inclusive Pedagogy and Decolonising the Curriculum within the Academy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 53*(3), 298-313.

Assalahi, H. (2015). The Philosophical Foundations of Educational Research: A Beginner's Guide. *American Journal of Educational Research, 3*(3), 312-317.

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of Universities: A University Culture-Based Framework. *Higher education, 45*(1), 43-70.

Baumann, G. (1996). *Contesting Culture: Discourses of Identity in Multi-Ethnic London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academics Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Milton Keynes: Society for Research into Higher education and Open University Press.

Becher, T. & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines*. (2nd Ed.). Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher education and Open University Press.

Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, *93*, 518-533

Bennett, R. & Kane, S. (2011). Internationalization of UK University Business Schools: A Survey of Current Practice. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 15*(4), 351-373.

Biglan, A. (1973). The Characteristics of Subject Matter in Different Scientific Areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*(3), 195-203.

Blaikie, N. (2010). *Designing Social Research: The Logic of Anticipation.* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourn, D. (2011). From Internationalisation to Global Perspectives. *Higher Education Research & Development, 30*(5), 559-571.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful Qualitative Research: A Practical Guide for Beginners.* London: SAGE Publications.

Braun, V., Clarke, V. & Weate, P. (2016). Using Thematic Analysis in Sport and Exercise Research. In B. Smith & A. C. Sparkes (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise.* (pp. 191-205). London: Routledge.

Brown, R. (2015). The Marketisation of Higher Education: Issues and Ironies. *New Vistas, 1*(1), 4-9.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buckner, E. & Stein, S. (2020). What Counts as Internationalisation? Deconstructing the Internationalisation Imperative. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 24*(2), 1-16.

Burgess, R. G. (1984). *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research*. London: George Allen & Unwin (Publishers) Ltd.

Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. London: SAGE Publications.

Clark, B. R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross National Perspective*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Clay, J. (1996). Scientific Literacy: Whose Science? Whose Literacy? In D. Baker, J. Clay & C. Fox (Eds.), *Challenging ways of knowing: In English, Maths and Science*. London: The Falmer Press.

Clifford, V. A. (2009). Engaging the Disciplines in Internationalising the Curriculum. *International Journal for Academic Development, 14*(2), 133–143.

Clifford, V. & Montgomery, C. (2017). Designing an Internationalised Curriculum for Higher Education: Embracing the Local and the Global Citizen. *Higher Education Research & Development, 36*(6), 1138–1151.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education*. (7th Ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.

Crawford, G., Mai-Bornu, Z., & Landström, K. (2021). Decolonising Knowledge Production on Africa: Why it's Still Necessary and What Can Be Done. *Journal of the British Academy*, *9*(s1), 21-46.

De Vita, G. & Case, P. (2003). Rethinking the Internationalisation Agenda in UK Higher Education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 27*(4), 383-398.

De Wit, H. & Merkx, G. (2012). The History of Internationalisation of Higher Education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. De Wit, J. D. Heyl & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*. London: SAGE Publications.

De Wit, H. (2013). Internationalisation of Higher Education, An Introduction on the Why, How and What. In H. De Wit (Ed.). *An Introduction to Higher Education Internationalisation*. Milan: Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation.

De Wit, H. (2014). The Different Faces and Phases of Internationalisation of Higher Education. In A. Maldonado-Maldonado & R. M. Bassett (Eds.). *The Forefront of International Higher Education: A Festschrift in Honor of Philip G. Altbach*. (pp. 89-99). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Science & Business Media.

Dunne, M., Pryor, J. & Yates, P. (2005). *Becoming a Researcher: A Research Companion for the Social Sciences*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Egron-Polak, E. & Hudson, R. (2014). Internationalisation of Higher Education: Growing Expectations, Fundamental Values. *IAU 4th Global Survey*. Paris: International Association of Universities.

El Magd, N. A. (2016). Why is My Curriculum White? Decolonising the Academy. *NUSconnect.* https://www.nusconnect.org.uk/articles/why-is-my-curriculum-white-decolonising-the-academy

Evans, C. (1995). Choosing People: Recruitment and Selection as Leverage on Subjects and Disciplines. *Studies in Higher Education, 20*(3), 253-265.

Fanon, F. (1961). *The Wretched of the Earth*. London: Penguin.

Fetterman, D. M. (1998). *Ethnography: Step by Step*. London: SAGE Publications.

Fitzgerald, T. (2007). Reading Between the Lines: Documents and Documentary Analysis. In M. Coleman & A. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Research Methods for Educational Leadership and Management*. (pp. 278-294) London: SAGE Publications.

Foskett, N. (2010). Markets, Government, Funding and the Marketisation of UK Higher Education. In M. Molesworth, R. Scullion & E. Nixon (Eds.), *The Marketisation of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Gold, R. L. (1958). Roles in Sociological Field Observations. *Social Forces, 36*(3), 217-223.

Green, W. & Mertova, P. (2016). Transformalists and Transactionists: Towards a More Comprehensive Understanding of Academics' Engagement with 'Internationalisation of the Curriculum'. *Research in Comparative and International Education, 11*(3), 229-246.

Gu, Q., Schweisfurth, M. & Day, C. (2010). Learning and Growing in a 'Foreign' Context: Intercultural Experiences of International Students. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 40*(1), 7-23.

Guardian (2020). Only a Fifth of UK Universities Say They Are 'Decolonising' Curriculum. https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jun/11/only-fifth-of-uk-universities-have-said-they-will-decolonise-curriculum

Gopal, P. (2021). On Decolonisation and the University. *Textual Practice, 35*(6), 873-899.

Green, J. & Bloome, D. (1997). Ethnography and Ethnographers of and in Education: A Situated Perspective, in J. Flood, S. Heath and D. Lapp (Eds.), *A Handbook of Research on Teaching Literacy Through the Communicative and Visual Arts*. (pp. 181-202). New York: Simon and Shuster Macmillan.

Hall, S. (1992). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. In S. Hall & B. Gieben (Eds.), *Formations of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press in Association with Blackwell Publishers and The Open University.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. Wiltshire: The Cromwell Press.

Harrison, N. (2015). Practice, Problems and Power in 'Internationalisation at Home': Critical Reflections on Recent Research Evidence. *Teaching in Higher Education, 20*(4), 412-430.

Heleta, S. (2016). Decolonisation of Higher Education: Dismantling Epistemic Violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. *Transformation in Higher Education, 1*(1), 1-8.

Heleta, S. (2022). Critical review of the policy framework for internationalisation of higher education in South Africa. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 0*(0), 1-17.

Henkel, M. (2000). *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Henkel, M. (2005). Academic Identity and Autonomy in a Changing Policy Environment. *Higher Education, 49*, 155-176.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Culture and Organisations: Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organisations Across Cultures*. (2nd Ed.). London: SAGE Publications.

Holliday, A. (1999). Small Cultures. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(2), 237-264.

Holliday, A. (2011). *Intercultural Communication & Ideology*. London: SAGE Publications.

Jackson, C. (2006). Feminism Spoken Here: Epistemologies for Interdisciplinary Development Research. *Development and Change, 37*(3), 525-547.

Jones, E. & Killick, D. (2007). Internationalisation of the Curriculum. In E. Jones & S. Brown (Eds.), *Internationalising Higher Education*. (pp. 109-119). London: Routledge.

Jones, E. & Killick, D. (2013). Graduate Attributes and the Internationalized Curriculum: Embedding a Global Outlook in Disciplinary Learning Outcomes. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(2), 165–182.

Jones, E. (2017). Problematising and Reimagining the Notion of 'International Student Experience'. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(5), 933-943.

Johnson, R. B. & Christensen, L. (2014). *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches*. (5th Ed.). London: SAGE Publications.

Joseph, C. (2011). Internationalizing the Curriculum: Pedagogy for Social Justice. *Current Sociology, 60*(2), 239-257.

Kelly, A. V. (2009). *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice*. (6ᵗʰ Ed.). London: SAGE Publications.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalisation Remodelled: Definition, Approaches and Rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*(1), 5-31.

Knight, J. (2014). Is Internationalisation of Higher Education Having an Identity Crisis? In A. Maldonado-Maldonado & R. M. Bassett (Eds.). *The Forefront of International Higher Education: A Festschrift in Honor of Philip G. Altbach*. (pp. 75-87). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Science & Business Media.

Knorr Cetina, K. (1999). *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kolb, D.A. (1981). Learning Styles and Disciplinary Differences. In A. Chickering (Ed.), *The Modern American College.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Leask, B. (2005). Internationalisation of the Curriculum: Teaching and Learning. In J. Carroll & R. Janette (Eds.), *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Leask, B. (2009). Using Formal and Informal Curricula to Improve Interactions Between Home and International Students. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(2), 205-221.

Leask, B. & Bridge, C. (2013). Comparing Internationalisation of the Curriculum in Action Across Disciplines: Theoretical and Practical Perspectives. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 43*(1), 79–101.

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the Curriculum*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Leask, B. (2022). Leading and Managing Internationalisation – Crafting Your Own Unique Story: An Interview with Betty Leask. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Leadership Studies, 3*(2), 174-183.

Leonardo, Z. (2016). The Color of Supremacy. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of Critical Race Theory in Education*. (pp. 265-277). New York: Routledge.

Liyanage, M. (2020). Miseducation: Decolonising Curricula, Culture and Pedagogy in UK Universities. *HEPI (Higher Education Policy Institute) Debate Paper 23*. Oxford: Higher

Education Policy Institute. https://www.hepi.ac.uk/2020/07/23/new-report-calls-for-decolonisation-of-universities-in-order-address-the-silent-crisis-in-universities/

Lofland, J., Snow, D., Anderson, L. & Lofland, L. H. (2006). *Analysing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. (4th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lomer, S. (2016). International Students in UK Policy from 1999 to 2013: Rationales for Recruitment and Representations of Students. http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/12269

Luxon, T. & Peelo, M. (2009). Internationalisation: Its Implications for Curriculum Design and Course Development in UK Higher Education. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 46*(1), 51–60.

Maringe, F., Foskett, N. & Woodfield, S. (2013). Emerging Internationalisation Models in an Uneven Global Terrain: Findings from a Global Survey. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 43*(1), 9-36.

Mauthner, N. S. & Doucet, A. (2003). Reflexive Accounts and Accounts of Reflexivity in Qualitative Data Analysis. *Sociology, 37*(3), 413-431.

McNess, E., Arthur, L. & Crossley, M. (2016). 'Ethnographic Dazzle' and the Construction of the 'Other': Shifting Boundaries Between the Insider and the Outsider. In M. Crossley, L. Arthur and E. McNess (Eds.), *Revising Insider-Outsider Research in Comparative and International Education*. (pp. 21-38). Bristol: Symposium Books Ltd.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mignolo, W. D. (2000). The Geopolitics of Knowledge and the Colonial Difference. *South Atlantic Quarterly, 101*(1), 57-96.

Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook.* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M. & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Method Sourcebook.* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Millora, C., Maimunah, S. & Still, E. (2020). Reflecting on the Ethics of PhD Research in the Global South: Exploring Reciprocity, Reflexivity and Situatedness. *Acta Academica, 52*(1): 67-87.

Mitchell, J. C. (1984). Case Studies. In P. F. Ellen (Ed.), *Ethnographic Research: A Guide to General Conduct*. (pp. 237-241). California: Academic Press.

Namey, E., Guest, G., Thairu, L. & Johnson, L. (2008). Data Reduction Techniques for Large Qualitative Data Sets. In G. Guest and K. M. MacQueen (Eds.), *Handbook for Team-Based Qualitative Research.* (pp. 137-162). Plymouth: AltaMira Press.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2021). Internationalisation of Higher Education for Pluriversity: A Decolonial Reflection. *Journal of the British Academy, 9*(1), 77-98.

Newman, I., Benz, C. R. & Ridenour, C. S. (1998). *Qualitative-Quantitative Research Methodology: Exploring the Interactive Continuum*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Nkrumah, K. (1973). *Revolutionary Path*. London: PANAF Books.

Ogawa, M. (1989). Beyond the Tacit Framework of 'Science' and 'Science Education' Among Science Educators. In E. Whitelegg, E. Thomas & S. Tresman (Eds.), *Challenges and Opportunities for Science Education*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Palmer, C. (2016). Ethics in Sport and Exercise Research: From Research Ethics Committees to Ethics in the Field. In B. Smith & A. C. Sparkes (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise*. (pp. 316-329). London: Routledge.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Pietkiewicz, I. & Smith, J. A. (2014). A Practical Guide to Using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis in Qualitative Research Psychology. *Czasopismo Psychologiczne Psychological Journal, 20*(1), 7-14.

Pietsch, T. (2013). Empire and higher education internationalisation. *University World News.* https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20130718115637589

Pilkington, A. (2013). The Interacting Dynamics of Institutional Racism in Higher Education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 16*(2), 225-245.

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, Catharsis, or Cure? Rethinking the Uses of Reflexivity as Methodological Power in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(2), 175-196.

Pimblott, K. (2020). Decolonising the University: The Origins and Meaning of a Movement. *The Political Quarterly, 91*(1), 210-216.

RMFO (2016). RHODESMUSTFALL: Our Aim. https://rmfoxford.wordpress.com/about/

Robinson-Pant, A. (2016). Exploring the Concept of Insider-Outsider in Comparative and International Research: Essentialising Culture or Culturally Essential? In M. Crossley, L. Arthur and E. McNess (Eds.), *Revising Insider-Outsider Research in Comparative and International Education*. (pp. 39-55). Bristol: Symposium Books Ltd.

Robson, S. (2011). Internationalization: A Transformative Agenda for Higher Education? *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 17*(6), 619-630

Rolfe, G. (2013). *The University in Dissent: Scholarship in the Corporate University.* London: Routledge.

Ryan, J. (2011). Teaching and Learning for International Students: Towards a Transcultural Approach. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 17*(6), 631-648.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.

Said, E. (1994). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.

Sanderson, G. (2011). Internationalisation and Teaching in Higher Education. *Higher Education Research & Development, 30*(5), 661-676.

Sarangi, S. (1995). Culture. In J. Verschueren (Ed.), *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sawir, E. (2011). Academic Staff Response to International Students and Internationalising the Curriculum: The Impact of Disciplinary Differences. *International Journal for Academic Development, 16*(1), 45-57.

Shain, F., Yıldız, Ü. K., Poku, V. & Gokay, B. (2021). From Silence to 'Strategic Advancement': Institutional Responses to 'Decolonising' in Higher Education in England. *Teaching in Higher Education, 26*(7-8), 920-936.

Shay, S. (2016). Decolonising the Curriculum: It's Time for a Strategy. *The Conversation.* https://theconversation.com/decolonisingthe-curriculum-its-time-for-a-strategy-60598

Shilliam, R. (2014). Black Academia in Britain. *The Disorder of Things.* https://thedisorderofthings.com/2014/07/28/black-academia-in-britain/

Simons, H. (2009). *Case Study Research in Practice*. London: SAGE Publications.

Simons, H. (2014). *Case Study Research: In-Depth Understanding in Context*. Oxford: Handbooks Online.

Smith, B. & Caddick, N. (2012). Qualitative Methods in Sport: A Concise Overview for Guiding Social Scientific Sport Research. *Asia Pacific Journal of Sport and Social Sciences, 1*(1), 60-73.

Smith, B. & Sparkes, A. C. (2016). Interviews: Qualitative Interviewing in the Sport and Exercise Sciences. In B. Smith & A.C. Sparkes (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise.* (pp. 103-123). London: Routledge.

Sparkes, A.C. & Smith, B. (2014). *Qualitative Research Methods in Sport, Exercise and Health: From Process to Product*. London: Routledge.

Spivak, G. C. (1994). Can the Subaltern Speak? In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory: A Reader*. (pp. 66-111). New York: Harvester.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. London: SAGE Publications.

Street, B. (1993). Culture is a Verb: Anthropological Aspects of Language and Cultural Process. In D. Graddol, L. Thompson & M. Byram (Eds.), *Language and Culture*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Svensson, L. & Wihlborg, M. (2010). Internationalising the Content of Higher Education: The Need for a Curriculum Perspective. *Higher Education, 60*(6), 595–613.

Swartz, S. (2011). 'Going Deep' and 'Giving Back': Strategies for Exceeding Ethical Expectations When Researching Amongst Vulnerable Youth. *Qualitative Research, 11*(1), 47-68.

Tate, S. A. & Bagguley, P. (2017). Building the Anti-Racist University: Next Steps. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 20*(3). 289-299.

Tedlock, B. (2000). Ethnography and Ethnographic Representation. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (pp. 458-486) California: SAGE Publications.

Thiong'o, N. W. (1986). *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey.

Thornton, R. (1988). Culture: A Contemporary Definition. In E. Boonzaeir & J. Sharp (Eds.), *Keywords*. Cape Town: David Philip.

Trahar, S. & Hyland, F. (2011). Experiences and Perceptions of Internationalisation in Higher Education in the UK. *Higher Education Research & Development, 30*(5), 623-633.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. (2nd Ed.). London: Zed Books.

Turner, J. (2011). *Language in the Academy: Cultural Reflexivity and Intercultural Dynamics*. Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Turner, Y. & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalising the University*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Universities UK International (2020). International facts and figures 2020. *London: University UK International.* https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/international-facts-figures-2020.aspx

Van Gyn, G., Schuerholz-Lehr, S., Caws, C. & Preece, A. (2009). Education for World-Mindedness: Beyond Superficial Notions of Internationalisation. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Internationalizing the Curriculum in Higher Education*. (pp. 25-38). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Walker, P. (2014). International Student Policies in UK Higher Education from Colonialism to the Coalition: Developments and Consequences. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 18*(4), 325-344.

Warwick, P. and Moogan, Y. J. (2013). A Comparative Study of Perceptions of Internationalisation Strategies in UK Universities. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 43*(1), 102–123.

Whitsed, C. & Green, W. (2014). What's in a Name? A Theoretical Exploration of the Proliferation of Labels for International Education Across the Higher Education Sector. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 18*(2), 105-119.

Wihlborg, M. & Robson, S. (2018). Internationalisation of Higher Education: Drivers, Rationales, Priorities, Values and Impacts. *European Journal of Higher Education, 8*(1), 8-18.

Webb, G. (2005). Internationalisation of the Curriculum: An Institutional Approach. In J. Carroll & R. Janette (Eds.), *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Wright, S. & Nelson, N. (1995). Participatory Research and Participant Observation: Two Incompatible Approaches. In N. Nelson & S. Wright (Eds.), *Power and Participatory Development: Theory and Practice.* (pp. 43-60). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Appendices

Appendix A – Background information of the participants

Background information of the participants (Interview)

	Gender	School/Department	Seniority
1	Male	Mathematics	Senior lecturer
2	Male	Mathematics	Senior lecturer
3	Male	Mathematics	Senior lecturer
4	Female	Mathematics	Senior lecturer
5	Male	Environmental Sciences	Senior lecturer
6	Female	Environmental Sciences	Lecturer
7	Female	Environmental Sciences	Senior lecturer
8	Female	Environmental Sciences	Senior lecturer
9	Male	Education	Senior lecturer
10	Female	Education	Senior lecturer
11	Female	Education	Senior lecturer
12	Male	Business	Senior lecturer
13	Male	Business	Senior lecturer
14	Female	Business	Senior lecturer
15	Male	Languages	Lecturer
16	Male	Languages	Senior lecturer
17	Female	Languages	Senior lecturer
18	Male	Politics	Lecturer
19	Male	Politics	Lecturer
20	Female	Politics	Lecturer
21	Female	Politics	Lecturer
22	Female	Politics	Lecturer
23	Female	Literature	Lecturer
24	Female	Literature	Lecturer

	Gender	School/Department	Seniority
25	Female	International Development	Lecturer
26	Female	International Development	Lecturer

Background information of the participants (Observation)

	Gender	School/Department	Seniority	Number of my observations
1	Male	Mathematics	Senior Lecturer	1
2	Male	Environmental Sciences	Senior Lecturer	3
3	Female	Environmental Sciences	Lecturer	1
4	Female	Environmental Sciences	Senior Lecturer	2
5	Male	Education	Senior Lecturer	2
6	Female	Education	Senior Lecturer	1
7	Female	Education	Senior Lecturer	3
8	Male	Languages	Lecturer	1
9	Female	Languages	Senior Lecturer	4
10	Male	Politics	Lecturer	1
11	Female	Politics	Lecturer	1

Appendix B – Request letter for Head of School

Dear ...,
I hope you are doing well.

I am a PhD student in the School of Education and Lifelong Learning, UEA. Supervised by Professor Anna Robinson-Pant and Professor Yann Lebeau, I am doing a research study to investigate the internationalisation of the curriculum in the context of UK higher education. I am interested in how academic staff in different disciplines at ... interpret the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum and their teaching practice in this area.

I have decided that ... would be a good choice for this project since the programmes in your school engage with global issues and have a large number of international students. For this reason, I would like to request your permission for me to conduct research in your school. I will approach the staff in your school by myself and ask their willingness to take part in my research (including interview and observation).

I hope that this research study will find out more how academics in different disciplines teach about international issues and their experience of working with international students. I am happy to share my research findings upon request, in whatever form you and your colleagues consider appropriate.

Thank you. I look forward to your reply.
Yours sincerely,
Weici Zhong
PhD student in School of Education and Lifelong Learning
University of East Anglia

Appendix C – Invitation letter for academic staff

Dear …,
I hope you are doing well.

I am a PhD student in the School of Education and Lifelong Learning, UEA. Supervised by Professor Anna Robinson-Pant and Professor Yann Lebeau, I am doing a research study on the internationalisation of the curriculum in the context of UK higher education. I am interested in how academics in different disciplines at … interpret the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum and their teaching practice in this area.

For this reason, I wondered if you would be willing for me to observe some sessions of your module and to take part in a one-on-one interview (about 30-40 minutes). During the interview, we will talk about your module in relation to teaching about international/intercultural issues and your experience of working with international students. Your identity will be kept as confidential in accordance with the regulations of UEA Research Ethics Committee.

If you agree to participate in this research, could you please inform me of which sessions you would like me to observe this semester? We can also arrange the interview at a time that is convenient to you. Please do let me know if you have any questions about my research/observation/interview. I am happy to share my research findings upon request, in whatever form you consider appropriate.

Thank you. I look forward to your reply.
Yours sincerely,
Weici Zhong
PhD student in School of Education and Lifelong Learning
University of East Anglia

Appendix D – Participant consent forms and information sheets

Weici Zhong
Postgraduate Researcher
October 2018

Exploring Academics' Understanding and Practices of Internationalisation of the Curriculum

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT---INTERVIEW

(1) What is this study about?

You are invited to take part in a research study about the internationalisation of UK higher education curriculum. I am interested in how academics in different disciplines understand the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum and their teaching practice in this area. You have been invited to participate because you work in one of the disciplines selected for this study. This Participant Information Statement tells you about the research study. Knowing what is involved will help you decide if you want to take part in the study. Please read this sheet carefully and ask questions about anything that you don't understand or want to know more about. Participation in this research study is voluntary. By giving consent to take part in this study you are telling me that you:

✓ Understand what you have read.
✓ Agree to take part in the research study as outlined below.
✓ Agree to the use of your personal information as described.
✓ You have received a copy of this Participant Information Statement to keep.

(2) Who is running the study?

The study is being carried out by the following researcher: Weici Zhong, Postgraduate Researcher, School of Education and Lifelong Learning, UEA.
Supervisors: Professor Anna Robinson-Pant, School of Education and Lifelong Learning, UEA; Professor Yann Lebeau, School of Education and Lifelong Learning, UEA.

(3) What will the study involve for me?

Your participation will involve one semi-structured interview with me. The interview will take place in your office or elsewhere at a time that is convenient to you. The interview will be audio

recorded if you permit. You will be asked questions relating to teaching about international/intercultural issues in your subject area and your experiences of working with international students. You will be able to review the transcripts of the interview to ensure if it is an accurate reflection of the discussion.

(4) How much of my time will the study take?
It is expected that the interview will take between 30-40 minutes.

(5) Do I have to be in the study? Can I withdraw from the study once I've started?
Being in this study is completely voluntary and you do not have to take part. Your decision whether to participate will not affect your current or future relationship with me or anyone else at the University of East Anglia. If you decide to take part in the study and then change your mind later, you are free to withdraw at any time. You can do this by letting me know by email (w.zhong@uea.ac.uk) or by phone (07596 452742). You are free to stop the interview at any time. You may also refuse to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer during the interview. If you decide at a later time to withdraw from the study, your information will be removed from the records and will not be included in any results, up to the point I have submitted my thesis.

(6) Are there any risks or costs associated with being in the study?
Aside from giving up your time, I do not expect that there will be any risks or costs associated with taking part in this study. I am able to stop the interview at any time you feel uncomfortable.

(7) Are there any benefits associated with being in the study?
I hope that being in the study will allow you to reflect on the teaching practice in this area. Also, your views and experiences will help us find out whether academics in different disciplines have different views and practices regarding internationalisation of the curriculum.

(8) What will happen to information about me that is collected during the study?
By providing your consent, you are agreeing to me collecting personal information about you for the purposes of this research study. Your information will only be used for the purposes outlined in this Participant Information Statement, unless you consent otherwise. Only the researcher and his supervisors will have access to the data. Data management will follow the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation Act and the University of East Anglia Research Data Management Policy (2015). Your information will be stored securely and your identity/information will only be disclosed with your permission, except as required by law. Study findings may be published but you will not be identified in these publications. In this instance, data will be stored for a period of 10 years and then destroyed.

(9) What if I would like further information about the study?
When you have read this information, Weici will be available to discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. You can contact him on w.zhong@uea.ac.uk or 07596 452742.

(10)   Will I be told the results of the study?
You have a right to receive feedback about the overall results of this study. You can tell me that you wish to receive feedback by ticking the relevant box on the consent form. This feedback will be in the form of a one-page lay summary of the findings. You will receive this feedback after the study is finished.

(11)   What if I have a complaint or any concerns about the study?
The ethical aspects of this study have been approved under the regulations of the University of East Anglia's School of Education and Lifelong Learning Research Ethics Committee.

If there is a problem please let me know. You can contact me via the University at the following address:
Weici Zhong
School of Education and Lifelong Learning
University of East Anglia
Norwich
NR4 7TJ
w.zhong@uea.ac.uk

If you would like to speak to someone else you can contact my supervisors: Professor Anna Robinson-Pant, A.Robinson-Pant@uea.ac.uk; Professor Yann Lebeau, Y.Lebeau@uea.ac.uk

If you are concerned about the way this study is being conducted or you wish to make a complaint to someone independent from the study, please contact the Head of the School of Education and Lifelong Learning, Professor Richard Andrews, Richard.Andrews@uea.ac.uk

(12)   OK, I want to take part – what do I do next?
You need to fill in the 1st copy of the consent form and give it to Weici before the interview is conducted. Please keep the information sheet and the 2nd copy of the consent form for your information.

This information sheet is for you to keep.

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM---INTERVIEW (1st copy to researcher)

I, ………………………………………………………… [PRINT NAME], agree to take part in this research study.

In giving my consent I state that:

✓ I understand the purpose of the study, what I will be asked to do, and any risks/benefits involved.

✓ I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been able to discuss my involvement in the study with the researcher if I wished to do so.

✓ The researcher has answered any questions that I had about the study and I am happy with the answers.

✓ I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary and I do not have to take part. My decision whether to be in the study will not affect my relationship with the researcher or anyone else at the University of East Anglia now or in the future.

✓ I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time.

✓ I understand that I may stop the interview at any time if I do not wish to continue. I also understand that I may refuse to answer any questions I don't wish to answer.

✓ I understand that personal information about me that is collected over the course of this project will be stored securely and will only be used for purposes that I have agreed to. I understand that information about me will only be told to others with my permission, except as required by law.

✓ I understand that the results of this study may be published, but these publications will not contain my name or any identifiable information about me. I consent to:

- **Audio-recording**   YES   ☐   NO   ☐

- **Reviewing transcripts**   YES   ☐   NO   ☐

- **Would you like to receive feedback about the overall results of this study?**

                                                    YES   ☐   NO   ☐

……………………………………………………..

Signature and date

Weici Zhong
Postgraduate Researcher
October 2018

Faculty of Social Sciences
School of Education and Lifelong Learning
University of East Anglia
Norwich Research Park
Norwich NR4 7TJ
United Kingdom
Email: w.zhong@uea.ac.uk
Tel: +44 (0) 7596 452742
Web:www.uea.ac.uk

Exploring Academics' Understanding and Practices of Internationalisation of the Curriculum

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT---OBSERVATION

(1) What is this study about?
You are invited to take part in a research study about the internationalisation of UK higher education curriculum. I am interested in how academics in different disciplines understand the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum and their teaching practice in this area. You have been invited to participate because you work in one of the disciplines selected for this study. This Participant Information Statement tells you about the research study. Knowing what is involved will help you decide if you want to take part in the study. Please read this sheet carefully and ask questions about anything that you don't understand or want to know more about. Participation in this research study is voluntary. By giving consent to take part in this study you are telling me that you:
- ✓ Understand what you have read.
- ✓ Agree to take part in the research study as outlined below.
- ✓ Agree to the use of your personal information as described.
- ✓ You have received a copy of this Participant Information Statement to keep.

(2) Who is running the study?
The study is being carried out by the following researcher: Weici Zhong, Postgraduate Researcher, School of Education and Lifelong Learning, UEA.
Supervisors: Professor Anna Robinson-Pant, School of Education and Lifelong Learning, UEA; Professor Yann Lebeau, School of Education and Lifelong Learning, UEA.

(3) What will the study involve for me?
I wish to observe some sessions of your module if you permit. I am interested in your module in relation to teaching about international/intercultural issues and your experiences of working with international students. The aim of the observation is not to evaluate your teaching practice but to find out what is going on in different disciplines regarding internationalisation of the curriculum. I will not be audio recoding or visual recording your class but will sit in the classroom and take notes to understand the teaching and learning culture of your subject area.

(4) How much of my time will the study take?

I will discuss with you regarding which module and session will be most appropriate for you. They will be part of your normal teaching and so no additional time is required for you.

(5) Do I have to be in the study? Can I withdraw from the study once I've started?

Being in this study is completely voluntary and you do not have to take part. Your decision whether to participate will not affect your current or future relationship with me or anyone else at the University of East Anglia. If you decide to take part in the study and then change your mind later, you are free to withdraw at any time. You can do this by letting me know by email (w.zhong@uea.ac.uk) or by phone (07596 452742).

(7) Are there any risks or costs associated with being in the study?

Aside from giving up your time, I do not expect that there will be any risks or costs associated with taking part in this study. I am able to stop the observation at any time you feel uncomfortable.

(8) Are there any benefits associated with being in the study?

I hope that being in the study will allow you to reflect on the teaching practice in this area. Also, your views and experiences will help us find out whether academics in different disciplines have different views and practices regarding internationalisation of the curriculum.

(9) What will happen to information about me that is collected during the study?

By providing your consent, you are agreeing to me collecting personal information about you for the purposes of this research study. Your information will only be used for the purposes outlined in this Participant Information Statement, unless you consent otherwise. Only the researcher and his supervisors will have access to the data. Data management will follow the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation Act and the University of East Anglia Research Data Management Policy (2015). Your information will be stored securely and your identity/information will only be disclosed with your permission, except as required by law. Study findings may be published but you will not be identified in these publications. In this instance, data will be stored for a period of 10 years and then destroyed.

(10) What if I would like further information about the study?

When you have read this information, Weici will be available to discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. You can contact him on w.zhong@uea.ac.uk or 07596 452742.

(11) Will I be told the results of the study?

You have a right to receive feedback about the overall results of this study. You can tell me that you wish to receive feedback by ticking the relevant box on the consent form. This feedback will be in the form of a one-page lay summary of the findings. You will receive this feedback after the study is finished.

(12) What if I have a complaint or any concerns about the study?

The ethical aspects of this study have been approved under the regulations of the University of East Anglia's School of Education and Lifelong Learning Research Ethics Committee.

If there is a problem, please let me know. You can contact me via the University at the following address:
Weici Zhong
School of Education and Lifelong Learning
University of East Anglia
Norwich
NR4 7TJ
w.zhong@uea.ac.uk

If you would like to speak to someone else you can contact my supervisors: Professor Anna Robinson-Pant, A.Robinson-Pant@uea.ac.uk; Professor Yann Lebeau, Y.Lebeau@uea.ac.uk

If you are concerned about the way this study is being conducted or you wish to make a complaint to someone independent from the study, please contact the Head of the School of Education and Lifelong Learning, Professor Richard Andrews, Richard.Andrews@uea.ac.uk

(13) OK, I want to take part – what do I do next?
You need to fill in the 1st copy of the consent form and give it to Weici before the observation is conducted. Please keep the information sheet and the 2nd copy of the consent form for your information.

This information sheet is for you to keep.

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM---OBSERVATION (1st copy to researcher)

I, ……………………..……………..……………..….…… [PRINT NAME], agree to take part in this research study.

In giving my consent I state that:

✓ I understand the purpose of the study, what I will be asked to do, and any risks/benefits involved.

✓ I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been able to discuss my involvement in the study with the researcher if I wished to do so.

✓ The researcher has answered any questions that I had about the study and I am happy with the answers.

✓ I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary and I do not have to take part. My decision whether to be in the study will not affect my relationship with the researcher or anyone else at the University of East Anglia now or in the future.

✓ I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time.

✓ I understand that I may stop taking part in the observation at any time if I do not wish to continue.

✓ I understand that personal information about me that is collected over the course of this project will be stored securely and will only be used for purposes that I have agreed to. I understand that information about me will only be told to others with my permission, except as required by law.

✓ I understand that the results of this study may be published, but these publications will not contain my name or any identifiable information about me.

- **Would you like to receive feedback about the overall results of this study?**

  YES ☐   NO ☐

……………………………………………………..…..
Signature and date

Weici Zhong
Postgraduate Researcher
June 2021

Exploring Academics' Understanding and Practices of Internationalisation of the Curriculum

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT--- ONLINE INTERVIEW

(1) What is this study about?
You are invited to take part in a research study about how academics understand and practise curriculum internationalisation. You have been invited to participate because the situation in UK HE has undergone a lot of changes over the past year and the movements such as Black Lives Matter, decolonisation initiative and anti-racism taskforce became more prominent than before. I am interested to find out more about the decolonisation initiatives and curriculum internationalisation. This Participant Information Statement tells you about the research study. Knowing what is involved will help you decide if you want to take part in the study. Please read this sheet carefully and ask questions about anything that you don't understand or want to know more about. Participation in this research study is voluntary. By giving consent to take part in this study you are telling me that you:
- ✓ Understand what you have read.
- ✓ Agree to take part in the research study as outlined below.
- ✓ Agree to the use of your personal information as described.
- ✓ You have received a copy of this Participant Information Statement to keep.

(2) Who is running the study?
The study is being carried out by the following researcher: Weici Zhong, Postgraduate Researcher, School of Education and Lifelong Learning, UEA.
Supervisors: Professor Anna Robinson-Pant, School of Education and Lifelong Learning, UEA; Professor Yann Lebeau, School of Education and Lifelong Learning, UEA.

(3) What will the study involve for me?
Your participation will involve a one-on-one online interview with me. The interview will be audio recorded if you give permission. You will be asked questions relating to the decolonisation initiatives, particularly in relation to curriculum internationalisation/decolonisation. You will be able to review the transcript of your interview to ensure if it is accurate reflection of the discussion.

(4) How much of my time will the study take?
It is expected that the interview will take between 30-40 minutes.

(5) Do I have to be in the study? Can I withdraw from the study once I've started?
Being in this study is completely voluntary and you do not have to take part. Your decision whether to participate will not affect your current or future relationship with me or anyone else at the University of East Anglia. If you decide to take part in the study and then change your mind later, you are free to withdraw at any time. You can do this by letting me know by email (w.zhong@uea.ac.uk) or by phone (07596 452742). You are free to stop the interview at any time. You may also refuse to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer during the interview. If you decide at a later time to withdraw from the study, your information will be removed from the records and will not be included in any results, up to the point I have submitted my thesis.

(6) Are there any risks or costs associated with being in the study?
Aside from giving up your time, I do not expect that there will be any risks or costs associated with taking part in this study. I am able to stop the interview at any time you feel uncomfortable.

(7) Are there any benefits associated with being in the study?
I hope that being in the study will allow you to reflect on the teaching practice in this area. Also, your views and experiences will help us find out whether academics in different disciplines have different views and practices regarding internationalisation of the curriculum.

(8) What will happen to information about me that is collected during the study?
By providing your consent, you are agreeing to me collecting personal information about you for the purposes of this research study. Your information will only be used for the purposes outlined in this Participant Information Statement, unless you consent otherwise. Only the researcher and his supervisors will have access to the data. Data management will follow the 2018 General Data Protection Regulation Act and the University of East Anglia Research Data Management Policy (2015). Your information will be stored securely and your identity/information will only be disclosed with your permission, except as required by law. Study findings may be published but you will not be identified in these publications. In this instance, data will be stored for a period of 10 years and then destroyed.

(9) What if I would like further information about the study?
When you have read this information, Weici will be available to discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. You can contact him on w.zhong@uea.ac.uk or 07596 452742.

(10) Will I be told the results of the study?
You have a right to receive feedback about the overall results of this study. You can tell me that you wish to receive feedback by ticking the relevant box on the consent form. This feedback will be in the form of a one-page lay summary of the findings. You will receive this feedback after the study is finished.

(11) What if I have a complaint or any concerns about the study?
The ethical aspects of this study have been approved under the regulations of the University of East Anglia's School of Education and Lifelong Learning Research Ethics Committee.

If there is a problem please let me know. You can contact me via the University at the following address:
Weici Zhong
School of Education and Lifelong Learning
University of East Anglia
Norwich
NR4 7TJ
w.zhong@uea.ac.uk

If you would like to speak to someone else you can contact my supervisors: Professor Anna Robinson-Pant, [A.Robinson-Pant@uea.ac.uk;](mailto:A.Robinson-Pant@uea.ac.uk) Professor Yann Lebeau, Y.Lebeau@uea.ac.uk

If you are concerned about the way this study is being conducted or you wish to make a complaint to someone independent from the study, please contact the Head of the School of Education and Lifelong Learning, Professor Yann Lebeau, Y.Lebeau@uea.ac.uk

(12) OK, I want to take part – what do I do next?
You need to fill in the 1st copy of the consent form and give it to Weici before the interview is conducted. Please keep the information sheet and the 2nd copy of the consent form for your information.

This information sheet is for you to keep.

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM---ONLINE INTERVIEW (1st copy to researcher)

I, ………………………………………………………………… [PRINT NAME], agree to take part in this research study.

In giving my consent I state that:

✓ I understand the purpose of the study, what I will be asked to do, and any risks/benefits involved.

✓ I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been able to discuss my involvement in the study with the researcher if I wished to do so.

✓ The researcher has answered any questions that I had about the study and I am happy with the answers.

✓ I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary and I do not have to take part. My decision whether to be in the study will not affect my relationship with the researcher or anyone else at the University of East Anglia now or in the future.

✓ I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time.

✓ I understand that I may stop the interview at any time if I do not wish to continue. I also understand that I may refuse to answer any questions I don't wish to answer.

✓ I understand that personal information about me that is collected over the course of this project will be stored securely and will only be used for purposes that I have agreed to. I understand that information about me will only be told to others with my permission, except as required by law.

✓ I understand that the results of this study may be published, but these publications will not contain my name or any identifiable information about me. I consent to:

- **Audio-recording**   YES   ☐   NO   ☐

- **Reviewing transcripts**   YES   ☐   NO   ☐

- **Would you like to receive feedback about the overall results of this study?**

                                                YES   ☐   NO   ☐

……………………………………………………………..
Signature and date

Appendix E – Observation guidelines

Curriculum content which:

- includes examples, projects, professional practices in different cultures.
- encourages students to reflect critically on what they are learning in relation to their own cultural identity.
- focuses on and addresses critical global issues.
- draws on a global literature/knowledge base.

Teaching and learning methods/activities which:

- encourage students to consider issues and problems from a variety of cultural perspectives.
- encourage students to use examples from their own experiences and cultural background.
- encourage international or intercultural interactions in the classroom.
- encourage students to discuss, analyse, and evaluate information from a range of international sources.
- encourage multilingual practices/reading/discussions.

Assessment methods/activities which:

- measure the skills, knowledge, and values associated with international perspectives and intercultural competence.
- encourage students to present information to an international and cross-cultural audience.
- assess students' ability to work with others, consider perspectives of others, and compare them with their own perspectives.
- encourage students to reflect on their own culture as well as other cultures.

Appendix F – Interview guidelines

Views on internationalisation of the curriculum:

- What does internationalisation of the curriculum mean to you and your teaching?

Strategies and practices for internationalising the curriculum:

- How do you design the curriculum content when the students come from different cultures and countries?
- How do you arrange the reading list for the students?
- How do you arrange group discussions in the classroom when students come from a variety of nations/cultures?
- How do you encourage students to reflect on what they are learning from their own experiences and cultural background?
- How do you assess students' skills, knowledge, and values associated with global perspectives and intercultural competence?
- What challenges do you face in internationalising the curriculum and how can the problems be resolved?
- What institutional support have you found helpful in internationalising the curriculum?

Views on the university's policies and strategies on internationalisation:

- What do you know about your university's internationalisation strategy?
- How is the university's internationalisation strategy implemented in your school?
- Could you help me understand the decolonisation initiatives at your university? What are these initiatives about and what do people want to achieve through these initiatives?
- What specific activities around decolonisation have you been involved in and who took part? What kind of responses have you had?
- What other policies/initiatives do you know that are connected with the decolonisation initiatives?
- Could you please share any materials or policy documents that might be useful in my analysis of internationalisation and decolonisation?

Appendix G – Interview coding samples

An example of coding interview transcripts:

Codes	Participants' responses to the interview question: What does internationalisation of the curriculum mean to you and your teaching?	Analytical memos
Looking for examples from the developing and developed world/countries	Emily (environmental sciences): *I tried to look for some examples of good practices from the developing world. In the lecture the other day, I mentioned everywhere in the world has a pollution problem. It is not just the developing world problem. This made me try to think more about using examples and being fair in acknowledging good practice if it is in Germany or if it is in China.*	She seems to have a binary view of the world/countries.
Adjusting the philosophical approach to education for students from different backgrounds	Ella (business): *For me, sitting where I am as an international staff and having come from a different educational system, I would say that there is a huge gap in the way that we meet internationalisation. I definitely think that we do not do enough to cater to international students … The philosophy of what education should be here is very much ideologically driven and grounded in a Western and European philosophical approach. I think it does not serve the learning needs of at least half of the student population because in the HE sector in Britain, more than half of the student population is made of international students.*	1) Her experiences of studying in both India and the UK let her observe different ways of thinking and doing education. 2) It is interesting that she thought the 'Western'/European philosophical approach does not serve the needs of international students. I found that she tends to homogenise and generalise international students' experience.
Mathematics is universal	Ryan (mathematics): *I have never really asked myself the question of how to internationalise the things that I teach. Honestly, in any other module that I teach here in the School of Mathematics. I have never asked myself the question. Because I have the perception that math is universal somehow. It is very objective. So, it is probably taught in the same way in all the areas of the world.*	It seems that how Ryan looks at his discipline/subject shapes his understandings and practices of internationalising the curriculum.

Questioning Knowledge hierarchies in the academy	Michael (education): *I think internationalisation has to go through the phase of decolonisation. Nobody forces us to do that. We have to openly talk about the legacy of colonialism. We have not decolonised knowledge. We have not decolonised the curriculum. I think we have to be bold and open and decolonise our epistemology and that includes the curriculum.*	1) He associated 'internationalisation of the curriculum' with the term 'decolonising the curriculum'. 2) He considered 'decolonisation' as not only adding diverse perspectives to the curriculum but also questioning the domination of the Eurocentric canon in the literature and the curriculum.
(…)	(…)	(…)

An example of grouping codes into sub-themes and themes:

Overarching theme: Conceptions of curriculum internationalisation
   Sub-theme 1: Broadening the curriculum content
        Code 1: Looking for examples from the developing and developed world/countries
        Code 2: Teaching examples from different countries
        Code 3: Comparing practices from different countries

   Sub-theme 2: Responding to the diversity of students in the classroom
        Code 1: Adjusting teaching methods for students from different backgrounds
        Code 2: Adjusting assessment methods for students from different backgrounds
        Code 3: Adjusting the philosophical approach to education for students from different
backgrounds

   Sub-theme 3: Internationalisation as universalisation
        Code 1: Mathematics is universal
        Code 2: 'The way I present things is pretty much standard'

   Sub-theme 4: Decolonising the curriculum
        Code 1: The domination of 'Western' perspectives
        Code 2: Questioning knowledge hierarchies in the academy
        Code 3: Decolonising the curriculum is a 'policy buzzword'
        Code 4: Decolonising the curriculum is a massive 'PR tool'