

Practice, problems and power in 'internationalisation at home': critical reflections on recent research evidence

Neil Harrison (Faculty of Arts, Creative Industries and Education, University of the West of England, Bristol, United Kingdom – neil.harrison@uwe.ac.uk)

Abstract: In a period when international flows of higher education students are rapidly increasing and diversifying, this paper reviews recent research evidence about the experiences of 'home' students – those who are not mobile and study in their home nation. This is situated within the concept of 'internationalisation at home', which asserts that these students should also receive an international educational experience: through interaction with international students, curriculum development and new pedagogic approaches.

However, the evidence to date suggests that this is considerably more problematic than might be imagined. For example, home students across the world are often found to resist intercultural groupwork and generally to avoid contact with their international peers, leading to concerns about unequal access to transformative experiences and powerful knowledge. The conflict between 'global worker' and 'global citizen' approaches to internationalisation are discussed, as well as the increasingly hegemonic role of English.

Keywords: globalisation, group work, curriculum development, homophily, staff development

Context

Globally, we are in a period of unprecedented growth in student mobility. UNESCO (2014) estimate that over 4 million students now study in a nation other than their own, up from 2 million in 2000. This has traditionally been typified as a movement of individuals from developing to developed world and, largely, from the southern and eastern hemispheres to the north and west. However, this pattern has diversified rapidly as more higher education systems have achieved international reputations (e.g. China or Korea), reducing outflow of students and stimulating inflow. At the same time, other nations (e.g. Viet Nam) have recently begun to value international educational experiences, having the public or private resources to provide mobility opportunities that did not previously exist.

By way of example, the UK is the second largest receiver of international students, behind the US and ahead of France, Australia and Germany (UNESCO 2014). The number of new international full-time undergraduates in the UK rose from 52,575 in 2002/03 to 83,775 in 2012/13 (Higher Education Statistics Agency 2014); in contrast, only 27,968 UK nationals in total are currently studying abroad (UNESCO 2014). International undergraduates now comprise around 18 percent of the total in the UK, up from 12 percent ten years ago – the most recent equivalent figure for postgraduate students is even higher at 59 percent (HESA 2014).

This is not an isolated trend; we are more generally in a period of unprecedented movement of peoples. Drawing again on data from the UK, 13 percent of residents were not born in the country (up from 9 percent in 2001 and 7 percent in 1991), largely resulting from freedom of movement within an expanding European Union, continued migration from the former British colonies and the granting of refuge from conflicts and oppression across the world (Office for National Statistics, 2012). This is not atypical, with many nations playing host to more cultural diversity than found in the UK, either due to the existence of different indigenous populations or various forms of more recent migration. For example, 43 percent of Singapore residents are migrants, compared to 28 percent for Australia, 21 percent for Canada and 14 percent for the US; the UK is close to other European nations such as Spain with 14 percent and Germany, France and the Netherlands with 12 percent (United Nations 2013).

As a result, it has become increasingly common for 'home' students (i.e. those remaining to study in their home nation, as opposed to international students) to encounter international students in the classroom and for these to be drawn from a wider array of national, cultural and linguistic backgrounds. As such, the experiences of many home students have altered significantly across the last twenty years, as globalisation and its concomitant mobility have taken hold. This flowering in cultural diversity within higher education presents a new challenge to educators and learners; intercultural classrooms have increasingly become the norm, particularly in certain disciplines, and this forms an essential backdrop to this paper. However, the binary between home and international students is something of an artificial one (Ippolito 2007). Many notionally home students will have been born in another country and have a minority language as their first, potentially feeling at odds with the prevailing majority culture. Conversely, some international students may be so only in terms of formal definitions, perhaps sharing many aspects of culture, heritage and language with the country in which they are studying. It is important, therefore, to remember that home and international students both exist on a continuum in relation to the extent to which they 'belong' where they are studying.

In this context, it is important to recognise that 'culture' not an unproblematic term. Historically, it has often been used in an essentialist sense to categorise people into (particularly national) groups that are taken to be broadly homogeneous in terms of belief, customs or behavioural norms, with the danger that cultural labels become a form of collective stereotype, which may or may not have negative connotations. The implication that individuals will live out this identity and that it will actively guide their attitudes and the decisions they take.

This paper takes more of a constructivist view of culture. While it recognises that individuals do often share a broad-based heritage resulting from their nation of birth, there are numerous other components to an individual's cultural identity which may have more or less valence. These might include other (e.g. ethnic, religious, social class or political) aspects of family heritage, alongside individual life experiences. Together, these are employed by the individual to construct a fluid cultural identity over their life course – or even multiple cultural identities that are activated within different circumstances. These identities are increasingly informed by a global context, where media exposure, internet usage and consumer choices may have as much of a role as nation of birth and where families are increasingly likely to have a mixed cultural heritage. As such

this paper uses the term 'international' to classify students and 'intercultural' to refer to students' experiences.

A commonly-used concept is that of 'cultural distance' - a subjective assessment of the dissimilarity between the cultures of two nations, groups or individuals. As with culture itself, cultural distance is problematic as the perceived distance may be experienced differently depending on context, observer or dimension of culture being activated. Nevertheless, dissimilarities in culture, however subjective, are likely to make intercultural interactions between home and international students more practically challenging and emotionally strained given fewer shared reference points and conflicting perspectives.

Finally, two other features associated with globalisation are relevant in the context of this paper. The first has been the cementing of English as the dominant world language of business, academia and popular culture. The number of people globally speaking English with a reasonable degree of proficiency has risen to 1.75 billion, with the language being increasingly seen as a prerequisite for professional employment (British Council 2013). Much of the demand for international higher education has historically been driven by a desire to acquire high-level English language skills, alongside the perceived prestige of degrees from Anglophone developed nations. More recently, non-Anglophone countries have also begun to offer degrees taught, in part or whole, in English, thereby providing an incentive for home students to remain and the chance to recruit international students from other nations (Maringe 2009; British Council 2014). The second has been a growth in expectations about internationalised graduate careers, with it becoming increasingly common for graduates to seek work outside of their home nation, while even those remaining within their home country are more likely to need to interact with colleagues, customers or suppliers elsewhere in the world – or at least with culturally-diverse individuals in their own country. As a result, universities perceive themselves to be under pressure to equip their graduates to compete in global labour markets, with an associated benefit to the university in terms of rankings, reputation and alumni support.

Internationalisation at home

These related trends set the scene for the concept of 'internationalisation at home' (IAH) – that home students are able to receive (and should be entitled to expect) an international higher education experience despite their own lack of mobility. The IAH movement can be traced back to a position paper published in 2000 by the European Association for International Education (Crowther et al. 2000) which was intended to provide a more rounded view of the internationalisation of universities than purely student (or staff) mobility and research collaboration (also see Knight 2004 and Teekens 2006). In particular, student mobility programmes have notably been dominated by the socially-advantaged who have the economic and cultural capital to take advantage of the opportunities available (Brooks and Waters 2011). IAH was therefore intended, *inter alia*, to offer a democratisation of the benefits of internationalisation to a much wider segment of society than that which could be, or wanted to be, geographically-mobile. The vision of IAH set out by Crowther et al (2000) had three principal components:

- *Diversity as resource*, with an increase in international mobility leading to more diverse social and academic spaces within universities. This diversity was constructed as a potential resource for home students (mediated through teaching staff), enriching their higher education experience by providing access to experiences that would not otherwise be available.
- *An internationalised curriculum*, through the integration of knowledge and perspectives from a range of national or cultural contexts into the formal curriculum. This was viewed as being coupled with personal dispositions and competences that enable students to successfully apply this knowledge across cultural boundaries and to develop positive and rewarding intercultural relationships.
- *A culturally-sensitive pedagogy*, based on a belief that universities should deliver programmes that are both responsive to, and optimise the use of, the diverse student body. Notably this includes the use of technology to provide more intercultural experiences, as well as structured opportunities for students to interact within the classroom. Through time, this has come to refer mainly to group project work.

Needless to say, these components were not posited in a vacuum and can be seen as part of a wider discourse around the globalisation and diversification of higher education. More generally, many of the issues raised by IAH can clearly be seen within the broader sweep of classroom diversity within higher education in terms, for example, of gender, social class or disability, as well as forms of intercultural diversity that do not derive from international mobility; a full discussion of these connections is beyond the scope of this paper.

Scope of review

This article reviews the research literature around IAH over the fifteen years since the EAIE position paper (Crowther et al 2000), with an emphasis on the last five years. The review focuses on reputable English-language peer-reviewed journals; it is appreciated that this may provide a somewhat partial view, but the review nevertheless includes contributions from Germany, Spain, Denmark, Sweden, Korea and Japan, as well as a range of Anglophone countries.

The reviewed literature was identified through a three-stage process. The first stage used Google Scholar to identify articles using the term 'internationalisation at home' or citing Crowther et al (2000). The second stage followed forward and backward citation trees to identify relevant articles cited by or citing the articles identified in the first stage. The third stage used Google Scholar to explore for other literature outside of the corpus already identified, through various combinations of search terms including 'internationalisation', 'higher education', 'curriculum' and 'pedagogy'.

For reasons of space, there is a focus on undergraduate students on the basis that they are more numerous and less aware of the nature of contemporary higher education at their entry to it, whereas postgraduate students will ordinarily have had several years to acclimatise to intercultural diversity. As a result, the review does not cover developments that are mainly associated with postgraduate classrooms, such as online distance learning or transnational education, but it does include articles where the experiences of postgraduates are likely to mirror those of undergraduates.

In addition, five types of paper were defined as being outside of the scope of this review. The first comprises the extensive literature that focuses solely on the experiences of international students, including the well-trodden path that they generally feel excluded from the prevailing local culture. The second relates to purely social relations between home and international students, even when the experiences of home students are represented, as this does not have direct bearing on the IAH agenda in relation to university strategy or classroom practice. The third exclusion is of literature concerning short-term exchange programmes, which are sometimes viewed as falling within the definition of IAH, despite their international mobility component. The fourth are those articles which interpret the IAH concept for a specific disciplinary context. The fifth are articles that focus on general issues of cultural diversity or intercultural relations, particularly those focused on within-country ethnic differences; this excludes a notable US-based literature around interaction between different American student populations. With respect to the fourth and fifth groups, a small number of useful exemplars *are* referenced to provide a link to these wider fields.

The article therefore aims to present a systematic review of all the literature defined above as being within scope, with a particular emphasis on themes of direct interest for educators; a small number of articles were omitted due to redundancy (multiple articles reporting the same study). As with all reviews, it is accepted that there may be other omissions, especially given the wide range of journals in which IAH research is published. However, as there is significant consensus within the literature reviewed, the likelihood of any omissions being noteworthy is small; the claim thus made is of representativeness, if not necessarily completeness.

The main body of the article is structured around the three components of IAH as identified by Crowther et al (2000): *diversity as resource*, *an internationalised curriculum* and *a culturally-sensitive pedagogy*. The article concludes with critical reflections on the literature as reviewed and the implications for educators and learners.

Diversity as resource

Spencer-Rodgers (2001, 640) notes that “international [students] constitute one of the most diverse collections of individuals that may be encountered by another group of social perceivers”, and growing corpus of research has addressed the ways in which home students engage with this

complexity. Spencer-Rodgers (2001) and Spencer-Rodgers and McGovern (2002) find that they are generally well-disposed towards their international peers, although they often hold stereotypical assumptions about the culture of 'others' (Holmes and O'Neill 2012). However, actual contact between the two groups is generally found to be uncommon, unstructured and lacking in meaning (Halualani et al. 2004; Halualani 2008). Among the reasons that home students give for not initiating interaction or friendships are language barriers (Saura Sanchez 2004; Ippolito 2007; Jon 2013; Hou and McDowell 2014; Mak, Brown and Wadey 2014), a fear of being judged for their own cultural practices (Peacock and Harrison 2009; Dunne 2009), anxiety about causing offence (Le Roux 2001; Hyde and Ruth 2002; Lee 2006; Peacock and Harrison 2009), differences in humour or a lack of shared cultural reference points (Ujitani and Volet 2008; Peacock and Harrison 2009; Kimmel and Volet 2012a), differing academic norms (Hou and McDowell 2014) and a general concern about the efforts required to understand and be understood across culture (Wright and Lander 2003; Ujitani and Volet 2008; Williams and Johnson 2011; Dunne 2013; Mak, Brown and Wadey 2014); Fritz, Chin and DeMarinis (2008) find that levels of anxiety about interaction correlate with cultural distance. Unusually, drawing on their Japanese sample, Ujitani and Volet (2008) report that home students may fear receiving offence more than fear causing it.

Some organisational approaches appear to exacerbate this further. Luxon and Peelo (2009) and Hou and McDowell (2014) note the particular challenges posed by the '2+2 model' of internationalised courses, where international students begin their studies in their home country before joining the home students in their second year, after friendship and working groups have formed. However, Groeppel-Klein, Germelmann and Glaum (2010) report similar difficulties in encouraging intercultural interaction even in the context of a university where this forms a key component of the organisational mission.

Bennett, Volet and Fozdar (2013) explore reticence to interact through the lens of one unusual case study friendship, finding that this was built on a shared 'outsider' status and supported by a multicultural heritage in both students' families (also see Ward 2006 and Montgomery 2009). However, while the relationship was positive and rewarding, it was strongly bounded to being an on-campus friendship based around academic support, with the two individuals returning to homophilic social groups when off-campus. Jon (2012) finds that willingness to engage in friendship is mediated by power relationships for Korean home students, with English language and interest in Korean culture being valued attributes in international students. Dunne (2013)

posits that his sample of home students used a cost-benefit analysis to juxtapose the effort and predicted anxiety of intercultural contact with rewards in terms of foreign language practice and improved marks. This is supported by Colvin, Fozdar and Volet (2013), whose monocultural home student sample is strategic in their intercultural relations, especially with respect to academic success.

Rienties and Nolan (2014) report that even within a strongly mixed classroom there are significant differences in friendship patterns. Confucian Asian and UK students tended to be friends with conationals, while other international students were significantly more likely to maintain intercultural friendships. They do, however, note that some UK students do have more diverse networks. This is supported by other studies reporting that the reticence of home students to build relationships with international students is not universal and that a substantial minority have more positive attitudes. Colvin, Volet and Fozdar (2014) establish a contrast between home students with a constructivist worldview, grounded in ethnorelativism and heterogeneous perceptions of diversity, and those whose experience of intercultural interactions is essentialist, shallow, ethnocentric and segregating. In particular, the latter group were marked by a strong belief in rigid cultural boundaries and homogeneity, often built around strong stereotypes. This schema matches well with Harrison and Peacock's (2010) analysis which names these groups as representing 'informed cosmopolitanism' and 'passive xenophobia' respectively.

Other research has probed the factors that predict into which group individual home students might fall. Using a UK sample of 755 students, Harrison (2012) finds that a multicultural upbringing, foreign language aptitude, agreeableness, openness to experience and an interest in international affairs were predictors for positive attitudes to intercultural interactions, while noting that women had lower levels of ethnocentrism. Similarly, Williams and Johnson (2011) find that openmindedness and being female are predictors for international friendships, while Lee (2006) identifies openness and trust as underpinning principles. Dunne (2013) notes curiosity as a predictor for contact, supported by Colvin and Volet (2014) who highlight the importance of 'cultural interest' to the quality of interactions and their educative power. Denson and Bowman (2013) also stress multicultural schooling and an active interest in culture as positive predictors for intercultural contact and confidence at university. Dunne (2009) finds that students with cultural interests are generally older, while Ward (2006) and Montgomery (2009) discuss the importance of a multicultural family history. In reviewing the US literature, Soria and Troisi (2014) find that

the enthusiasm for intercultural engagement is higher among women, the more affluent and members of the white majority ethnicity.

Recent research therefore constructs home students as being differentially predisposed towards seeking and making the most of intercultural experiences. This is perhaps unsurprising as – in contrast to international students who are typically drawn from financial or power elites with the resources and disposition to seek an international education – home students are drawn from a relatively wide cross-section of society with variable enthusiasm for intercultural experiences. In general, research suggests that they have a low propensity to seek interaction with international students, although there are obviously exceptions to this; a group of ‘informed cosmopolitans’ (Harrison and Peacock 2010) or ‘cultural travellers’ who might be typified having a multicultural upbringing (in their family or geographical milieu) which has kindled a ‘cultural interest’ (Colvin and Volet 2014) encompassing languages and global affairs, and led to an openness to diversity and a weakly-constructed set of cultural classifications. These students, who are more likely to be female, affluent and older, also have a higher propensity to choose degree programmes with an international flavour and to participate in cultural events and projects at university (Soria and Troisi 2014). Engberg (2007) identifies positive attitudes towards diversity on entry to university as a major determinant of choices of future cultural experiences through the curriculum or co-curricular activities.

A contrasting group are drawn from monocultural families and communities, with an ethnocentric, bounded and insular outlook that views intercultural relations as vexed and only worth pursuing where there is a strategic benefit to be gained (Colvin, Fozdar and Volet 2013; Dunne 2013). Clearly these groups and their membership are not rigid or deterministic, but they are useful in terms of framing our understanding of IAH. In short, not all home students enter higher education expecting, wanting or valuing intercultural experiences (Ippolito 2007), yet many educators believe that they are vital in terms of education and/or future employment. Interestingly, Spiro (2014) notes that many home students fail to see their own cultural positioning, while Pritchard and Skinner (2002) report that some believe that cultural differences do not exist.

It is apparent, therefore, that simple proximity to diversity is insufficient to spark the kinds of transformative experiences valued by the IAH agenda, especially given the ‘homophily’ or natural affinity that individuals feel towards ‘people like us’ who share elements of cultural identity,

which, in turn, influences the formation of friendship groups (Lazarsfeld and Merton 1954; McPherson, Smith-Lovin and Cook 2001). This was predicted by Allport (1954), whose *contact hypothesis* suggests the need for additional prerequisites for meaningful intercultural interaction to occur. Most importantly, he argues that the individuals need to have a purpose which becomes the focus of shared work, undertaken with equal status (also see Cruickshank, Chen and Warren 2012). This provides context for the relationship and requires a deeper engagement with the ‘other’ than the polite, but shallow, interactions that otherwise dominate. Individuals need to engage with alternative perspectives, understanding how the cultural heritage (impacting on ontology, epistemology, knowledge and skills) of their peers applies to the task at hand (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006). This argues against a *laissez faire* approach to international classrooms, not least as opportunities for positive (and potentially powerful) experiences are inevitably unevenly distributed depending on students’ varying enthusiasms. We now turn to examine the role played by the curriculum in supporting IAH.

An internationalised curriculum

The idea of the ‘internationalised curriculum’ has now been in existence for some years, although it continues to defy easy or compelling definition (Dunne 2011). In relation to IAH, it might generally be typified to mean the integration into the curriculum of content that (a) uses knowledge *about* other nations, (b) uses knowledge, perspectives or epistemologies *derived in or from* other nations, and/or (c) is intended to act as a springboard to developing skills around intercultural interaction. It is also variously used to mean a curriculum that is adapted for the benefit of international students (e.g. by embracing different forms of knowledge) or one which is designed to increase the international input for home students; these are clearly not mutually exclusive objectives, but they are often confused. Dunne (2011) argues that this breadth of interpretation may itself be one component in the limited progress to date and that a concept of the ‘intercultural curriculum’ might be more useful.

Over the last fifteen years, Betty Leask and colleagues (e.g. Leask 2001, 2009; Leask and Carroll 2011; Leask and Bridge 2013) have argued for a systematic approach towards internationalising the curriculum, with a clear articulation of learning outcomes and the development of authentic tasks “that are structured in such a way that they cannot be successfully completed without a

meaningful exchange of cultural information” (Leask 2009, 211). She also argues for a close and managed relationship between the formal classroom curriculum and the ‘informal’ curriculum of mentoring schemes, social events and similar, with a view to cementing lasting and meaningful relationships between home and international students that are transferable between contexts (Leask 2009; Leask and Carroll 2011; Cruickshank, Chen and Warren 2012). Furthermore, Leask and Bridge (2013, 97) assert that “an important part of the process of internationalisation is inviting, accommodating and nurturing new rationales, alternative paradigms and interpretations”, providing a more open curriculum space than that offered by traditional Western approaches. Dunne (2011) argues for a four-way approach towards an ‘intercultural curriculum’, with the teacher as facilitator, the encouragement of respectful interaction between students, the use of multiple perspectives and an appreciation of students as unique resources.

Other writers have observed a marked difference in engagement in curriculum thinking between disciplines. Sawir (2011) and Clifford (2009) both report that staff in science and technology disciplines are generally less open to innovation than those in humanities and social sciences, where international perspectives are generally valorised by teaching staff as part of a rounded curriculum. Sawir (2011) nuances this further to suggest that applied disciplines across the range are more likely to focus on the personal skills that are perceived to be useful to graduates. Staff in the pure sciences are therefore constructed as viewing their discipline as being inherently international in nature (with its reliance on universal symbols over language), requiring no changes in curriculum or associated pedagogy for either home or international students.

A full review of the discipline-based literature on the internationalisation of the curriculum is beyond the scope of this paper, so we will focus on two contrasting examples. Whiteford and Wright St-Clair (2002) and Horton (2009) examines the rationale for internationalising occupational therapy – an applied science discipline. Both articles focus strongly on the need to equip graduates not for careers in other countries, but rather for intercultural careers in their home country. In common with other medical and healthcare roles, occupational therapy requires close interaction with individuals from a broad range of cultures, so value-driven dispositions around understanding one’s own beliefs and having respect for diversity are essential alongside skills in varied forms of communication. In contrast, Spiro (2014) presents two specific examples of curriculum innovations from English – a pure humanities discipline. These focus primarily around contrasting intellectual perspectives and ‘voice’ between students from different cultural

backgrounds. This was not contextualised within a broader framework of employability (whether international or in the home nation), but rather as a means of invigorating learning and providing students with new reflexive tools to enhance their appreciation of language, as well as specific cultural knowledge. These curricular innovations were particularly notable in the extent to which they made use of the 'resource' of international students in a respectful mode that positioned them as experts within the classroom.

Indeed, there appears to be a tension between two competing conceptualisations of what an internationalised curriculum is *for*, based in distinct paradigms about the purpose of higher education. The first of these is grounded in a marketised vision of universities as producing high-quality graduates for the global labour market. Within this paradigm, globalisation – with its shrinking geography, increased interconnectedness and large-scale migrations – means that graduates are constructed as needing to be equipped with some understanding of the world outside their own country; they are increasingly likely to work overseas or to need to interact with people who are. The transmission of knowledge about other nations and cultures is therefore an appropriate preparation for 'global workers', although this may be more relevant in some disciplines than others. Aside from cultural knowledge, this vision also stresses the need for a portfolio of 'cultural intelligence' (Earley and Ang 2003) or 'intercultural competences' (Deardorff 2006; Holmes and O'Neill 2012, but also see Dunne 2011) that enable graduates to transact successfully across cultural distance, enabling accurate communication, an understanding of context and the ability to influence others from a different cultural background.

A contrasting paradigm approaches globalisation from an alternative perspective, arguing that worldwide problems require the intervention of a new generation of 'global citizens' who are equipped with an awareness of the interconnectedness of the modern world and the agency to initiate change. Within this conceptualisation, intercultural competence is a necessary, but not sufficient, requirement for global citizenship, enabling graduates to understand their position in the world and the responsibility that they have, for example, in addressing climate change or challenging social inequalities (Oxfam 2006; Caruana 2014). The additional focus is therefore on developing beliefs, attitudes and dispositions that underpin a respectful and equal discourse between cultures, as well as a tolerance to difference and an empathy to understand alternative perspectives (Sawir 2013; Denson and Bowman 2013). While perhaps not in direct opposition to concerns over employability (global citizens need global jobs, after all), this argument draws its

justification from a more critical perspective, focusing on global problems (and their local manifestations) rather than individual positionality. This vision of an internationalised curriculum is also closely aligned with the movements around promoting 'education for sustainable development' (UNESCO 2012).

Internationalisation is thus not value-neutral and teaching staff report student resistance to being taught within one or other of these paradigms (Clifford 2009). Indeed, those home students with an ethnocentric worldview are unlikely to warm to the premise of global citizenship, potentially posing difficulties in terms of engagement, learning and student satisfaction.

Moving focus from curriculum to those defining it, Spiro (2014) draws attention to the role of the individual educator in initiating curriculum development and a number of writers have argued that one feature of IAH has been differential support from teaching staff. Trahar and Hyland (2011) and Luxon and Pello (2009) both note that little research attention has focused on teaching staff in this regard; the former see IAH as a source of potential dilemmas for educators, while the latter make the case for bottom-up staff-led developments in pedagogic and curriculum thinking. Drawing on a sample of educators within a university with a high proportion of international students, Sawir (2013) reports a prevailing view that the latter form a positive resource, but one from which home students tend not to benefit; this suggests that some staff are not equipped to realise the potential that exists within the international classroom. Indeed, just as students exhibit differential skills in dealing with cultural diversity, so must teaching staff. Some will assume a natural role as 'cultural travellers', acting simultaneously as source of knowledge, participant in meaning-making and positive role model. However, others will find this role more challenging, evidencing the need for high-quality and critically-grounded staff development to ensure that the internationalisation of the curriculum extends beyond those disciplines and classrooms where staff have an existing interest or predisposition (Teekens 2003; Leask 2009; Leask and Carroll 2011; Mak and Kennedy 2012). A notably unresearched factor is the extent to which internationalisation fits within a wider context of output-led pressure on the curriculum as a whole, such that the level of curriculum crowding may compromise the ability to find space for what may be perceived as a 'desirable' rather than 'essential' component.

Commentators appear to agree that progress towards providing an internationalised curriculum, whether for the benefit of home students, international students or both, has not been rapid. For

example, Leask and Bridge (2013, 80) argue that in contrast to common university rhetoric on internationalisation, efforts to date have been “piece-meal and reactive, rather than coherent and holistic”. They go on to stress the need for senior support for internationalised curriculum development, with appropriate time allowances and reward structures (also see Luxon and Peelo 2009). More broadly, there is limited empirical evidence for the efficacy of an internationalised curriculum; from large US samples, Parsons (2010) asserts a strong impact on students’ intercultural skills and outlook, while Engberg (2007) reports positive effects on attitudes and orientations, but there are complex issues of mediation and causality to resolve. Nevertheless, we now turn to the ways in which the curriculum is delivered, including the role taken by educators.

A culturally-sensitive pedagogy

The focus for providing the types of positive interactions envisaged by Allport (1954) has generally coalesced around the use of group-based project work. It is argued that one key means by which intercultural skills are acquired is through active, positive and purposeful interactions with people from other cultural backgrounds (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006; Denson and Zhang 2010). This type of pedagogic approach provides a frame for a long-term relationship between students, where their success is interdependent – especially if a group mark is awarded. In any instance, the successful completion of the task is mediated through the processes of group dynamics, but where there is an activated and salient intercultural component, these challenges are multiplied.

There is considerable inter-study agreement around the existence of academic homophily among home students and the reasons for it, the most powerful of which is an anxiety that international students will compromise their marks (Harrison and Peacock 2010; Kimmel and Volet 2012; Strauss, U-Mackey and Crothers 2014; Hou and McDowell 2014). The most common outcome is that home students quickly choose monocultural groups where they are allowed to do so (Rienties, Alcott and Jindal-Snape 2014; Hou and McDowell 2014) and with these groups reporting less positive attitudes to diversity than groups that are culturally mixed (Kimmel and Volet 2012). It appears that these views are formed relatively early in students’ careers and that they entrench over time (Summers and Volet 2008), partly as a result of the rapid spread of ‘bad stories’ among students (Kimmel and Volet 2012). Ippolito (2007) and Kelly (2008) suggest that opportunities for learning are missed as a result, while bad experiences with groupwork may heighten future

anxiety (Pritchard and Skinner 2002; Summers and Volet 2008). Dunne (2013) and Colvin, Fozdar and Volet (2013) provide a slightly more positive perspective, with home students working with international students where they see a strategic reason to do so and Montgomery (2009) reports more collegial attitudes emerging in recent years. Nevertheless, home students often construct their international peers as representing a 'realistic threat' (Stephan and Stephan 2000) by failing to complete assessed tasks to the appropriate standard. In contrast, home students report that groupwork with co-nationals or existing friends is enjoyable, predictable and stress-free (Peacock and Harrison 2009).

Studies in international classrooms by Rienties and colleagues (Rienties et al 2012; Rienties and Johan 2014; Rienties, Alcott and Jindal-Snape 2014) have explored the differential working of self-selecting student workgroups and those that have been randomised or purposively 'balanced'. Across a range of situations, they find that students tend to self-select into pre-existing friendship groups that have a strong component of cultural homophily (Strauss, U and Young 2012). At foundation, students believe that these groups will be more successful than random/balanced groups, but this is not borne out by later analysis (also see De Vita 2002 and Summers and Volet 2008 for evidence that multicultural groups perform more highly, while McClelland 2012 argues this point more generally for randomised groups). Furthermore, the members of the random/balanced groups develop a wider network of friends and learning collaborators as a result of the groupwork exercise. Rienties, Alcott and Jindal-Snape (2014, 79) conclude that, "When students have to work together in teams for a substantial period on authentic but complex group products, students seem to be able to develop sufficient coping strategies to overcome initial cultural differences." This is supported by Cruickshank, Chen and Warren (2012, 807), who stress the active management of groups, the creation of tasks in which international students are constructed as experts and explicit explanations of the underpinning learning purposes, asserting that "Unplanned strategies could actually work against improving classroom interaction [and] confirm and construct the power of dominance of some groups of students and the marginalisation and lack of participation of others". Sweeney, Weaven and Herington (2008) similarly stress the need for careful management of the learning environment and strong brief/debrief activities with students.

Home students tend to juxtapose the ease of communication and a shared pedagogic vision with other home students with the complexities, anxieties and risks of working with international

students. Some are willing to take these risks if the rewards are perceived to be high enough, but they are outnumbered by those that would prefer to 'play safe'. Kimmel and Volet (2012, 177) argue that universities must, nonetheless, continue to develop groupwork opportunities, although "continuous, structured teacher support" is needed to help students to overcome their anxieties and provide "positive, secure and rewarding experiences". Strauss, U-Mackey and Crothers (2014) are more circumspect given the high-stakes nature of assessment in higher education, fearing that students will always resist 'forced' random or balanced grouping, placing educators under pressure. However, this feels defeatist, affording access to intercultural learning to just the minority that seek it, although there may be other solutions; for example, Cotton, George and Joyner (2013) suggest that intercultural learning processes should be explicitly recognised in assessment criteria. Kimmel and Volet (2012) highlight that norms may differ between disciplines, with science students generally showing more positive attitudes and understanding of team dynamics than those drawn from business. They caution that this may be a feature of the higher entry requirement to science subjects in their sample, but it may also be a function of the extent to which projects are predicated on spoken language (as opposed to the more symbolic and international foundation of science).

Indeed, a common theme in the literature around IAH concerns the role of language. In discussing this, we will first examine this where the language of instruction is the first language of the home students (e.g. English in Anglophone nations) before examining situations where home students are taught in what is, for most of them, a second language (e.g. English in continental Europe or East Asia).

In the former instance, most home students are clearly in a situation of positional advantage – although there will be a minority not fluent in the dominant language and these may find themselves tacitly parcelled with international students. Colvin, Fozdar and Volet (2013) remark on the hegemonic assumptions of monolingual English speakers in their Australian sample who view themselves as having an inbuilt advantage and the power to exploit it within the classroom; those with limited English are viewed as having little meaningful to contribute. Cotton, George and Joyner's (2013) observational study found that UK students (particularly men) tended to dominate discussions, although their influence on decision-making was much lower. This discourse of language deficiency is then conflated with cognitive ability, cultural know-how or academic skills (Harrison and Peacock 2010). In particular, Strauss, U-Mackey and Crothers (2014)

note the growth of 'talk' in learning and assessment in recent years and the privileged position in which this places the language of instruction. This, in turn, can see those with weaker oral skills being relegated to observers, 'manual labourers' or freeloaders in the context of groupwork discussions, which explain why international students report being as fearful of assessed work in mixed groups as much as home students (Kimmel and Volet 2012; Hou and McDowell 2014).

Turning to the second scenario, Tange (2010) discusses the experience of Danish educators being newly-required to teach in English in classrooms where few have it as their first language. At first glance, this situation – where nearly everyone is operating in a second language – feels more equal in power terms. However, it is reported to create its own pedagogic issues. Educators feel pressured to improve their language proficiency, especially by those for whom clarification in Danish is not possible. More generally, English is seen as an impediment to the effective teaching of the home student majority, while Svensson and Wihlborg (2010) warn about a monocultural globalisation derived from the hegemonic position of English. In a Korean context, Jon (2012) reports that international students that are fluent English speakers are afforded a particular respect by home students due to the language's global status. These students are viewed as a useful resource for language learning and to assist with understanding in classes taught in English, although English proficiency is contradictorily also seen as a marker for a poor work ethic and consideration of others.

These examples provide very different constructions of international students. In the Anglophone examples, home students possess (and often exercise) hegemonic power that effortlessly equips them for the international classroom by simply ignoring the fact that others lack their proficiency and proceeding to their own personal advantage. The Korean example reverses this dynamic and constructs English-speaking international students as a powerful cultural resource to be tapped, although other international students are viewed much less favourably. The Danish example provides a more equal field, although one where nearly everyone (including educators) feels at a disadvantage. Collectively, they help to highlight the vexed issue of language within IAH, especially as English continues to take hold globally, even finding its way into classrooms where English is relatively rarely spoken by the general population.

Concluding reflections

This paper has sought to explore the current progress towards the largely laudable aims for IAH set out in Crowther et al (2000) through the lens of recent research evidence from across the world. In doing so, it has problematised a number of key features and this last section will critically reflect on the implications of these for teaching in higher education.

Firstly, research has demonstrated a strong resistance from home students to features of the international classroom that they find threatening. The most proximal for educators is the perceived threat to an instrumental concept of academic success – in short, that international students jeopardise marks, whatever long-term benefits they may bring. This has strong repercussions for classroom management, the specification of group tasks and approaches to assessment, none of which has seemingly yet been resolved. More generally, home students also tend to express fears about miscommunication, leading to embarrassment or offence. This anxiety can be a powerful emotional barrier to intercultural learning for many students.

Secondly, we have seen that not all home students experience the same forms or levels of negative affect when confronted with cultural diversity. Student mobility is generally confined to advantaged groups within their national context and IAH is intended to spread the benefits of international perspectives to those who are not mobile. However, there is accumulating evidence that even IAH is unequally distributed, with strong differences in willingness (or ability) to benefit. Those with pre-existing 'cultural interests' are most likely to seize the opportunities available to them, leaving a larger group of students effectively self-excluding – a case of those most in need of an educational input being the least likely to get it. Intercultural knowledge, skills and reflexivity can be constructed as 'powerful' in the sense used by Young (2008) and are associated, at least hypothetically, with access to lucrative and high-status careers, with concomitant opportunities for travel and entry to a global elite. We therefore have to situate any discussion about IAH in a wider context of inequalities, social mobility and class transmission. If access to the power derived from an internationalised higher education is unequally distributed (either through availability or choice), then the power derived from it will also be unequally distributed. We have also seen that access to IAH developments may also be unequal by discipline or through the relative levels of commitment from teaching staff, although this is true of any learning innovation.

Thirdly, the growth of English as a professional *lingua franca* is not unproblematic. From the perspective of teaching staff and home students in non-Anglophone countries, it can be constructed as a constraint on efficient learning. In Anglophone countries, its global ubiquity positions home students in a hegemonic relationship over their international peers, placing them in deficit and viewing their lesser competence as a proxy for lower academic ability – or even ‘worth’. Interestingly, however, commentators have noted that much of the English language used internationally is not in a form that native speakers would necessarily recognise (Crystal 2003; Graddol 2006). The informal development of a simplified ‘global English’ and a number of creoles (e.g. so-called Singlish in Singapore) provides linguistic challenges to those with English as a first language, who may struggle to understand and, in particular, be understood. Assumptions about what is ‘good’ English may vary from situation to situation, with the complexities of grammar, pronunciation and idiom acting as a barrier to successful communication and interaction; the English language is no longer ‘owned’ by the UK or its diaspora, with many more people speaking it as an additional language than as their first; Anglophone graduates might not enjoy quite the natural hegemony they expect.

Finally, there is a danger that the competing paradigms of ‘global worker’ and ‘global citizen’ run the risk of obscuring the most important potential benefits of IAH. At the highest level of abstraction, an engagement with diversity provides the individual with the opportunity to develop a certain form of reflexivity which enables them to question their perspectives and cultural heritage by juxtaposing them with those held by equal others (Holmes and O’Neill 2012). This provides opportunities to develop an empathetic approach to problem-solving, as well as the tools to challenge hegemonic power structures. Reflection on cultural difference also enables the individual to question the nature of commonly-used categories and the strength and reality of the boundaries and stereotypes that we use to order the world. The complexity of diversity provides the opportunity for new forms of critical thinking and re-visioning that might be associated with creativity, decision-making and other high-level cognitive tasks. It is also important to remember the joy that culture can bring, enriching lives through personal discovery. For many people, being a cultural traveller is part of the ‘good life’ that brings happiness, fulfilment and a sense of purpose.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to gratefully acknowledge the contribution of Charlotte Murray to the literature search that underpins this paper, as well as extending his thanks to several colleagues and reviewers who have commented on earlier drafts.

References

- Allport, G. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.
- British Council. 2013. *The English Effect: the Impact of English, What it's Worth to the UK and Why it Matters to the World*. London: British Council.
- British Council. 2014. *English as a Medium of Instruction – A Growing Global Phenomenon: Phase 1 Interim Report*. London: British Council.
- Bennett, R.J., S.E. Volet, and F.E. Fozdar. 2013. "'I'd Say it's Kind of Unique in a Way': The Development of an Intercultural Student Relationship." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 17 (5): 533-553.
- Brooks R. and J. Waters. 2011. *Student Mobilities, Migration and the Internationalization of Higher Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Caruana, V. 2014. "Re-thinking Global Citizenship in Higher Education: from Cosmopolitanism and International Mobility to Cosmopolitanisation, Resilience and Resilient Thinking." *Higher Education Quarterly* 68 (1): 85-104.
- Clifford, V. 2009. "Engaging the Disciplines in Internationalising the Curriculum." *International Journal for Academic Development* 14 (2): 133-143.
- Colvin, C., F. Fozdar, and S Volet. In press. "Intercultural Interactions of Mono-cultural, Mono-lingual Local Students in Small Group Learning Activities: a Bourdieusian Analysis." *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. DOI: 10.1080/01425692.2013.823834.
- Colvin, C. and S. Volet, 2014. "Scrutinising Local Students' Accounts of Positive Intercultural Interactions: A Multidimensional Analysis." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 42: 77-92.
- Colvin, C., S. Volet and F. Fozdar. 2014. "Local University Students and Intercultural Interactions: Conceptualising Culture, Seeing Diversity and Experiencing Interactions." *Higher Education Research & Development* 33 (3): 440-455.
- Cotton, D., R. George and M. Joyner. 2013. "Interaction and Influence in Culturally Mixed Groups." *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 50 (3): 272-283.
- Crowther, P., M. Joris, M. Otten, B. Nilsson, H. Teekens and B. Wächter. 2000. *Internationalisation at Home: A Position Paper*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Cruickshank, K., H. Chen and S. Warren. 2012. "Increasing International and Domestic Student Interaction through Group Work: A Case Study from the Humanities." *Higher Education Research & Development* 31 (6): 797-810.

- Crystal, D. 2003. *English as a Global Language (2nd edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deardorff, D. 2006. "Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10 (3): 241-266.
- Denson, N. and N. Bowman. 2013. "University Diversity and Preparation for a Global Society: The Role of Diversity in Shaping Intergroup Attitudes and Civic Outcomes." *Studies in Higher Education* 38 (4): 555-570.
- Denson, N. and S. Zhang. 2010. "The Impact of Student Experience with Diversity on Developing Graduate Attributes." *Studies in Higher Education* 35 (5): 529-543.
- De Vita, G. 2002. "Does Assessed Multicultural Group Work Really Pull UK Students' Average Down?" *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 27 (2): 153-161.
- Dunne, C. 2009. "Host Students' Perspectives of Intercultural Contact in an Irish University." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 13 (2): 222-239.
- Dunne, C. 2011. "Developing an Intercultural Curriculum Within the Context of the Internationalisation of Higher Education: Terminology, Typologies and Power." *Higher Education Research & Development* 30 (5): 609-622.
- Dunne, C. 2013. "Exploring Motivations for Intercultural Contact among Host Country University Students: An Irish Case Study." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 37 (5): 567-578.
- Earley, P. and S. Ang, S. 2003. *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions Across Cultures*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Engberg, M. 2007. "Educating the Workforce for the 21st Century: A Cross-Disciplinary Analysis of the Impact of the Undergraduate Experience on Students' Development of a Pluralistic Orientation." *Research in Higher Education* 48 (3): 283-317.
- Fritz, A., D. Chin and V. DeMarinis. 2008. "Stressors, Anxiety, Acculturation and Adjustment among International and North American Students." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 32: 244-259.
- Graddol, D. 2006. *English Next*. London: British Council.
- Groeppel-Klein, A., C. Germelmann and M. Glaum. 2010. "Intercultural Interaction Needs More than Mere Exposure: Search for Drivers of Student Interaction at Border Universities." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 34: 253-267.
- Halualani, R. 2008. "How do Multicultural University Students Define and Make Sense of Intercultural Contact? A Qualitative Study." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 32: 1-16.

- Halualani, R., A. Chitgopekar, J. Morrison and P. Dodge. 2004. Who's interacting? And What are they Talking About? – Intercultural Contact and Interaction among Multicultural University Students." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 28: 353-372.
- Harrison, N. 2012. "Investigating the Impact of Personality and Early Life Experiences on Intercultural Interaction in Internationalised Universities." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 36 (2): 224-237.
- Harrison, N. and N. Peacock. 2010. "Cultural Distance, Mindfulness and Passive Xenophobia: Using Integrated Threat Theory to Explore Home Higher Education Students' Perspectives on 'Internationalisation at Home'." *British Educational Research Journal* 36 (6) : 877-902.
- Higher Education Statistics Agency. 2014. *Statistical Release 197*. Cheltenham: HESA.
- Holmes, P. and G. O'Neill. 2012. "Developing and Evaluating Intercultural Competence: Ethnographies of Intercultural Encounters." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 36: 707-718.
- Horton, A. 2009. "Internationalising Occupational Therapy Education." *British Journal of Occupational Therapy* 72 (5): 227-230.
- Hou, J. and L. McDowell. 2014. "Learning Together? Experiences on a China–U.K. Articulation Program in Engineering." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 18 (3): 223-240.
- Hyde, C. and B. Ruth. 2002. "Multicultural Content and Class Participation: Do Students Self-censor?" *Journal of Social Work Education* 38 (2): 241-256.
- Ippolito, K. 2007. "Promoting Intercultural Learning in a Multicultural University: Ideals and Realities." *Teaching in Higher Education* 12 (5-6): 749-763.
- Jon, J-E. 2012. "Power Dynamics with International Students: From the Perspective of Domestic Students in Korean Higher Education." *Higher Education* 64 (4): 441-454.
- Jon, J-E. 2013. "Realizing Internationalization at Home in Korean Higher Education: Promoting Domestic Students' Interaction with International Students and Intercultural Competence." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 17 (4): 455-470.
- Kelly, P. 2008. "Achieving Desirable Group-work Outcomes through the Group Allocation Process." *Team Performance Management* 14 (1/2): 22-38.
- Kimmel, K. and S. Volet. 2012a. "Understanding Motivation, Engagement and Experiences of Intercultural Interactions at University: A Person-in-multiple Contexts Perspective." *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 27 (2): 227-245.

- Kimmel, K. and S. Volet. 2012b. "University Students' Perceptions of and Attitudes Towards Culturally Diverse Group Work: Does Context Matter?" *Journal of Studies in International Education* 16 (2): 157-181.
- Knight, J. 2004. "Internationalization remodelled: Definition, Approaches and Rationales." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 8 (1): 5-31.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F. and R.K. Merton. 1954. "Friendship as a Social Process: A Substantive and Methodological Analysis". In *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, edited by M. Berger, T. Abel, and C. H. Page. New York: Van Nostrand, 18–66.
- Lee, P.-W. 2006. "Bridging Cultures: Understanding the Construction of Relational Identity in Intercultural Friendship." *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 35 (1): 3-22.
- Le Roux, J. 2001. "Social Dynamics of the Multicultural Classroom." *Intercultural Education* 12 (3): 273- 288.
- Leask, B. 2001. "Bridging the Gap: Internationalizing University Curricula." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 5 (2): 100-115.
- 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. and C. Bridge. 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. and J. Carroll. 2011. "Moving Beyond 'Wishing and Hoping': Internationalisation and Student Experiences of Inclusion and Engagement." *Higher Education Research & Development* 30 (5): 647-659.
- Luxon, T. and M. Peelo. 2009. "Internationalisation: Its Implications for Curriculum Design and Course Development in UK Higher Education." *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 46 (1): 51-60.
- McClelland, G.P. 2012. "The Influence of Randomly Allocated Group Membership when Developing Student Task Work and Team Work Capabilities." *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 36 (3): 351-369.
- McPherson, M., L. Smith-Lovin and J. Cook. 2001. "Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 415-444.
- Mak, A.S., P.M. Brown and D. Wadey. 2014. "Contact and Attitudes Toward International Students in Australia: Intergroup Anxiety and Intercultural Communication Emotions as Mediators." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 45 (3): 491-504.

- Mak, A.S. and M. Kennedy. 2012. "Internationalising the Student Experience: Preparing Instructors to Embed Intercultural Skills in the Curriculum." *Innovative Higher Education* 37 (4); 323-334.
- Maringe, F. 2009. "Strategies and Challenges of Internationalisation in HE: An Exploratory Study of UK Universities." *International Journal of Educational Management* 23 (7): 553-563.
- Montgomery, C. 2009. "A Decade of Internationalisation: Has It Influenced Students' Views of Cross-Cultural Group Work at University?" *Journal of Studies in International Education* 13 (2): 256-270.
- Office for National Statistics. 2012. *International migrants in England and Wales: 2011 Census*. London: ONS.
- Oxfam. 2006. *Education for Global Citizenship: A Guide for Schools*. Oxford: Oxfam.
- Parsons, L. 2010. "The Effects of an Internationalized University Experience on Domestic Students in the United States and Australia." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 14 (4): 313-334.
- Peacock, N. and N. Harrison. 2009. "'It's so Much Easier to go with What's Easy': 'Mindfulness' and the Discourse Between Home and International Students in the UK." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 13 (4): 487-508.
- Pettigrew, T.F. and L.R. Tropp (2006) "A Meta-analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90 (5): 751-783.
- Pritchard, R. and B. Skinner. 2002. "Cross-cultural Partnerships Between Home and International Students." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 6 (4): 323-354.
- Rienties, B., P. Alcott and D. Jindal-Snape. 2014. "To Let Students Self-Select or Not: That Is the Question for Teachers of Culturally Diverse Groups." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 18 (1): 64-83.
- Rienties, B. and N. Johan. 2014. "Getting the Balance Right in Intercultural Groups: A Dynamic Social Network Perspective" *Social Networking* 3: 173-185.
- Rienties, B. and E-M. Nolan. 2014. "Understanding Friendship and Learning Networks of International and Host Students using Longitudinal Social Network Analysis." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 41: 165-180.
- Saura Sánchez, J. 2004. "Intergroup Perception of International Students." *Academic Exchange Quarterly* 8 (1): 309-313.
- 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.

- Sawir, E. 2013. "Internationalisation of Higher Education Curriculum: The Contribution of International Students." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 11 (3): 359-378.
- Soria, K.M. and J. Troisi. 2014. "Internationalization at Home Alternatives to Study Abroad: Implications for Students' Development of Global, International, and Intercultural Competencies." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 18 (3): 261-280.
- Spencer-Rodgers, J. 2001. "Consensual and Individual Stereotypic Beliefs about International Students among American Host Nationals." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 25 (6): 639-657.
- Spencer-Rodgers, J. and T. McGovern. 2002. "Attitudes Towards the Culturally Different: The Role of Intercultural Communication Barriers, Affective Responses, Consensual Stereotypes, and Perceived Threat." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 26 (6): 609-631.
- Spiro, J. 2014. "Learning Interconnectedness: Internationalisation through Engagement with One Another." *Higher Education Quarterly* 68 (1): 65-84.
- Stephan, W. and C. Stephan. 2000. "An Integrated Threat Theory of Prejudice" In *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination*, edited by S. Oskamp. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Strauss, P., A. U and S. Young. 2011. "'I Know the People I Work Well With': Student Anxiety in Multicultural Group Projects." *Studies in Higher Education* 36 (7): 815-829.
- Strauss, P., A. U-Mackey, and C. Crothers. 2014. "'They Drag my Marks Down!' –Challenges Faced by Lecturers in the Allocation of Marks for Multicultural Group Projects." *Intercultural Education* 25 (3): 229-241.
- Summers, M. and S. Volet. 2008. "Students' Attitudes Towards Culturally Mixed Groups on International Campuses: Impact of Participation in Diverse and Non-diverse Groups." *Studies in Higher Education* 33 (4): 357-370.
- Svensson, L. and M. Wihlborg. 2010. "Internationalising the Content of Higher Education: The Need for a Curriculum Perspective." *Higher Education* 60 (6): 595-613.
- Sweeney, A., S. Weaven and C. Harrington. 2008. "Multicultural Influences on Group Learning: A Qualitative Higher Education Study." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 33 (2): 119-132.
- Teekens, H. 2003. "The Requirement to Develop Specific Skills for Teaching in an Intercultural Setting." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 7 (1): 108-119.
- Teekens, H. (ed.) 2006. *Internationalization at Home: A Global Perspective*. The Hague: NUFFIC.
- Trahar, S. and F. Hyland. 2011. "Experiences and Perceptions of Internationalisation in Higher Education in the UK." *Higher Education Research & Development* 30 (5): 623-633.

- UNESCO. 2012. *Education for Sustainable Development: Building a Better Fairer World for the 21st Century*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2014. *Global Flow of Tertiary-level Students*. Available online at <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Pages/international-student-flow-viz.aspx>
- United Nations. 2013. *Trends in International Migrant Stock: the 2013 revision*. Available online at <http://esa.un.org/unmigration/TIMSA2013/migrantstocks2013.htm>
- Ujitani, E. and S. Volet. 2008. "Socio-Emotional Challenges in International Education: Insight into Intercultural Relational Development." *Journal of Research in International Education* 7 (3): 279-303.
- Ward, C. 2006. "Acculturation, Identity and Adaptation in Dual Heritage Adolescents." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 30: 243-259.
- Whiteford, G. and V. Wright St-Clair. 2002. "Being Prepared for Diversity in Practice: Occupational Therapy Students' Perceptions of Valuable Intercultural Learning Experiences." *British Journal of Occupational Therapy* 65 (3): 129-137.
- Williams, C. and L. Johnson. 2011. "Why Can't We Be Friends?: Multicultural Attitudes and Friendships with International Students." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 35: 41-48.
- Wright, S. and D. Lander. 2003. "Collaborative Group Interactions of Students from Two Ethnic Backgrounds." *Higher Education Research & Development* 22 (3): 237-252.
- Young, M. 2008. *Bringing Knowledge Back In: From Social Constructivism to Social Realism in the Sociology of Education*. Abingdon: Routledge.