

17th IDP Australian International Education Conference

21 – 24 October 2003, Melbourne, Australia

Supporting the Pedagogy of Internationalisation

Gina Curro & Robin McTaggart James Cook University¹

Abstract

The conceptual work of Kemmis and McTaggart in curriculum and action research is used here to provide a framework for the internationalisation of pedagogy. We argue that pedagogical innovation means change in: (i) communicative practices (language, symbols and other representations of teaching), (ii) organisational practices (relationships between teachers and learners), and (iii) work practices ('teaching', 'management', 'teacher education' and 'evaluation'). We also suggest that spontaneous learning practices among students provide a stimulus for thinking about internationalised curricula and pedagogy. It is difficult for teachers to internationalise their work individually. The institution itself must embrace change to create the conditions for informed and collective reflective practice. Internationalisation must become a theoretical and practical exploration of change in the ways in which: (i) teachers learn from, and teach each other, and are supported by teaching development staff; (ii) curriculum, teaching and learning in the university 'classroom' develop; (iii) organisational practices evolve; and (iv) research, evaluation and theory building practices inform and influence teaching and learning. Because our focus here is the establishment of communities of practice we also consider the interactions between the above and individual subjectivity (skills, values, understandings), social structures (culture, economy, political life) and social media (language, work, power).

Introduction

'Internationalisation' is the watchword of change in Australian universities². It signals a commercial impulse, but at the same time expresses a commitment of Australian higher education to use international standards to evaluate its practices. Australian universities are moving away from being somewhat homogeneously 'Australian' with a smattering of international students. They are becoming instead global universities offering curricula and research programs with an Australian perspective. Just what this means is difficult to specify because internationalisation must be the subject of planned invention, experimentation, reflection and development over a period of time. But how do we create the environment for this innovative pedagogical work?

Our intention here is to develop a conceptual framework to guide and support those changes, through the university curriculum. We argue that it is difficult to change some institutional practices without changing most others. We see social life as manifold, rather than complex. It consists of intricately related relationships, not separate aspects that can be studied and changed in isolation. So, whilst we start with the internationalisation of curriculum as a focus, other practices and their contexts must be considered too. We include teaching with the curriculum and develop the discussion of curriculum and teaching further, by considering the spontaneous and autonomous emergence of student learning practices.

First, we see curriculum as a theoretical plan for teaching, describing much more than what is to be taught and learned. It also implies what is worth knowing, what can be taught successfully to students, and the educational relationships envisaged among teachers and learners. Second, we see the enactment of the curriculum through teaching as the curriculum that students experience, no matter what the handbook or subject outline describes. The conceptual frame we propose recognises that the daily interactions between learners, teachers and curriculum resources are what counts. Third, and logically, it follows that the key agents in the changes we anticipate are university teachers. So the contextual conditions needed for teachers to change the university curriculum, its enactment and testing in their educational work, is our focus. We do not see university teachers as 'implementers' of internationalisation, but rather as creators of it over time, with support from others, including students, through their own agency over learning.

Internationalisation of the curriculum is a construct, not a clearly defined set of ideal or best practices. Internationalisation in universities refers to curriculum change in two main ways:

¹ Dr Gina Curro is a Lecturer/Learning Adviser at James Cook University with responsibility for international students. Professor Robin McTaggart is Pro-Vice-Chancellor Staff Development and Student Affairs at James Cook University.

² See for example, Aulakh et al 1997, Haarlov 1997, Hooper et al 1999, Francis 1993, Knight cited in IDP 1995, OECD 1994.

- (i) change to make the curriculum more engaging and relevant for students from cultures different from that of the university itself, and
- (ii) change to prepare students from the home and other cultures to live and work in settings and organisations quite different from those of the university's home culture.

Internationalisation affects all fields of study in the university in one way or another. Many fields will be affected explicitly by an influx of international students, on-campus, on-line, off-shore or in combinations of these. Most universities will have many more students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Students will have different expectations about relationships between teacher and learner, between knowledge and authority, between critique and bad manners, and between buyer and seller. In all fields, universities will also have more domestic students who will need help to develop the skills, understandings and values necessary to work in organisations, systems and communities quite different from their own. Many cross-cultural educational issues apply even where non-Western students attend Australian universities to be inducted into the dominant scientific and technological discourses that are a hallmark of Western culture. It is not sufficient to argue that no change is necessary because science or technology is universal. All knowledge is re-interpreted in particular contexts, and workplaces, customs, industrial laws and the like are far from uniform throughout the world. The location, shape, purpose and scale of a bridge are aesthetic, social and cultural issues, not merely engineering problems, for example. That is, no-one is exempt from the need to reflect and change, not even the practitioners of the more 'universal' disciplines. Similar arguments apply to social technologies such as enrolment procedures, which should take account of expectations of students from different cultures.

A direction for internationalisation

Internationalisation is a social practice. It takes time to put into effect, and can always occur at different levels of engagement. Internationalisation typically begins with rather matter-of-fact technical changes. Because these changes are educationally unsustainable for a number of reasons, small communities of practice among university teachers emerge. They embark on a continuum of development from technical observance, through practical deliberation and more relational participation, to critically reflective practice.

From technical observance to critical reflection

Technical observance is illustrated by an emphasis on:

- (i) recruiting more international students
- (ii) hiring more international staff (or staff with international experience)
- (iii) using international examples in curricula
- (iv) adding support services to help students survive
- (v) seeing 'poor' English as a clinical condition requiring remedy.

In the technical view, internationalisation is an 'add on'. Students are expected to change to meet the expectations of the University while the University remains the same. Of course, university students are expected to change during their studies. Training does involve submitting to the authority of the legitimated texts, and there is an element of that cultural reproduction in all education. But education, especially university education, also involves cultural production, and this requires a dialectical relationship between text and learner, teacher and taught, student and milieu. The serious task of university international education is the re-creation of globalisation in the form of social practices that build new forms of transcultural existence. In such a university, staff and students collaborate with each other in the renegotiation of the practices of:

- (i) curriculum, teaching and learning, and learning support,
- (ii) organisation and administration as the context for social relations,
- (iii) staff development (academic and general), and
- (iv) research into, and evaluation of, curriculum, teaching and learning, and learning support.

The goal of this renegotiation has three elements suggested by Rizvi (2000). First, it implies a curriculum approach that

seeks to provide students with skills of inquiry and analysis rather than a set of facts about globalisation. Since we are confronted with a fast-changing knowledge economy, students need to develop questioning skills so that they are able to identify the sources of knowledge, assess claims of its validity and legitimacy, examine its local relevance and significance,

determine its uses and applications and speculate about how it might be challenged and refuted. The ability to think reflectively and critically about knowledge creation and use requires a form of global imagination; the capacity to determine how knowledge is globally linked, no matter how locally specific its uses (p. 5).

Second, it requires a substantial change in institutional mindset and practice: 'the development of new skills, attitudes and knowledge among students and staff alike' and 'the creation of new learning practices, spaces, ethos and cultures.' The idea of an internationalised and inclusive curriculum also creates challenges about what curriculum content should be. Rizvi says:

.... curriculum content should not arise out of a singular cultural base but should engage critically with the global plurality of the sources of knowledge. It should not only respond to the needs of the local community but should seek to give students knowledge and skills that assist their global engagement. It should encourage students to explore how knowledge is now produced, distributed and utilised globally. It should help them develop an understanding of the global nature of economic, political and cultural exchange. In short, it should assist them in the development of not only global understanding but also global imagination (p. 7).

Third, these explorations assume certain values, values that spell out some of the key differences between universities and other social institutions:

Internationalisation of curriculum therefore should incorporate a range of values that include openness, tolerance and cosmopolitanism. It should demand culturally inclusive behaviour, designed to ensure that cultural differences are heard and explored, that curriculum is a product of the determination to learn from other cultures and that there are a wide variety of factors that affect cultural change (p. 8).

In short, internationalisation involves changing most things a university does, not just the 'student mix'. Internationalising the curriculum makes little sense without contemplating the way the institutional context creates and constrains possibilities for change. The question is how to proceed from technical observance to critically reflective practice. Universities will always begin with some practices at the technical level, not least because they have much to learn about educating internationally. Many will remain at that level. One cannot internationalise curriculum without enrolling students, for example. However, a serious educational and moral problem arises if all practices remain at a technical level. From the critical perspective, technical procedures are only acceptable as developmental steps or as part of a more comprehensive set of critically reflective practices. Vigilance is necessary to ensure that development moves the university towards an authentic and critical internationalist view of itself.

Beyond 'niceness'

Critically self-reflective internationalisation of curriculum is a difficult theoretical, practical and organisational task. It can be said that progressive ideas, such as 'cultural sensitivity' equivocally reflect progress and failure at the same time. Cultural sensitivity may despatch racism, but still denotes 'otherness', whereas a concept like 'cultural inclusiveness' reflects a sense of confidence, reciprocity and mutuality befitting the idea of 'internationalisation' in education. Such affirmation is expressed in the curriculum literature by the notion of the 'inclusive curriculum.' It means more than including people; it means including and recognising different cultural perspectives in the curriculum, and implicitly, attempting to construct dialogue between cultural perspectives that does not homogenise them.

It is likely that universities already have some existing practices that are well constructed practically, and well justified theoretically. These can be regarded as examples from which others can learn, and can reinterpret and reconstruct in their own settings, in response to their own aspirations and student needs. But how does a university decide which are its best examples of international inclusive, critical curriculum practice?

Towards a conceptual frame

At the individual level, changing teaching and curriculum involves change in three basic areas. Teachers will need new skills. They will also need new understandings to justify different curriculum content and teaching practices. Further, they will need to develop new values to guide their work. Each of these will be an extension of existing repertoires, and it will be largely through interaction with peers in the university and in the discipline at large that these changes will come about. How do we inform and examine those changes at the individual level?

Kemmis and McTaggart (2000, forthcoming 2004) in their work in curriculum and action research provide a framework for university teacher development for the internationalisation of pedagogy. They argue that 'practice' can be viewed in several ways:

- (i) the individual performances, events and effects which constitute practice as it is viewed from the "objective", external perspective of an outsider (the way the practitioner's individual behaviour appears to an outside observer);
- (ii) the wider social and material conditions and interactions which constitute practice as it is viewed from the "objective", external perspective of an outsider (the way the patterns of social interaction among those involved in the practice appear to an outside observer);
- (iii) the intentions, meanings and values which constitute practice as it is viewed from the "subjective", internal perspective of individual practitioners themselves (the way individual practitioners' intentional actions appear to them as individual cognitive subjects);
- (iv) the language, discourses and traditions which constitute practice as it is viewed from the "subjective", internal social perspective of members of the participants' own discourse community who must represent (describe, interpret, evaluate) practices in order to talk about and develop them, as happens, for example, in the discourse communities of professions (the way the language of practice appears to communities of practitioners as they represent their practices to themselves and others); and
- (v) the change and evolution of practice – taking into account all four of the aspects of practice just mentioned – which comes into view when it is understood as reflexively restructured and transformed over time – in its historical dimension.

The latter view of the study of practice requires clarification. We can conceptualise this at the individual level in terms of knowledge and social practices, and at the social level in terms of social structures and social media:

INDIVIDUAL (subjectivity)	KNOWLEDGE		
	Understandings	Skills	Values
	SOCIAL PRACTICES		
	Communication	Production	Social Organisation
SOCIAL (structure, ideology)	SOCIAL STRUCTURES		
	Culture	Economy	Political life
	SOCIAL MEDIA		
	Language (discourses)	Work	Power

Because we focus here on developments occurring in communities of practice, university teachers internationalising curriculum and teaching, our principal interest will be the domain of social practices. Within that domain, we argue that pedagogical innovation requires change in several aspects of practice:

- (i) communication (language, symbols and other representations of teaching)
- (ii) organisation (relationships among teachers, learners and others)
- (iii) production (teaching, management, teacher education and evaluation).

In turn, we suggest that educational practice consists of four sub-practices:

EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES	COMMUNICATION	PRODUCTION	SOCIAL ORGANISATION
CURRICULUM	Curriculum content	Pedagogy	Classroom authority and control
ADMINISTRATION	Educational policy	Administrative practices	Relations of authority and evaluation
TEACHER DEVELOPMENT CURRICULUM	Curriculum content	Pedagogy	Classroom authority and evaluation
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH & EVALUATION	Educational theory	Research and evaluation practices	Politics of research and evaluation

The fifth view of view of practice outlined in (v) above invites us to consider the cells of this table in terms of their interactions. This means questioning the adequacy of a focus on inter-subjectivity and shared meaning and recognising that practices are formed discursively in a particular historical and political setting. This challenges us to move beyond concepts like 'cultural sensitivity' to include various cultural perspectives and to think about how different interests are served and worked through. This view itself might be challenged as Western cultural imperialism, and that is an important discussion to open because critique and self-reflection together seem fundamental to the idea of 'a university'.

We do consider that all of the institutionalised practices and sub-practices come from common ideological roots and implicit understandings. This view means that the sub-practices are closely related and overlap. It also means that the consciousness of all practitioners is constituted in similar ways. There are shared understandings at the conscious and sub-conscious levels. The left column could easily be interpreted as a series of practices conducted by university teachers, administrators, staff developers and researcher/evaluators. It is true that sometimes these are specialised professional groups in their own right, but the point here is that elements of all of these sub-practices are evident in all of these forms of work. For example, teachers do curriculum work, but they are also involved in:

- formulating policies for their own classes and the university generally,
- administration and organisation,
- teaching colleagues as well as students, and
- researching, theorising and evaluating their own educational work.

Understanding relationships among the various practices is as important as understanding the relevance of relationships among people engaged in different forms of work. For example, administrative practices such as record keeping about assignment submission are significantly pre-empted by university administrative practices about the processing of assessment results. Both of these are pre-empted by system administrative (and legal) requirements like the Department of Immigration Affairs monitoring international student attendance and progress. All of these levels of practice are intricately, and in some way, the same.

The conceptual frame applied

The previous table has been expanded to include in each cell a gradation of practice from the 'technical' to the 'critical', to give a sense of the preferred developmental direction. This is done for two reasons:

- (i) To comment on the ways in which our categories make certain practices visible, but at the same time de-emphasise other practices. We use student learning practices to illustrate this; and
- (ii) To show how attention to the relationships is necessary for this development to occur.

EXAMPLES of INTERNATIONALISATION: UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM and CONTEXT

UNIVERSITY EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES	COMMUNICATION	PRODUCTION	SOCIAL ORGANISATION
CURRICULUM	Curriculum content	Pedagogy	Classroom authority and control
Technical	Acknowledgment of international authors in the field	Correct pronunciation of student names	Polite Western manners
Practical	Teaching examples from other cultures	Deliberate questioning of students from different cultures to sample perspectives	Consultation with students about preferred classroom relationships
Critical	Competing cultural explanations and perspectives presented for students to compare	Curriculum changes in dialogue with students to reflect cultural preferences and to nurture collaborative learning practices for deep learning and cross-cultural critique	Use of foreign language forms of address, idioms and patterns of respect and deference
ADMINISTRATION	Educational policy	Administrative practices	Relations of authority and evaluation
Technical	Policy emphasises equality of opportunity	Service staff trained to deal with students from different cultures, especially students from Non-English speaking backgrounds	Staff invited to undertake cultural sensitivity training
Practical	Policy emphasises staff development for cultural sensitivity, inclusiveness	Staff of different cultures are appointed	Cultural sensitivity training required of all staff as part of PMP
Critical	Policy emphasises representation of alternative cultural perspectives in all university practices	Active recruitment and support of academic and general staff to move ethnicity profile of staff towards that of students.	Policies and practices systematically and regularly evaluated by stakeholders including community groups
TEACHER DEVELOPMENT CURRICULUM	Curriculum content	Pedagogy	Classroom authority and evaluation
Technical	Basic routines for involvement of all students in classroom interaction included	Participation in staff development for internationalisation voluntary	'Oh that's interesting', 'This is how I do it' classroom dialogue
Practical	Hierarchy of inclusiveness technical to critical/emancipatory included	Teachers explore and document internationalisation practices extant in curricula they teach.	Teacher educators encourage critique of teachers' ideas
Critical	Active critique and reform of curriculum required as part of course assessment	Teacher educators actively teach critique and assist teachers to change teaching and curriculum practices	Data about teaching is presented and improvements to teaching and curriculum planned, implemented and evaluated critically
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND EVALUATION	Educational theory	Research and evaluation practices	Politics of research and evaluation
Technical	Policy regarded as (i) binding aside from occasional review, or (ii) irrelevant or too vague to guide practice	Evaluation of teaching dominated by use of standardised student rating scales	Research and evaluation practices are quantitative, <u>about</u> people rather than for <u>them</u> .
Practical	Theories of teaching and learning well-documented but regarded as eclectic mix and largely a matter of individual personal choice and preference	Research on teaching is phenomenographic, qualitative with a few to discovering general principles of effective teaching	Research and evaluation tend to focus on the curious, the interesting and representation of the other.
Critical	All university teaching and learning policies are treated as theories to be tested in practice and subjected to collective critique to improve practice by making it more rational, justice coherent and satisfying.	Research and evaluation practices focus on teaching, curriculum and the educational milieu together are disciplined by relevant literatures, collective critique, disciplined and informed self-reflection and commitment to improved educational practice	Research and evaluation seen as socially- and historically-constituted practices and therefore correctable by stakeholder participation and a commitment open and reasonable dialogue among those involved and affected.

Learning as a practice

As students of the post-modern will recognise, category systems like those above are contradictory: (i) they provide a lens for seeing social phenomena, and (ii) they obscure others. Of course, what we have described are relationships between teachers and teaching, as aspects of curriculum practice. A critical perspective obviously includes symmetry and reciprocity in the relationships between teachers and learners. To take that point a little further, we emphasise learning as an autonomous practice, often quite divorced from teaching as a practice. We do this to draw attention to the fact that university students are increasingly expected to take control of their own learning. We see that expectation rather weakly articulated as a series of developmental steps in the curriculum. Perhaps oddly, the expectation seems even less explicit for domestic students than for international students from non-English speaking backgrounds. It appears that, all too often, a lack of facility with English and academic English is taken to mean passivity in learning. This is not our view, and by turning attention to the learning practices among 'Confucian Heritage Cultures' (CHC) students, we will explain why.

Students from CHC have been studied extensively because of their emerging importance in Australian higher education. The research has exposed some of the ethnocentric assumptions of the kind already mentioned. Western misconceptions about students from CHC countries (China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, Korea and Japan) have been studied by Watkins & Biggs (2001). Writers such as Mak (1990), and Cheung et al. (1992) both in Watkins & Biggs (1996), warn against referring to a homogeneous Chinese culture. They remind us that students come from varied social and cultural milieux in Chinese Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, Australasia, North America and UK. Nonetheless, by examining the influences of cultural factors on approaches to learning, for example, collectivism, we may find some useful concepts for teachers of today's ethnic Chinese students.

Curro (2003) has outlined some of the features of the learning practices of CHC students. These features appear to exert influence on the ways in which these learners take control of their own learning. This leads us to speculate that autonomous learning practices may stem from aspects of the Confucian tradition itself. "Confucianism is a social ethic that provides a this-worldly oriented moral code of conduct whose chief virtues are filial piety and a combination of loyalty and reverence" (Lew 1988, in Ferguson, 2001, p. 17). However, Confucianism is not homogenous, and national differences have been noted. For example, Confucianism had greater influence in Korea than in China, where the doctrine originated (Hur & Hur, 1988). Korean Confucianism evolved into a strict set of rules for social conduct and encouraged people to sacrifice individualism for the collective good (Ferguson, 2001, p. 17).

Learning as a social practice

The importance of social harmony in relation to the individual in Chinese society has been analysed by several writers. In their review of the learning characteristics of Chinese students, Wilson & Pusey (1996, in Watkins & Biggs, 1996) indicated that collectivism and face consciousness were factors that cause Chinese students to be more achievement-motivated. Ho (1986, in Watkins & Biggs, 1996) observed that when considered globally, the Chinese appear collectivist, compared with the highly individualistic nature of Americans. It has also been said that Chinese collectivism is 'instrumental' in preference to 'terminal', meaning that the Chinese value what education can achieve for them, and not education for its own sake.

According to Ho & Chiu (1994), the concepts of individualism and collectivism are complex, distinct and not at either ends of a single continuum.

... individualism and collectivism are multidimensional constructs; each embodies a constellation of component ideas... There is no necessary contradiction in holding individualist and collectivist views at the same time (Ho & Chiu, 1994, p. 138).

From the scheme, 'Components of Individualism and Collectivism', which was developed for the purpose of classifying over 2,000 popular Chinese sayings, we learn that collectivism and anti-individualism are expressed in only one of the five areas examined: achievement. The other four areas examined in the scheme were values, autonomy/conformity, responsibility and self-reliance/interdependence. In a second scheme, the 'Components of Social Organisation', Ho & Chiu use the terms integrative and non-integrative with respect to organisation. Principles such as the sharing of leadership and responsibility, altruism, public morality, group discipline, harmony, and hierarchical loyalty (Ho & Chiu, 1994, p. 138) appear in this scheme. The latter are relevant to behaviour in learning situations, but it is the importance of collectivism in the pursuit of educational achievement that we wish to consider.

Tang (1996, in Watkins & Biggs, 1996) stated that, in their social transactions, the Chinese value inter-relatedness and dependence. This sense of collectivism in Chinese society has been referred to as 'a

preference for a tightly-knit social framework in which members can expect others to look after them in return for total loyalty' (Hofstede, 1983, in Watkins & Biggs, 1996, p. 225). The Chinese are believed to value efforts by members of a group achieving collective goals, rather than individual competitiveness, according to Ho (1981, 1986 in Watkins & Biggs, 1996). A study by Bond (1991, in Watkins & Biggs, 1996) revealed that when asked to describe themselves in relation to self and society, Chinese people associate more closely with their 'social self', than their 'ideal self'. They lean more toward group-related concepts, holding group-related traits and roles in high regard.

Yang (1986, in Watkins & Biggs, 1996) argued that the Chinese are prepared to sacrifice personal enjoyment in favour of collective benefit. With the influence of modernization, however, he admits that the Chinese character is moving away from its collectivist orientation (Yang, 1986 in Kim et al. 1994). Comparing the work habits of Chinese and American students, Wheeler (1986, in Watkins & Biggs, 1996) noted that the type of cooperation and interaction among Chinese students is task-related, rather than recreational. Furthermore, in their social relationships, Chinese people are more trustful and willing to commit themselves in material resources and information, and at the same time take pride in the success of others (Watkins & Biggs, 1996, p. 183). According to Li, Cheung & Kau (1979, in Watkins & Biggs, 1996), as Chinese children grow older, they show greater willingness to cooperate with peers and, interestingly, this readiness to cooperate survives under competitive conditions:

Chinese socialization practices emphasize sharing, cooperation and acceptance of social obligations, and deemphasize competition and aggression' (Ho, 1986 in Watkins & Biggs, 1996, p. 225).

'Friendship first, competition second', is an ancient Chinese proverb which challenges the Western misconception that competition is valued in Chinese society. In a chapter on peer tutoring and learning outcomes, Winter (in Watkins & Biggs, 1996, p. 228) provided five accounts of peer tutoring studies in Hong Kong (Hui, 1985, the North Point study (no date), Ma, 1993, Chan, 1987, and Pang, 1993). The findings of all of these studies suggested that the outcomes for both tutors and students, in achievement terms, are striking. What is worth noting is that these studies were conducted outside of class times. It seems clear that cooperative learning approaches such as peer tutoring have much to offer the Chinese educational context (Watkins & Biggs, 1996). In other words, existing social practices among CHC learners provide an important cue for an educational approach in Australian contexts.

Informal learning as a practice

Spontaneous social situations offer students a wealth of opportunities for learning from each other. Boud and colleagues (2001) have described the benefits of informal peer learning which they say takes place in all courses at all levels. Often teachers are not even aware of the fact that students initiate conversations about their learning both inside and outside classrooms. The students gather and share information, review each other's work, consult each other about approaches and work out solutions to assessment tasks.

It is worth emphasising that it is not always necessary for academic staff to give feedback: students can often learn more from formal or informal assessments by their peers... (Ramsden, 2003, p. 189).

Chinese students, perhaps more than other students, have a real need to work together. Even when rewards or grades are awarded individually, Chinese students are ready to cooperate with each other on an informal and spontaneous basis. Researchers in Hong Kong observed cooperative learning activities being organised by the students themselves. Instead of teachers coordinating learning groups formally, the initiative to gather in small groups and cooperate in preparation for assessment tasks was undertaken by the students themselves (Tang, 1996, in Watkins & Biggs, 1996). These learning practices devised by students have an important educational effect. Compared with other styles in competitive and individualistic situations, studies reveal that cooperative learning is superior in enhancing student achievement (Humphreys, Johnson & Johnson, 1982; Nichols & Miller, 1994; Slavin, 1983a, 1987; Topping, 1992; Web, 1985 in Watkins & Biggs, 1996).

Peer learning as a practice

Following Watkins and Biggs (1996, 2001), Curro (2002) has argued that these CHC student learning practices appear consistent with the use of teaching approaches such as peer tutoring.

Peer tutoring is guided by a cooperative value that the success of others is as important as one's own success; it involves students actively working together to achieve a shared learning goal; and it requires the teacher to

become a manager of learning rather than a provider of instruction (Watkins & Biggs, 1996, p. 221).

Ramsden (1992) has drawn attention to the commitment for higher education to promote student independence through active and responsible cooperative learning practices. Clearly, there are many advantages for the self-directed learner when working with peers. The affective, attitudinal and behavioural gains for both the students and the tutors involved in peer learning are well known. We are interested however, in the process involved when spontaneous learning practices result in adaptive and productive pedagogical strategies.

It is interesting to note that the preference for group learning may explain one of the curious contradictions about CHC learners. In Western countries, educationalists often assume that memorization equals mechanical rote learning (learning without understanding), even when analysing Asian approaches to learning. Consequently, Western teachers often perceive Chinese students as passive rote learners. In their work on the psychological and pedagogical perspectives in teaching Chinese students, Watkins & Biggs (2001) referred to the paradox of the Chinese learner: how is it possible that Chinese students who rely so much on memorization as a learning strategy outperform their Western counterparts and have deeper, meaning-oriented approaches to learning?

We suggest that it is the social and communicative nature of CHC learning approaches that actually leads to generating deep learning. The meaning or message underlying the learning material is critical in deep learning, unlike surface learning, where the learning material itself is the focus. Tang (1990, in Ramsden 2003) pointed out the positive effects on achievement for students involved in cooperative group discussions about assignments. "They perceived their activity to be useful for understanding the content to be learned and used deep approaches to learning it. These were in turn related to higher-quality learning outcomes" (in Ramsden, 2003, p. 98).

We have noted here the extent and nature of the spontaneous group learning practices of CHC learners. As suggested in the framework (see the highlighted cell p. 10), we want to argue for more dialogue between teachers and learners, to increase the responsiveness of the curriculum to student needs and learning preferences. We want to consider how university teachers can improve teaching and curriculum in communities of learning practice. In other words, how do we construct more informed pedagogical relationships between teachers and learners? There is already a substantial literature about university teacher development (Ramsden, 2003). What we want to focus on is supporting teacher development. What conditions are necessary to support teachers to become active participants in their own learning about the practices of internationalisation.

Supporting internationalisation of curriculum

How does the framework suggest a university should respond to stimulate and support internationalisation of the curriculum? We know that academic participants in internationalisation expect comprehensive rationales to justify changes in educational practice. We also know that inconsistency among policies and practices leads to rejection of innovation on the grounds of lack of substance and commitment.

Leading and supporting change is therefore not easy. Educational institutions are loosely coupled; people cannot be directed to implement change. Some people are resistant to change. That is not to say university teachers are resistant; the contrary is typically the case. But what nurtures change towards internationalisation, and more critically reflective approaches to it?

The answer is 'Change everything!', but also 'Start small!'. As well as inviting local efforts to change practices, we must work in all university services to change social structures (culture, economy, political life) and the social media (discourses, work, power) that create or constrain possibilities for change.

Social structures

Internationalisation involves changing institutional culture. A step in this direction means adopting 'internationalisation' as a project for the whole curriculum, not merely a curriculum for international students. This directs attention away from assimilation approaches based on ethnocentric, deficit models which focus on remediation (Volet, 1999). Of course, institutional cultures are composed of more than teaching and learning programs. Internationalisation involves thinking about research and research training, staff recruitment, corporate support, clearly stated and shared aspirations, community relationships (service, input, advocacy), support for students, and critique, for example, in course and department reviews. Attention to internationalisation should permeate institutional life.

The material economy of institutional life must reflect commitment to 'internationalisation'. People should be promoted for being good at it, given time release to recast curricula, and teaching and staff development awards should feature internationalisation. Bilingual staff should be recognised. In the current economic climate, failure to attract international students may lead to financial difficulties for some disciplines. It is a fact that some disciplines can generate resources for internationalisation more readily than others. The university must develop budget approaches that redistribute operating surpluses so that all disciplines can participate in curriculum internationalisation. This is another way of saying commercial values should not dominate decisions about the curriculum profile of the university.

Closely related to economic influences is the real politik of institutional life. Not only material imperatives influence the way people act. Recognition, legitimate authority and the invitation and opportunity to innovate are important. The university should support staff wanting to 'internationalise' against the conservative edicts of professional bodies (but recognise their capacity to stimulate innovation too). It makes a difference if the management of the university sponsors internationalisation, and works to create a culture of disapproval of monoculturalism.

Social media

Ideology manifests itself in all of the above, but perhaps is most strongly expressed in the subtle message systems of

- allowed and preferred discursive forms (for example, favouring commercial over intellectual values)
- what counts as legitimate work (for example, publication is more important than rewriting assessment tasks to make them more accessible for NESB learners), and
- the patterns of deference that illustrate power differentials (for example, a learning adviser with TESOL teaching skills deferring to a lecturer whose teaching is confusing international students).

Shifts in ideology will be reflected in a changing concept and image of the 'student'. This will be reminiscent of the change observed in a past generation when the concept of the student expanded from 'school leaver' (and an elite one at that) to include 'mature age', 'postgraduate' and so on. Work practices will change as teaching and support staff acquire new skills, understandings and values legitimated by changing institutional ideology and established as a result of training and staff development. Any unevenness in economic return or other international success will adjust work practices and power differentially. New forms of institutional politics must be learned to preserve curricular breadth and integrity, and to restrict the dominance of commercial values in the selection of curriculum content in the disciplines.

Summary

Supporting the internationalisation of pedagogy is a comprehensive task. It involves opportunities for academic staff to experiment with teaching and curriculum, and especially to respond to the learning practices already in students' repertoires. Internationalisation can occur in simple technical ways, or can be developed from a critical perspective with commitment to inclusiveness. None of this will happen readily in the absence of shifts in the ideology of the institution. Attention must be paid to the real politik and material economy of institutional life in order to make internationalisation satisfying for staff. Staff development must promote new ideas about educational practices and university teachers must be given realistic opportunities to try ideas out. The university must sponsor disciplined and informed reflection on both current practices and changes. In this way, the university can internationalise its curriculum.

References

- Aulakh, G., Brady, P., Dunwoodie, K., Perry, J., Roff, G., and Steward, M. (1997). *Internationalising the curriculum across RMIT University*. Melbourne: RMIT.
- Ballard, B., and Clanchy, J. (1997). *Teaching International Students. A brief guide for lecturers and supervisors*. ACT: IDP Education Australia.
- Boud, D., Cohen, R. & Sampson, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Peer learning in higher education: Learning from and with each other*. St Ives, UK: Clays.
- Butorac, A. (1997). *Quality in Practice. Internationalising the Curriculum in the Classroom*. Western Australia: Curtin University.
- Ferguson, M. (2001). Teaching and learning inside the Korean culture. *International Educator*, X(2), 16-23.
- Francis, A. (1993). *Facing the future: the internationalisation of post-secondary institutions in British Columbia*. Vancouver, British Columbia: Task Force Report, Centre for International Education.
- Haarlov, V. (1997). *National Policies for the Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe 1985-2000 (Case: Denmark)*. Stockholm: Hogskoleverket Studies, Hogskoleverket Agency for Higher Education.
- Ho, D. & Chiu, C. (1994). Component Ideas of Individualism, Collectivism, and Social Organisation: An Application in the Study of Chinese Culture. In U. Kim, H. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon. (Eds.). *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications*, (pp. 137-156). Thousand Oakes, California, USA: Sage.
- Hooper, M., Garnett, G., Walsh, L., Vicziany, M., Rizvi, F., and Webb, G. (1999). *Internationalisation of the Curriculum*. Melbourne: Monash University (mimeo).
- Hur, B. & Hur, S. (1993). *Culture shock! Korea*. Singapore: Times Books International.
- IDP Education Australia (1995). *Curriculum Development for Internationalisation: Australian Case Studies and Stocktake*. Canberra: DEETYA.
- Kemmis, S. and McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory action research. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research (2nd Ed.)*(pp. 567-605). Beverley Hills CA: Sage.
- Kemmis, S. and McTaggart, R. (forthcoming). Participatory action research: Communicative action and the public sphere. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research (3rd Ed.)* Beverley Hills CA: Sage.
- OECD (1994). *Education in a New International Setting: Curriculum Development for Internationalisation — Guidelines for Country Case Study*. Paris: OECD (CERI).
- Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. (2nd ed.). London, UK: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Rizvi, F. (2000). *Internationalisation of curriculum*. Melbourne: RMIT University (mimeo).
- Volet, S. (1999). Learning across cultures: appropriateness of knowledge transfer. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 31, 625-643.
- Watkins, D. & Biggs, J. (Eds.). (1996). *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences*. Hong Kong: Central Printing Press.
- Watkins, D. & Biggs, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and pedagogical perspectives*. Hong Kong: Central Printing Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice : Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Bionotes

Dr Gina Curro is a Lecturer/Learning Adviser at James Cook University with responsibility for international students. She recently designed for pre-entry international students a new subject that uses specific writing styles of several disciplines to develop communication and learning skills.

Professor Robin McTaggart is Pro-Vice-Chancellor Staff Development and Student Affairs at James Cook University. His academic interests are in participatory action research, curriculum and democratic evaluation.