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Abstract
This paper illuminates an area that has received scant attention in the literature on the internationalisation of higher education. Whilst interest has been paid over the past 15 years to the internationalisation of universities qua organisations and, lately, to the student experience, this paper focuses on the internationalisation of the academic Self and lecturers as global citizens. It develops themes that emerged from doctoral research in an Australian university on an allied health department which was peer recognised as an exemplar in teaching international students. The research findings suggested that the staff had dispositions that were consistent with cosmopolitan outlooks even though they did not engage to any significant extent with internationalised curricula. It is argued that whilst having a cosmopolitan disposition is a necessary condition for global citizenship, it is debatable whether it is in itself a sufficient condition in isolation when viewed through the lens of the work of lecturers in the Twenty First century. A stronger expression of global citizenship would be lecturers with cosmopolitan dispositions working with internationalised curricula, for together these perspectives can provide useful synergies which can produce and sustain a sophisticated, contextualised expression of being a ‘citizen of the world’.
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Introduction
The discourse around the internationalisation of higher education since the turn of the new millennium has increasingly concentrated on developments in curricula that support learning outcomes which are based on international, intercultural1, and global perspectives. This represents a broadening of the focus which was evident throughout the 1990s when internationalisation was largely discussed in terms of what it meant to universities at the organisational level in terms of, for example, rationales, activities, processes, and outcomes. Smart, Volet, and Ang (2000) suggested that towards the end of the last decade there had been growing interest in internationalising curricula, although it was largely pursued in a sporadic, ad hoc manner and was mostly concerned with altering subject matter, or curriculum content, to make it less parochial (p. 41). For Smart et al (2000), while content reform was beneficial, the most promising innovations would most likely emerge in the area of instructional methods and intercultural interaction in the classroom (p. 41). Such developments give legitimacy to the claims of observers like Knight (1999), Singh (2002), and Bartell (2003) who maintain that universities have embarked on a mission to help all students become ‘new internationalist’ learners, workers, and citizens.

1 Although little distinction is apparent in the learning and teaching literature at the level of the individual between terms such as multicultural, cross-cultural, and intercultural, the latter term is most closely matched to the interests of this paper. Liddicoat (2003) spoke of “interculturality” as being primarily concerned with the “issues of identity and engagement” that involved “both a culture-general component and a culture-specific component” (p. 19).
Whilst this may be so, the corollary, indeed precursor, of all of this is that academics as individuals (and in teams) would need to be operating from a base that extends beyond local and national perspectives to help students develop, appreciate and consolidate international, intercultural, and global outlooks. Lecturers, themselves, would have to be among the cosmopolitans of the Twenty-First century if they are to promote these outcomes to their students, for how else could it be achieved? The interests of this paper, then, lie in unpacking what it means for lecturers to be the ‘new internationalists’. To explore this, the paper develops themes that precipitated from doctoral research from 2002-2006 in which the theoretical and practical pillars of a ‘profile of the ideal lecturer for teaching international students’ was examined against the teaching practice of lecturers in an allied health department that was peer recognised as a leader in teaching international students. This provided an opportunity to investigate curricula in the department (in terms of its content, process, and context) as well as the personal and professional qualities of the lecturers in relation to why their peers regarded the department as an exemplar of working in a supportive way with students from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds.

The conceptual framework of this paper is based on four elements. The first situates and explains ‘internationalisation’ to provide a reference point for the concept as it applies to higher education. The second provides a brief overview of what is meant by ‘internationalised curricula’. This is necessary to give an indication of the sorts of activities that are generally referred to when people speak of learning and teaching and internationalisation. The third element outlines what is meant by ‘global citizenship’. The paper uses the concept of ‘cosmopolitanism’ to explore the fundamental ideas associated with this form of citizenry. The fourth briefly highlights the main features of ‘universal’ or ‘inclusive’ approaches to teaching through the work of John Biggs. Together, these four elements set the scene for the research results and discussion that follows which addresses the question posed in the title of this paper, that is, can inclusive teaching that is essentially devoid of internationalised curricula qualify as a sufficient condition for global citizenship?

**Situating and explaining ‘internationalisation’**

Knight’s process approach to internationalisation in higher education has been evident in the literature since the mid-1990s (Knight, 2004, p. 9) and has been widely embraced by Australian universities (Harman, 2005, p. 124). Her ideas have had considerable influence on the ways that various stakeholders have come to understand internationalisation as it applies to universities *qua* organisations. Essentially, Knight (2004) conceptualises internationalisation as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2004, p. 11). Significantly, Knight (2004) believes that despite the influence of sectoral and national forces, the “real process” of internationalisation is actually taking place at the level of individual institutions (p. 6).

Of late, however, Knight’s (2004) work has been recognised as being limited in terms of its utility for guiding some important within-institution internationalisation initiatives. For example, Enequist (2005) describes Knight’s (2004) most recent definition and concept of internationalisation as one amongst a number of “very general” offerings (p. 15). Liddicoat (2003) says that Knight’s work “gives little concrete assistance to individual academics who seek to pursue the aim of internationalisation in their teaching practices, curricula and delivery of courses” (p. 4). Knight largely concentrates on organisational approaches to internationalisation and does not attempt to instruct at the level of the individual actor, for example, the lecturer and their teaching work. This is not to say that her conceptualisation
of internationalisation is meaningless to lecturers who want to better understand its import for a range of activities in higher education. It is simply lacking in the detail that would satisfy the particular needs that Liddicoat (2003) outlines. Lecturers have look elsewhere for assistance to unpack what ‘international’, ‘intercultural’, and ‘global’ perspectives mean in terms of the curricula they develop and implement.

**Perspectives on internationalised curricula**

International, intercultural, and global perspectives can be manifested both in and through curricula in a number of ways. Perhaps the most straightforward of these is through curriculum content. For example, a Bachelor of Property at an Australian university might include information on how property is developed, evaluated, and managed in Singapore as well as in Australia. The basis of this could be that having students know that ‘property development’ can be approached differently elsewhere is good for comparative purposes, as well as for their participation in the international labour market when they graduate. This appeals to the point made by Smart et al (2000) that internationalising curriculum content broadens students’ horizons beyond from peculiarly local phenomena.

What interested Smart et al (2000) more than internationalising curriculum content, however, were innovative teaching approaches that foster intercultural interaction and, presumably, a greater understanding and acceptance of cultural diversity; the overriding responsibility of contemporary education, according to UNESCO’s International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (1996, pp. 22-24.) Support for such outcomes is evident elsewhere in the literature on learning and teaching in higher education. For example, Rizvi and Walsh (1998) note that “a more comprehensive awareness of difference and its implications for personal and social development has come to be seen as a profound feature of contemporary life” (p. 8). Kalantzis and Cope (2000) believe that all students needed to become “comfortable with cultural diversity” (p. 31).

‘Intercultural competence’, according to Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2003), is a key for preparing international and local students for their working lives. To this end, curricula which expose students to, and help them develop, intercultural knowledge, awareness, skills, and dispositions are vitally important. To provide an idea of how this might look, Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2003) reported briefly on four case studies to illustrate how they developed intercultural competence in their students. Two of their initiatives were classroom-based, one was based in the university community, and one was based in the broader community outside the university (see Table 1). The activities are largely experiential and put the students into situations which engage them in active learning both inside and outside of the classroom.

Whilst Smart et al (2000) thought that the classroom was the place where innovative teaching would promote intercultural interaction and engagement, the out-of-classroom activities described Table 1 demonstrates lateral thinking about how to provide students with internationalisation-related experiences and learning opportunities. Other creative approaches which extend the idea of where and when this sort of learning can take place can be found in two subjects at the University of South Australia. One is where business students collaborate online with business students at a university in The Netherlands to produce a significant project. The other is the Global Experience program which is designed to expand students’ knowledge “through networks, workshops and a range of activities including volunteering, language studies, mentoring and going on exchange.” (UniSA, 2008). It is also worth noting Leask’s (2008) research around the ‘informal curriculum’, consisting of structured and semi-structured educational opportunities outside class time, which aim to
produce meaningful outcomes for students in terms of intercultural engagement. For example, peer mentoring and ‘buddy’ initiatives that take place outside class time which both facilitate and reward interaction between international and local students.

Table 1 - A customised typology for internationalising coursework and curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of integrating aims, concepts of culture</th>
<th>Learning Aims</th>
<th>Concepts of Culture</th>
<th>Learning Context</th>
<th>Learning Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Study 1:</strong> Internationalisation and intercultural exchanges: a Chinese language and culture exchange program</td>
<td>Enhancing interaction between students, viz. those learning Mandarin and students from China</td>
<td>Culture as a set of everyday practices and behaviour</td>
<td>Outside the classroom: one-on-one interactions</td>
<td>Structured interviews and worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Study 2:</strong> Internationalisation and rethinking culture: Spanish in the Community</td>
<td>Providing opportunities for students to see culture in the ‘everyday’</td>
<td>Culture as an organism: a dynamic view of culture</td>
<td>Outside the classroom: one-on-one interactions</td>
<td>Structured interviews and worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Study 3:</strong> Internationalisation and class activities: using the experiences of local and international students as a classroom resource</td>
<td>Using students as learning resources in understanding cultural practices and attitudes</td>
<td>Culture as both ‘something you perform and something you learn about’</td>
<td>Inside the classroom: whole class and small group work</td>
<td>Videos, interviews, problem-solving activities and inter-group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Study 4:</strong> Internationalisation and assessment practices: academic work exploring as a cultural practice</td>
<td>Enhancing opportunities for understanding the cultural practices of the university</td>
<td>The university as a sub-culture</td>
<td>Inside the classroom: whole class and small group work</td>
<td>Cooperative group research, creating a portfolio of readings through database searches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Modified from Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2003), p. 90.

This overview of how internationalised curricula might be manifested speaks to more than just teaching around formal and informal aspects of curricula. It also suggests that the lecturers who are involved would be intellectually, personally, and professionally engaged with the conceptual foundations of the ‘internationalised’ learning. Indeed, it is difficult to envisage a lecturer whose work was directed towards fostering international, intercultural, and global outcomes in their students yet who would not embrace and support the foundations upon which the curricula are built. Not to do so would seem inauthentic, unfulfilling, and ultimately unsustainable. The foundations which underpin internationalised curricula are explored in the following section through the lens of cosmopolitanism-as-global citizenship.
Features of global citizenship
Contemporary globalisation has rekindled the idea of a global citizenry. In a time when many people experience “an altogether new condition of neighbourliness, even with those most distant from ourselves” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 29), increasing importance is being placed on the ability of people to better understand one another and be accepting of cultural diversity in particular. Globalisation has created “overlapping communities of fate” by bringing the world’s population “closer together” (Held, 2003, p. 180). Koenig-Archibugi (2003) suggests that people in all circumstances and from all countries “sense that their fortunes partly depend on events occurring in distant parts of the globe” (p. 1). Whether this realisation supports the largely instrumental view that being able to understand and work with other cultures is a prerequisite for success in the global market economy, or a broadly humanistic view that is based on shared understanding, acceptance, mutual respect, and world peace, the claim that Diogenes Laertius made nearly two and a half thousand years ago of being a ‘citizen of the world’ is apt. To this end, this paper uses the concept of cosmopolitanism to convey the notion of global citizenship.

Kleingeld and Brown (2002) suggest that “the nebulous core shared by all cosmopolitan views is the idea that all human beings, regardless of their political affiliation, do (or at least can) belong to a single community, and that this community should be cultivated” (¶ 1). This view supports what Gunesch (2004) notes as a catchcry in the current literature on cosmopolitanism, that is, feeling “at home in the world” (p. 256) or, crudely expressed, to be able to live anywhere and get on with anyone. More specifically, a cosmopolitan outlook is usefully described by Tomlinson (as cited in Matthews & Sidhu, 2005) as “an intellectual and aesthetic sense of openness towards people, places and experiences from different cultures, especially those from different nations” (p. 53). This resonates well with the sorts of educational outcomes that universities are seeking to develop in their students. It also suggests that a key to this state of being is an acknowledgement that people need “to become critically aware of one’s own tacit assumptions and expectations” (Mezirow, 2000, p. 4); perhaps even more so than being intimately familiar with culture-specific knowledge. Knowing more deeply what is ‘inside’ is can facilitate a heightened appreciation of what is ‘outside’ and is perhaps the fundamental activity that Said (1995) promotes as critical to understanding Otherness. It also resonates with the exhortation from Socrates to ‘know thyself’.

Of interest, whilst the notion of cosmopolitanism is only just beginning to be associated with the internationalisation of higher education, its ideal is compatible with the thing that most proponents of internationalisation of higher education are passionate about, viz. a moral and ethically-founded spirit of internationalism; “the view that the nations of the world should co-operate politically, economically, culturally, etc and work towards greater mutual understanding” (Manser & Thomson, 1995, p. 672). The discourse around internationalisation and higher education is more often than not based on a philosophy of being a grassroots, bottom-up, ethical response to top-down global forces, particularly in a bid to ameliorate the effects of neo-liberal globalisation and the hegemony of the West/North.

---

2 This paper adopts the view of Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton (1999) who describe globalisation as “a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organisation of social relations and transactions – assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact – generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power” (p. 16).

3 See Sanderson (2008) for a detailed consideration of cosmopolitanism, internationalisation, and higher education.

4 Examples are information on cultural etiquette and Hofstede’s (2001) cultural dimensions.
(This is actually the basis of Knight’s approach.) In a traditional sense, internationalism contains a functional and even a moral imperative. This is expressed well by Luke (2004):

The ethical and moral demands on education, as well as the changed conditions of human capital production ... are requiring broader critical engagements with globalization, with cross- and trans-cultural knowledges, and with the complex synergies between geo-political, economic local events and knowledges. Simply, while new economic and geopolitical conditions are requiring a new teacher with critical capacities for dealing with the transnational and the global, current policies have turned the teacher into a generic consumer of multinational products with a narrowly local, regional and national epistemic standpoint. What is needed is nothing short of the reenvisioning of a transcultural and cosmopolitan teacher: a teacher with the capacity to shunt between the local and the global, to explicate and engage with the broad flows of knowledge and information, technologies and populations, artefacts and practices that characterise the present historical moment. (pp. 1438-1439)

Whilst the focus in the contemporary literature is mainly on curricula that assist students to be proficient in what Eisenchlas and Trevaskes (2003) termed “interculturality” (p. 87) in order to satisfy both instrumental and humanistic ends, it presupposes that lecturers are equipped, both personally and professionally, to bring about such educational outcomes. This is a big presupposition given that very little investigation has been done on the competency of lecturers in this area, but it at least portrays the possibility that lecturers (and students) who embrace cosmopolitan outlooks will be the sort of agents who can help create what the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (1996) called the “necessary Utopia” (p. 22) in which, above all else, people will have learned to “live together” (p. 22).

Further, it is important to note that the sort of cosmopolitanism this paper promotes is one that embraces both local and international/global identities. This position eschews universal moral cosmopolitanism in favour of what G. Pascal Zachary (2000) calls “the global me: local people who are neither limited to their particularities nor doomed to an empty we-are-the-world universalism” (p. xv), the latter being a hyperglobalist interpretation of cosmopolitanism. Rooted cosmopolitanism (sometimes referred to as ‘grounded’ cosmopolitanism) reconciles two seemingly opposite poles of a local-global continuum; roots and ‘wings’ (G. Pascal Zachary, 2000). A person’s roots are found in their heritage, whilst their wings enable them to relate to life beyond their locality. In the face of global forces promoting a Western world view through, for example, financial and cultural flows, rooted or grounded cosmopolitanism would seem to be the only legitimate worldview for committed internationalists. In addition, the journey from neophyte to seasoned cosmopolite means transiting the places and spaces along the local-global continuum. This introduces a sense of dynamism to the development of cultural identity where it is a case of it being more “shades of grey (than) black and white” (Gunesh, 2004, p.257).

Inclusive teaching and cosmopolitanism
The preceding discussion has specified meaning for important themes in this paper. Attention is now turned to the work of Biggs (2003) around inclusive approaches to teaching to understand how he sees the role of culture in learning and teaching. This provides an insight into how the notion of cosmopolitanism-as-global-citizenship articulates with ‘good teaching’. Biggs (2003) promotes inclusive teaching as a way to support the progress of all students towards achieving learning objectives associated with their studies. It matters not if these learning objectives revolve around internationalised curricula or not. The focus is on teaching through the lens of how students respond academically to the learning and teaching arrangements that constitute the curriculum process of any particular subject.
Biggs (2003) posits that inclusive teaching is teaching as educating because it focuses on what students do, rather than on what students are or what the lecturer does. It is the most desirable form of teaching and Biggs (2003) suggests it rests on the following propositions:

1. Persistent teaching problems lie not in the student but in the teaching.
2. In our teaching, we should focus on the similarities between students rather than on differences. Differences obviously exist, but to focus on them is counterproductive.
3. Accordingly, allowing for the needs of special groups, such as ISs [international students], is best done within the whole teaching system. (pp. 138-139)

Biggs (2003) says inclusive teaching promotes “learning in context” (p. 136) and is directed at helping students develop the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet the learning objectives of their studies. It is based on the universality of the learning process and recognises that many of the strategies about how to teaching international students are actually universal teaching principles that will benefit all students. For example, explaining idiom, colloquialisms, discipline-specific terminology, or being explicit about assessment requirements. Further, this form of teaching is predicated on the ethnicity of international students as being “beside the point” (Biggs, 2003, p. 134). As long as there is consistency in the alignment between the elements of (valid) curricula and students are assisted to make the transition to the learning and teaching environment, inclusive teaching can take place regardless of in which country and in which cultural context the teaching happens. It doesn’t matter if the teaching is directed towards local or international students in local or international settings (for example, in Australia or Taiwan or Kazakhstan). If the curricula support and promote deep learning outcomes, then the cultural diversity present in the class is not an educational concern. Such a view might be said to effectively make the notion of internationalised teaching practice (curriculum process activities) largely redundant. Put simply (and in the Biggsian sense) good teaching will engage all students and help them learn what is worth learning.

To support his argument, Biggs (2003) draws on research which concludes that the main study-related difficulties reported by local and international university students in Australia are related to poor teaching, a mismatch between student and staff expectations, lack of access to staff, and heavy workloads (Mullins, as cited in Biggs, 2003, p. 137). For Biggs (2003), these findings indicate that the fundamental difficulties faced by international students are essentially the same as those faced by Australian students as they make the transition to study at the tertiary level. He does, however, make two concessions. One is that the extent of the challenges is likely to be greater for international students. The other is that language is a big issue for ‘English as an Additional Language’ (EAL) students. These challenges notwithstanding, good teaching will ceteris paribus assist students to adapt and adjust to the demands of the local learning and teaching environment. For Biggs (2003), the key concept is transition as the students move from one learning environment into another (and it is just as relevant to local students as it is to international students.)

The link between inclusive teaching and cosmopolitanism is implicit. Rather than lecturers focusing on what students are (Level 1 teaching), where cultural stereotypes are a convenient way of interpreting their behaviour, or trying to accommodate the needs of, for example, international students in terms of what they are used to from their previous educational experiences (Level 2 teaching), Level 3 teaching considers what students do in response to the learning and teaching arrangements that characterise their current studies. They focus not on the cultures of the students but instead on helping all students meet the course’s learning objectives. The inference is that Level 3 teaching takes place in an environment which promotes respect for the uniqueness of the students as cultural and
social beings. In this way, these lecturers can be said to have dispositions that lend themselves to being cosmopolitan in their outlook.

The research activity
The research site was an allied health teaching department at a medium-size Australian university that taught undergraduate and postgraduate coursework programs. International students made up half of the 100 students in total. Although the vast majority of the international students came from Singapore, Malaysia, and Hong Kong, there were also students from other Asian countries, as well as Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. The research utilised a case-study approach which employed a questionnaire and interviews to collect data from six lecturers in the department\(^5\). This increased the range and types of data that were obtained and also represented a triangulation technique which increased the validity of the research. Both instruments were pre-tested and pilot tested and ethics approval was granted for the research to begin. Pseudonyms were use to enhance the anonymity of the research participants. The main feature of the data collection was the use of multiple, in-depth interviews of at least one hour each between 2003 and 2005. The rationale for this was Seidman’s (1991) advice to interviewers was that “a one-shot meeting with an “interviewee” whom they have never met tread[s] on thin contextual ice” (p. 10).

Results and discussion
This section of the paper is divided into two parts. The first demonstrates how internationalised curriculum content features only in a minor way in the allied health program. The second part focuses on the personal and professional qualities of the lecturers that are indicative of cosmopolitan dispositions, and which position their teaching towards Biggs’s Level 3 ‘teaching as educating’ rather than at Level 1 or Level 2\(^6\).

Internationalised curriculum content
Each lecturer was asked about ways the content in their subjects used examples from various cultural and national settings. What became apparent was that the curriculum content of the department’s academic programs was focused on providing graduates who could work in the Australian health system. Whilst the allied health qualifications could also be used for employment in many overseas countries, the content was driven by national needs and moderated by the professional association which represented the allied health discipline. As put by Dahlia, “The bottom line is that they come out with an Australian degree which makes them eligible to work in the Australian health system.” She continued, “This course was really designed for Australians to meet [the professional allied health association’s] standards ... So in terms of the course design, delivery and things, it’s done as how we want it to do ... to develop the sort of professionals that we’re aiming to do.” It is interesting, then, that half of the student population in the department was international students.

Samantha agreed that the content of the degrees was fundamentally set by the requirements of the Australian context “except for what is called independent studies ... the freedom for students to undertake their own area of study.” In addition, Ursula, Ruth, and Bronwyn referred to a topic that students undertook on socio-cultural issues related to the allied health discipline. Despite the directed nature of the bulk of curriculum content towards national ends, some lecturers made efforts where possible to encourage international perspectives. Ursula reported that she had made attempts “to give students options, for example, in assessment tasks.. to pursue.. use data or guidelines or whatever

---

\(^5\) See Appendix 1 for relevant attributes of the six lecturers.

\(^6\) In the real world, lecturers are likely to be at or in between more than one level at any point in time.
from their own country.” Even this, however, was potentially problematic. Ursula said, “Students haven’t taken that offer up partly because the level of data... the quality and the access to it is much more limited than in Australia.” The compounding challenge, according to Ursula, was that “there are also issues around me marking and assessing them because I have the same problem with accessing the information and it’s stuff that I’m not familiar with. So, it requires me to almost prepare a teaching session on it before[hand].” This is an important point which demonstrates that internationalising the curriculum entails more than just infusing internationalised content into subject material. It requires the lecturer to be very knowledgeable about the material and its context.

When Ruth was asked if content examples from various cultural and educational settings were evident in the department’s curriculum, she said, “I wouldn’t say that it’s a major thing by any means, but it is certainly there. It would be more minor things than major.” Ruth was then questioned about whether she thought that this had something to do with the requirements of the Australian association which represented the profession of the allied health discipline. She said:

That’s right, it’s an Australian qualification with Australian competencies defined, and you know there’s just.. it’s a very full course and so there is a limit to what you can put in and we’re really choc-a-bloc full. So you put in anything you have to take something out and so while it would seem to be nice, it’s almost viewed as a bit of a luxury, really, in some ways.

It is evident that the program’s content is largely oriented to meet the requirements of the professional association of the allied health discipline which, in turn, commits the department to meeting the needs of the Australian health setting. As a result, there are seemingly limited opportunities to imbue the content of the academic programs with international perspectives. The international students who choose to study the department’s programs, therefore, have to fit in with this model despite the nature of the health setting and the cultural particularities that might exist in their home countries. It appears that the best that the lecturers can do in this situation is to support the international students to become familiar with the characteristics of the Australian health setting and the way that ‘Australian culture’ puts its own distinctive stamp on that environment.

Towards Level 3 teaching and cosmopolitan dispositions

This part of the results and discussion presents highlights from the research in the form of noteworthy observations made by individual lecturers in relation to teaching international students. It provides an overview of the lecturers’ conceptualisation of the place of culture in the classroom. From this, it is possible to glean some dispositions that approach Level 3 teaching as well as fundamental characteristics of cosmopolitanism such as acceptance, reflection, inquisitiveness, respect, openness, and understanding. The criteria that are presented are:

1. Being open, flexible, and interested in teaching learners from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds
2. Responding to the statement that ‘culture is learned and is difficult to unlearn’
3. Avoiding the use of stereotypes

These represent six of 52 criteria that are promoted in ‘The Profile of the Ideal Lecturer for the International Classroom’ (see Teekens, 2000) which outlines the sorts of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are posited as being beneficial for lecturers working in higher education environments characterised by significant cultural, language, and educational diversity.
4. Being able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits
5. Assessing student performance with due respect for different cultures
6. Being aware of the role that body language plays in communication

1. Being open, flexible, and interested in teaching learners from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds

This criterion relates to the way that lecturers view international students in general. Ursula responded to this statement by saying, “They bring a level of, um, enjoyment often into the classroom I think.” To explain this, she drew a distinction between the largely independent Australian students and the international students who often needed more support. Ursula said, “I mean, sometimes they [international students] bring a level of frustration and, and a feeling of helplessness in me because I don’t know... I don’t feel I know what to do to help.” This is a bold disclosure from Ursula, the most experienced lecturer in the department. International students, she said, caused her “to think more about how students learn and, you know, and you pay attention to that in the classroom and, and look for ways of supporting students.” She felt like she made “a difference to their learning and they made a positive difference to her teaching ... so, I think they add a different dimension of personal satisfaction in, in the teaching.” These last two observations are stand-out comments from Ursula.

Ruth said that she had “moved to” being open, flexible and interested in teaching international students after initially being uncomfortable with it:

I have to say when I first started teaching, I probably wasn’t very open to it and really to be honest, I was, because from a teaching point of view, what happens is, it changes the way you teach in a classroom ... If you go into a tute (tutorial) and you have fifty percent of students who are Australian and will open up and communicate really well, and another fifty percent who won’t open their mouths, then it changes the way the whole tute interacts ... And I think that kinda forced me to be a bit more interested and to learn a bit more about how to best encourage international students and how to tap into some of their strengths etcetera, because I found that you just couldn’t keep using the same kind of teaching techniques. And so I became a bit more interested then, and I feel I know very little about it, so I like to think I’m a bit sort of open and flexible as to what might help in the future.

Ruth’s comment above expresses a transformative experience in her approach to teaching in response to increasing greater numbers of international students in her classes. It is encouraging to hear her wanting to tap into the strengths of the international students. Overall, her stand-out comment implies a reflective process and the flexibility to pursue an expanded repertoire of teaching strategies to help address students’ learning needs.

2. Responding to the statement that ‘culture is learned and is difficult to unlearn’

This criterion sought to make lecturers think about how they perceived the impact of students’ cultures in the learning and teaching environment in the department. Bronwyn thought that the statement that ‘culture is learned and is difficult to unlearn’ was reasonable assertion. She said this often manifested itself “when you hit a problem. I think the easiest thing we do as human beings is to react in a predictable manner. Or we get threatened in some way (pause) we may react in a predictable way.” For Bronwyn, ‘unlearn’ was better expressed as ‘change’: “It’s not so much unlearn it, but probably it’s change. I think you can change ... Obviously they (international students) have to change to fit into the Australian context.” The statement also evoked in Bronwyn how she had changed through teaching international students: “I think you have to change a little bit with international students. It doesn’t mean you make it easier but you change the way you teach. It makes you think a lot
more about the... what you’re doing and why you’re doing it.” This is a stand-out comment. Similar to the responses from Ruth and Ursula that were presented earlier, the presence of international students in the classroom had been a catalyst for Bronwyn to reflect on learning and teaching.

Ursula’s reaction to the statement that ‘culture is learned and is difficult to unlearn’ was, “Yeah, I think so. We are very, very much products of our cultural background. Our cultural backgrounds have [indiscernible words, possibly ‘given us’] very basic ways we view the world and operate in the world and much of that is at an unconscious level and unlearning that is quite difficult.” She also added, “I don’t really want them to unlearn their own culture. I don’t think that is appropriate. But I guess what they have to do when they want to operate successfully is learn some aspects of our culture and learn how to operate across both.” Samantha, too, agreed with statement: “Definitely culture is learned.” When asked what implications this had for international students as learners, Samantha gave the following insightful response:

We ask a lot of them to adapt to our cultural way of learning in one year. In one month even. It’s like [interviewee snapped her fingers] from the minute they arrive we hit them with a very, very intense, very rapidly moving program which is assessed very, very quickly, and they have to perform and they have to deliver very, very quickly. And so I think, if I were to put myself in their shoes, they are working damn hard, and I know they are.. to try and adapt.

Samantha’s stand-out comment hints at both the adaptive capacity of international students as well as the demanding requirements of the educational environment into which they are immersed. It also highlights an important point in relation to the support provided to international students in the department, that is, the lecturers are responsive to their learning needs. Whilst this is so, it is clear that the nature of the support is geared to helping international students adapt to the particular learning and teaching arrangements teaching approaches utilised in the department. For Biggs (2003), this would be a legitimate approach.

Dahlia, too, commented that she was open, flexible, and interested in international students, but to this point the focus of her interest had not been on cultural issues:

I certainly call myself open. I think I’d hope I was flexible, but in terms, I guess, to be honest, I haven’t gone out of my way to investigate what I should be doing specifically for those students to help them. I guess I use what I use in other ways, but I think I would be more.. I certainly believe I have understanding. I’m certainly interested in wanting them to achieve their goals, but in terms of.. I haven’t put effort into investigating how they perceive things.

Dahlia said if she noticed they were not moving forward she would reflect on her teaching and ask, “What do I need to do?” Despite the few years that Dahlia has taught at university, plus her frank admission about not having investigated cultural dimensions associated with broader teaching and learning processes, it is clear that she engages in reflective practice in relation to the progress of her students. This is indicative of ‘teaching as educating’.

3. Avoiding the use of stereotypes

When Bronwyn was asked if she avoided thinking in stereotypes, she said “No, I do think in stereotypes, I think, in the way that’s easiest for me to think probably.” Bronwyn thought that individual interactions with “someone from another culture” made her reassess her impressions of people: “So I think you do think a little bit differently as a result of that, but you know, if you’re tired and you’re grumpy, and you’ve had a really bad day you may tend
to flip back to the most convenient way of thinking about things.” Of thinking in stereotypes, Bronwyn said, “I think it’s something that you learn from very early age. And I do think you can unlearn it.”

When Dahlia was asked if she avoided thinking in stereotypes, she replied, “I try to be aware that’s what I’m doing.” She reported that a way to get around thinking in stereotypes was by “asking, talking to them [international students], interacting with them, finding about ... personal circumstances ... some are quite wealthy, but some not so wealthy, some have had different experiences in Australia and so I guess I’ll try and find more out about them.” Larissa said that although it was hard to avoid using stereotypes, she tried to relate to the individual person with whom she was communicating. This is similar to the approach taken by Bronwyn and Dahlia. On stereotyping people, Larissa said, “You meet someone, you think okay, and you know a bit about what they do or the background and you have various assumptions that are really unconscious.” On meeting a new student, Larissa said, “In my head I would have... not a list but there’d be like a list of issues that I may need to or... things I need to take account of ... So I keep that in mind but then adapt it according to the student.”

With regard to international students, Larissa said, “Even if they come from the same country, so you can’t sort of think, ‘Oh well, everybody’s like this’. It’s very individual.”

When Ruth was asked if she thought in stereotypes, she replied, “I probably do to be honest. I think it’s easy to do that ... and what changes that is if you get to know students really well and then you can tap into their personal strengths and weaknesses and style of learning or whatever.” For Ruth, however, getting to know the students at this personal level was more difficult as the international student numbers increased:

We’re lucky we’ve only got that number of [international] students [fifty]. There would be a lot of lecturers who would be lecturing to a lecture theatre with two hundred in it and you wouldn’t have a hope of getting to know them. But certainly years ago, when we would be down around the thirty five [number of international students], it was easier to do that, whereas at fifty it just gets harder and harder.

In a similar way to Larissa, Ruth said, “I don’t consciously stereotype people, but I think subconsciously I do do (sic) that. And then, what makes that change is when you get to know them on a personal level.” Although Samantha though she “aspired to” avoid thinking in stereotypes, she said, “It’s quite useful to make generalisations but to... what is the point when a generalisation becomes a stereotype? And I think that there is a lot of area grey in there. So while I do generalise, I wouldn’t like to stereotype. I might sometimes.” Ursula said that she consciously tried to avoid thinking in stereotypes. Instead, she focused on students as individuals.

4. Being able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits

Dahlia’s response to the statement was, “I don’t think I’ve thought about it to an extent. I think the two are too deeply entwined to be able to... and I think you’d have to know someone quite well. I think the danger of perhaps saying it’s a cultural trait ... is that you actually label somebody, putting them in a box and not seeing them as an individual.” Dahlia is thinking about the statement in terms of avoiding stereotyping people based on ‘culture norms’. She also noted, “We’re getting one or two students from the more diverse places.”

An example was a student from Oman. Of the student’s culture, Dahlia admitted, “I would know nothing.. I still know very little having had her here for two years.” The researcher suggested that, “Without any reading about the culture of Oman, you wouldn’t know whether she’s exhibiting culturally-based behaviour or personal trait-based behaviour.”
Dahlia responded, “No, no. And I guess it is important to know, probably yes ... have some understanding. Well, I guess the other thing is to be open, not to make a judgment.”

The researcher suggested to Larissa that “A cultural difference might be that many students from South East Asian countries are quiet in class, but it might also be a personal trait. Would you be able to distinguish between these?” Larissa said, “Most students that I work with, I work with in small groups. So it’s a much.. they tend to talk much more than in a larger class situation.” For Larissa, small group work meant that students had to communicate, regardless of whether their cultures or personalities lend themselves to this behaviour or not. Such communication is a requirement of the academic program.

Bronwyn gave the following reply to the statement above:

I think I do try to do that. You’ve got to make allowance for the fact that just because you think a culture is generally very polite and quiet, there are going to be personality differences. So, I don’t just assume that. I mean, we get some very quiet Asian students ... We get some very noisy Australian students and some very quiet Australian students. And I guess the only way you would know the difference between culture and personality is from having a reasonable experience of a lot of them, all living in their cultures, which I’m not able to do. So, I think over the years ... a general trend for the Asian students [is] to be a lot quieter than the Australian students, but there will be variations within that.

When Ruth was asked if she was skilled in being able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, she drew on her experience with exchange students who had stayed in her family home: “It’s been really interesting that ... what I’ve thought of as personality traits have actually been quite deep cultural traits.” Ruth continued, “If you end up with a large number of students from the same country [Singapore], particularly over the years, you can start to distinguish some of those a little bit more. So for example, not all Singaporean students are like that [reserved]. Some of them are quite outgoing and so like everything else, there is the spectrum, isn’t there?” Ruth also reflected on the difficulty of ascribing cultural characteristics to individual students. She said of her experience with Chinese students, “We’ve had a couple who.. you know, one has been really, really outgoing and the other who’s been very quiet and shy. And then you start wondering, well, have they spent a significant amount of time out of China? Did they study in America? And then where does culture fit there, cos you get that kind of layering effect. It’s very difficult to separate it out, really.” This response from Ruth shows capacity for reflection and a willingness not to rely on prejudging international students.

Ursula said whilst she was sympathetic to the idea of being able to distinguish cultural differences from personal traits, in her view the most important thing to note was whether a student’s behaviour inhibited learning, whatever the basis of the behavioural characteristic. This is a stand-out comment that is characteristic of Biggs’s (2003) Level 3 ‘teaching as educating’. Ursula’s response suggests that she is focused on helping all students develop skills which relate to the educational outcomes of their academic program.

5. Assessing student performance with due respect for different academic cultures

Thus far, it is clear that the lecturers are happy for the students to ‘be themselves’ on their journey to meeting the requirements for their studies. In terms of demonstrating flexibility in relation to summative assessment, Bronwyn’s response was, “I think probably not. But then I think we probably would make no apologies for not having the same academic culture, given that the students have chosen to come here.” She thought the assessment criteria were there for a specific reason: “I think it is a necessary requirement. It’s a
communication skill that’s going to be worthwhile ... So the assessment criteria should keep that fairly level for them.”

When Dahlia was asked if she assessed student performance with a respect for different academic cultures given that people may not be used to what is expected in the Australian setting, she replied, “Well, I guess it would only be in terms of perhaps their use of language, so I would accept sort of minor grammatical errors, you know like, occasionally a single plural, you know, the a’s and the the’s missing ... I mean the student still probably would not get a high distinction with those, which I wouldn’t perhaps accept from an Australian student. I would see that as sloppy.” Dahlia referred to “standards of the degree” in that the international students were “taking an Australian degree so they have to meet the standards.” In terms of meeting such standards, Dahlia said, “I mean, I would help them get there, more than happy to give them feedback. Comprehensive feedback.”

Larissa’s comment was, “That is a bit.. that is difficult. I’m thinking of the clinical placement again because I’m involved in that and involved in that assessment. Because one needs to meet certain competencies, that’s hard to do. We can to some extent take account of the particular student for some of the competencies. But others you can’t, because they do need to achieve those things ... It is really hard.” Here, again, is the strong message that the all students must satisfy the assessment criteria. Whilst the assessment does not demand that international students reject their own culture in order to pass, certain behaviours, for example critical thinking, showing initiative, and communicating in the expected manner, more or less demand that things be done in a certain way. For Dahlia, for example, this meant correct spelling and, presumably, grammar. For Larissa, this meant that the clinical competencies had to be demonstrated. Success in these areas is heavily dependent on the international student’s language ability in terms of speaking and listening and their capacity to understand the contexts of the Australian (mostly Anglo-Celtic) social and health framework.

When Ruth was asked if she assessed student performance with a respect for different academic cultures, she replied, “It’s a hard one ... I try not to, is my basic position on it, I think, because of that thing of it being an Australian course and so therefore needing to have them well and truly reach the Australian standard that we are aiming for.” Although Ruth followed the policy of marking a piece of work ‘blind’, that is, without identifying the work with the particular student, she said, “Without a doubt you can pick whether you’ve got an international student in front of you or not, because of the language, etcetera, that they use.” Ruth said sometimes this meant she could identify students “who we know are really, really struggling, particularly [sponsored] students, not because they’re [sponsored], but often because they come from poorer backgrounds.” She continued, “It’s hard to not bring that prior knowledge into it. You know how hard they’re working, and I think subconsciously, what I do then is tend to look at the progress in their work rather than the actual.. what their work is. But having said that, the bottom line is we have got a standard, and it needs to meet that standard.” Again, Ruth referred to the non-negotiable aspects of assessment in the department:

There is a huge emphasis in our assessment process and application of knowledge and the core skills that we value like critical thinking and independent learners, and that sort of thing. A lot of our assessment would be geared right away from what international students are probably more used to.

When Samantha was asked if she assessed student performance with a respect for different academic cultures, she responded, “We assess students to our standards and that’s it, full
stop. We don’t have a flexible way of assessing students that embraces their different learning traditions and different styles of instruction.” With regard to academic pieces of work, she thought that “there’s very little scope to be flexible and interpret international perspectives.” Samantha believed that language proficiency also affected student performance in assessment and their willingness to participate in class. She concluded that, “It has a profound effect on the experience of teaching and learning; the experience of teaching for us and experience of learning for our students.” This is a stand-out comment from Samantha. Similar to Ruth’s earlier comment about having to change her approach to teaching based on the characteristics of international students, this observation from Samantha also recognises a willingness to reflect on her approach to teaching to support the needs of the students.

Ursula said, “The short answer would be no, because for every piece of assessment we have standard assessment criteria developed for that piece of work which the students all have and have before the piece of work.” Ursula referred to a “grading grid that tells the students what a distinction for that criteria looks like, and we would use that for all students as a standard.” However, she did say, “We’re fairly flexible about deadlines, provided the students contact us. So we will pretty much give an extension to anybody who asks.”

6. Being aware of the role that body language plays in communication
To the question of lecturers being aware of the role that body language plays in communicating a message, it was put to Ursula that some international students might be surprised to see lecturers in Australia lean against or sit on desks. In response, she made a particularly important comment on authenticity and teaching:

But is that a problem? ... I guess my view is (pause) I need to be authentic. I need to be me, and I need to be culturally sensitive. But I don’t think it’s appropriate for me to consciously try and change my basic personal style, because other peoples’ response to that will be very variable and there’s no doubt that for some students in the class that would prefer a more casual style and find someone who’s more casual more approachable and other students will have the opposite reaction. So I think that you have to be yourself. You have to be authentic, because I think people pick up on that pretty quickly, if you’re not.

Ursula’s stand-out comment reflects the notion of authenticity in teaching in higher education. That she had to be ‘herself’ and ‘culturally sensitive’ is indicative of the sort of self-assessment that could sustain a rooted cosmopolitan outlook. It is a particularly refined appraisal of (her)Self in an educational setting characterised by the presence of students from diverse cultural, language, and educational backgrounds.

Conclusion
The interests of this paper lie in exploring the question of whether inclusive teaching in the absence of internationalising curricula represents a sufficient condition for lecturers to be regarded as global citizens. The argument initially provided a conceptual framework based on four elements that underpin the research at hand, namely, theory associated with internationalisation, internationalised curricula, cosmopolitanism-as-global-citizenship, and inclusive teaching-as-cosmopolitanism. A case was built to promote internationalism-inspired cosmopolitanism as an expression of global citizenship, where lecturers are open to interacting in a positive and productive way with students who may have different worldviews and previous educational experiences that may not ostensibly augur well for their participation in, for example, Western academe. It was also suggested that Level 3 ‘teaching as educating’, having moved beyond using cultural stereotypes to understand student behaviour and discounting the idea of lecturers accommodating international
students with approaches to teaching that reflect their previous educational histories, is an implicit expression of a cosmopolitan disposition.

The research findings demonstrated that the curriculum content and curriculum process of the allied health teaching department was largely devoid of international perspectives due to its focus on producing graduates to work in the Australian health system. Nevertheless, their approach was an inclusive one in that their prime motivation was to assist all students to meet the learning objectives of their studies, regardless of their cultural, language, and educational backgrounds. Further, the lecturers did this whilst also clearly demonstrating that they recognised, respected, and appreciated the diversity in their students. The personal and professional characteristics of the lecturers reflected a strong sense of rooted, or grounded, cosmopolitanism. Furthermore, such qualities are not only consistent with the notion of global citizenship but they should also be viewed as a necessary condition for global citizenship. They are foundational to that state of being.

What remains open to debate, however, is whether inclusive teaching in the absence of internationalised curricula is a sufficient condition in itself for global citizenship, for a stronger expression of global citizenship would appear to be lecturers with cosmopolitan dispositions developing and facilitating internationalised curricula. The two working in tandem have the capacity to result in a more sophisticated, contextualised expression of being a ‘citizen of the world’ in which lecturers can be more deeply engaged with international and intercultural issues in the face of Twenty First century globalisation. This will be a good thing both for them and their students.
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Appendix 1

**Staff attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute / Pseudonym</th>
<th>Bronwyn*</th>
<th>Dahlia*</th>
<th>Larissa*</th>
<th>Ruth*</th>
<th>Ursula*</th>
<th>Samantha*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages spoken</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English, plus one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
<td>≥ 46yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of employment</td>
<td>Contract, full-time</td>
<td>Contract, full-time</td>
<td>Contract, full-time</td>
<td>Contract, full-time</td>
<td>Tenure, full-time</td>
<td>Tenure, full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education qualifications</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching at university (Full Time Equivalent)</td>
<td>2-5yrs</td>
<td>2-5yrs</td>
<td>≤ 1yr</td>
<td>2-5yrs</td>
<td>10-19yrs</td>
<td>6-9yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of international students in class</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
<td>10-19%</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest international student group in class</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd largest international group in class</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term (1 month or less) overseas work-related experiences in Asia or the Sub-Continent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>≥ 10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = interviewed