QUT Digital Repository:
http://eprints.qut.edu.au/

QUT

Implementing the International: Challenges and Approaches

Vivienne Muller, Queensland University of Technology, Australia
Lesley Hawkes, Queensland University of Technology, Australia

Abstract: This paper documents some preliminary findings arising from our Creative Industries Faculty's invitation to academics to submit suitable proposals for Internationalising the Curriculum, an initiative that aligns with the University's recognition of the importance of "building international components into their teaching programs" Our research project involves revisiting the literature on internationalising the curriculum with a view to implementing pedagogic and assessment strategies that respect and encourage intercultural and international understandings and competencies. The paper addresses the problems in designing such a unit; in this case an American Literature unit which will be taught and studied in Australia at QUT in 2011. The challenges inherent in the task of internationalising the curriculum stem from the 'traditional' and accepted ways of structuring and delivering such units. While the content may be international, the problem remains as to how to go about teaching and assessing the unit to achieve a global approach. How can it be taught in a way that steps outside the borders of our national teaching practices and understanding of western epistemology and becomes far more inclusive of other modes of knowledge?

Keywords: internationalising, curriculum, American literature, teaching, global, assessment

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to explore some ideas and issues around the topic of internationalizing the curriculum with respect to the teaching of American literature in the Australian University context. Our project is funded by our University (the Queensland University of Technology) and is specifically located within the QUT International Strategy for students for 2007-2011. Objective 1(c), under *Global Outlook* of the strategic plan strongly suggests the desirability of an internationalized perspective as one of the graduate capabilities. It exhorts faculties and teachers to

Seek ways to internationalize all students' learning experiences, including increasing international content in units and courses and promoting opportunities for students to study in a global context, including through languages and culture (2010).

To this end our project seeks to formulate pedagogic strategies (teaching methods, planned content, and particularly assessment) that would reflect and implement this objective in the delivery of a unit on American literature, with the possibility of establishing a template for internationalising the curriculum across the University. At this stage in the project and in this paper we address the epistemological assumptions and the cultural and pedagogical concerns that are central to our task. The practicalities of implementing these within the unit itself,

raised towards the end of the paper, will be the subject of further research before the final planning and teaching of the unit.

Our project accepts as a given that we live in an increasingly globalised community facilitated by economic and cultural exchange and by new technologies of communication. While there have been many negative responses by various cultures and regions to the forces of globalization, most suspicious of the monolithic dominance of the West, there also exist those responses that are more optimistic. Smith argues for example that the processes of globalisation have "opened up a space for the periphery to have a voice, with the monolithic power and authority of the centre subject to question from multiple competing centers" (Smith 2001, 232). In the academy, this re-calibration of the centre and periphery dichotomy has found its expression over the last two decades, and in many countries including Canada, Japan the UK and Australia, in a multiplicity of administrative and academic initiatives from the proliferation of courses that might be broadly labelled intercultural, to infrastructure support and programs for international students, to funding support for micro level projects such as ours on internationalizing the curriculum (Adams, 2007; Kehn and Teichler, 2007; Manning, 2006). [1] These initiatives are not always holistically or uniformly developed within the academies. Qiang points out that in the Canadian context different institutions work in a variety of ways and at different levels in their implementation of internationalising processes – forming a "spectrum from the ad hoc to the highly systematic" (2003, 259).[2]

We elected to link our project of internationalising the curriculum to the very specific task of planning and teaching a unit on American Literature which has been mandated as an elective in an undergraduate Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in the disciplines of Creative Writing and Literary Studies and will be taught in 2011. Internationalising a unit on American literature poses some interesting and not easily answered questions. For example how can a literature unit, which by its nomenclature denotes a strong sense of a unified culture and speaks of the national rather than the international, be 'internationalised'? This problem is further augmented by the fact that we will be teaching a national literature within a different national context which is not an uncommon situation. What content should we decide on? What pedagogical strategies should be used to ensure that 'internationalised' learning is occurring? What criteria do we use to measure this? To address these concerns, we first ask what is meant by internationalizing the curriculum, and the answers to this are of course many and varied.

'Internationalising' the curriculum – the problems of definition

The terms international, intercultural, transcultural and transnational have often been used interchangeably with or alongside each other in the many educational discussions and studies

---

[1] Green notes that "Internationalization is not simply a matter of adding a language requirement, introducing a global requirement in the general education system or increasing the number o students going abroad…It requires articulating explicit goals and developing coherent and mutually reinforcing strategies to reach those goals. An internationalised campus has more than a series of courses or programs that promote international learning; it links them together intentionally in order to create a learning environment and to provide a set of experiences to as many students as possible" (2009, 16).

[2] QUT has an International School on campus, programs of study, services and support for international students and The International Strategy Information System (ISIS) which provides information on International marketing activities, country and region profiles, overseas partners and International student statistics.

around internationalising the curriculum. What the terms tend to share despite their different inflections is an emphasis on understandings and competencies that recognise and work with and across differences and borders (whether they are cultural or national). Knight's 2003 definition of what internationalization means calls for a comprehensive conceptualisation that targets and integrates different levels of delivery. She comments:
Internationalisation at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education (2003, np).

Knight is careful to point out that she has used the variety of terms within her definition to denote that "internationalization is also about relating to the diversity of cultures that exist within countries, communities, and institutions" (2003 np). While many researchers are concerned as Knight is for the national, sector and institutional levels to work together effectively in implementing an internationalized curriculum, others are more focussed on the "centrality of teaching and learning in internationalisation", even if this means embracing the "fragmented nature of innovation at the micro level" (Luxon & Peelo, 2009, 6). Indeed Luxon and Peelo point out that too much attentiveness to the broader systemic changes within universities "detaches the issues of internationalisation from the everyday experience of the learning environment" (2009, 6).

At this teaching and learning level, Leask notes that internationalised curriculum accents learning processes which encourage the development of "international and cross-cultural understanding and empathy" (2008, 14). Makeham and Gesche argue however that implicit in the various definitions of intercultural is that "one's own cultural orientations remain relatively unchanged" (2008, 242). They prefer the term 'transcultural' as opposed to either international or intercultural, because it "focuses on commonalities and connections, without intending to homogenize cultures or establish monocultures" (2008, 243). Transcultural processes, actions and attitudes "thus bridge, redefine and/or reconstruct aspects of cultures. In rare circumstances, they may even go so far as to bring about social change" (Flechsig, 2000 as cited in Makeham and Gesche, 2008, 243). While Makeham and Gesche adopt Felchsig's term transcultural rather than international or intercultural, Tanaka favours the latter, suggesting that it need not lead to fixity of cultural orientation. In his view an intercultural perspective is one that involves "a process of learning and sharing across difference where no one culture dominates" (2002, 182). Identifying at least three approaches to university campus fostering of interculturalism in student development, Tanaka is most interested in what he calls the "intersubjective" approach. This term, borrowed from poststructuralist cultural theory, flexes the concept of subject positions and involves fostering learning environments which facilitate monitoring and understanding of power differentials such as race, class, ethnicity, gender and sexual orientation as they operate within and across transactional and intercultural spaces. According to Tanaka, the **inter**subjective approach rejects ideas of assimilation and essentialism and challenges the concept of a dominant and authoritative culture or nation. The intersubjective paradigm also requires what Kostogriz and Tsolidis describe as a "shift from boundary maintenance to boundary crossing" (2010, 131).

Canada has been one of the very active participants at the macro and micro level of internationalizing the curriculum. Williams notes that there are three approaches most commonly used for internationalizing the curriculum in Canadian post-secondary institutions - the "add-on, infusion and transformation" approaches (2008, 24). The add-on approach is,

according to Green, the easiest to implement because most colleges and universities are "experienced at making changes at the margins" which involves adding a language and/or global requirement in the curriculum or increasing the number of students studying abroad (2002, 12). The infusion model is dedicated to course content that reflects diverse cultural practices, knowledge and perspectives (Whalley as cited in Williams, 2008, 24). Williams claims that this model however tends to "Simply juxtapose mainstream, Eurocentric perspectives and values against minority views, which diminishes their 'radical qualities'" (Brookfield, as cited in Williams, 2008, 24). Williams argues that the transformational approach, and the most valuable one, is also the most difficult to implement and the least used because it requires students to "move between two or more worldviews", to question accepted or given knowledge embedded in their own cultural positions and to appreciate "multiple realities".

The questions of which definition, or which approach or which cluster of objectives /rationales to embrace in internationalizing the curriculum remain important ones for our project, not least for the fact that as concepts, they are already embedded within Western systems of classification and understanding which tend to reflect Western ideologies and epistemologies. The question of who speaks for whom, whose views are central and whose marginalised by prevailing definitions of intercultural, transcultural, transnational or international, remains, as it does in diasporic and postcolonial studies, a crucial one.[3] In respect of this, Wylie suggests adopting post-colonial approaches to internationalising the curriculum to offset the hegemonic bias of western education systems and practices (2008, 12). Wylie's proposition clearly respects the transformational approach Williams identifies and resonates with the intersubjective dimension of interculturalism that Tanaka supports.

Internationalisation at home

With these understandings and issues in mind as well as the problems that attend utopian trajectories of some of the definitions of internationalization (Cooper, 2007, 523), and the restrictions imposed by governing bodies within and outside the academy (not always pedagogically motivated),[4] how do we go about internationalizing the curriculum with respect to planning a specific unit on American Literature within an Australian context? There is also the pressing question of how we might internationalise our students, our teachers and our courses without international students being present in significant numbers. In our case for example we are dealing with a largely white, Anglo-Saxon Australian student cohort who identify as such and with very few students from other countries present. There are of course third generation Indian, Italian, Greek and Chinese students amongst them, but the majority identify as Australian. From our research it is evident that many internationalizing the curriculum projects can and do draw productively and extensively on their international student body to help broker their objectives, although some scholars point to the "missed opportunity for intercultural exchange when an international population is underutilized" (Manning, 2006, 48). So what to do when there are no 'international' students present? Otten notes that while institutions of higher education are very good at providing for

---

[3] See Aiwha Ong's comments on American studies of diasporan cultures in her book *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality* (1999, 13).
[4] Our university recently devolved its languages programs to one of the larger Brisbane universities (UQ); a decision that had more to do with economic rationalization than anything else. The results of this centralization of international languages remains to be seen, but it could be argued that it elevates English as the global language of transaction and communication within our own university.

their international cohort, there has been "very little attention for a systematic preparation for intercultural settings for domestic students and faculty" (2003, 20). Wylie argues that the economic imperative within academe to attract international students might need to be offset by good-faith attempts to grant instructional opportunities to both international and local participants that challenge traditional curriculum content and form (2008).

Otten's and Wylie's concerns align with Turner's and Deardorff's goals of internationalizing the "local student population, giving them through their education intercultural competence or so-called internationalization at home" (Turner, 2009, 240; Deardorff, 2006). In this respect the approach that might be the most useful for Internationalisation at home is the transformational approach outlined by Williams as it necessitates the individual stepping outside their own cultural positioning in order to open up a "thirdspace of dialogical meaning-making" (Kostogriz and Tsolidid, 2010, 133). Again this may be better facilitated by drawing on an international cohort of students within the classroom, but, as Cooper points out, international students need not necessarily be present for the institution to achieve its aims of ensuring their education programs are "genuinely multicultural". This can be achieved by presenting material from "different and in different contexts". (Cooper, 2007, 523). Literature courses can provide diverse content as well as reflective opportunities to navigate cross national and cross cultural borders, and are potentially transformative sites for cultural exchange and interaction within an internationalization at home model.

Literature and the intersubjective, third space

Arguably literature, like film and other artistic products, resonates with some of the objectives of internationalising the curriculum. As an important site of cultural representation literature often generates topics and themes, aesthetic styles and innovative techniques that frequently address what it means to be human, and how we relate to each other, creating an intersubjective, discursive space of contact between texts and readers, readers and the larger world. It offers an engaging imaginary where power struggles, cultural differences, the production of subjectivities, the contextualising of identity are often central to the thematic and stylistic textures. Literature invites us, as internationalising of curriculum does, to an "understanding of how the languages and cultures of others influence their thoughts, values, actions and feelings" (Leask, 2008, 19). Exposing students to this intersubjective space encourages them to understand that what it means to be human does not always have the same framing. One knowledge system may equate human with 'the individual', while another may stress the community aspect of being human. Intercultural or internationalised education, like many literary texts "strives to develop critical engagement, self-reflection and sensitivity towards any aspect of interaction and communication between self and 'others'" (Papademetre, as cited in Leask, 2008, 19). Such self-reflective practice constitutes an important plank in the theory and practice of internationalising the curriculum and it calls on specific strategies of engagement in teaching approaches, pedagogy, planning and assessment in order to be expedited. What forms these might take and how they might be realised in the teaching of a unit on American literature are clearly part of the challenge that awaits us as does the question: what exactly **is** American literature?

What *is* American literature?

Our research thus far into the teaching of American literature within some of the US and Australian academies points to a variety of interpretive paradigms from traditional to

innovative, from American Studies courses to individual units within literature courses. Prominent in many universities are very traditional programs which denote American literature as specifically the literature of the United States, or United States and Canada (North America). This conventional conceptualisation of a 'national' literature is underpinned by hegemonic and traditional ideas around the canon, which have the tendency to separate a distinctively white dominated American Literature program from say Hispanic, Latin American or Afro-American literature courses which tend to fall into Spanish departments or African American studies departments. While this separation of the literature of the Americas might serve to bolster and foster the value of once marginalised literatures, it can also serve to perpetuate traditional distinctions that reinforce such marginalisation.

There continues to be much debate around what is included in a literature course that purports to represent the literature of a particular country or nation. Indeed in the history of the academy in our own country in terms of what constitutes 'Australian' literature, there has been historically a fierce and often uncompromising allegiance to key writers. However, feminist, postcolonial, indigenous and regional challenges to the Australian canon and to the domination of a white Westernised canon have resulted in shifting borders and perceptions around these understandings and in changes to content and approaches. This also appears true of some university courses in American literature both inside and outside the United States where teaching approaches to the subject interrogate and often challenge the dominant cultural paradigm, or use the literary canon in creative and deconstructive way without necessarily devaluing the quality of the writing or the culture within which is resides. SUNY Fredonia, a public liberal arts college in Western New York for example offers a wide range of interdisciplinary undergraduate courses in American Studies, which in their words "prepare students to become engaged and active citizens of a global society". Their literature/ American Studies programs offer units as diverse as Representing Japan in American Culture and Black Women Writers. The Bachelor of Arts (Honours) degree in American Studies at the University of Lincoln in England is run along similar lines. The University of Queensland in Australia offers a unit in Latin American writing while the University of La Trobe runs an American literature subject in which one of the stated aims is to explore "the relations between the old and the new, including between the traditional American canon and emerging literatures" (http://www.latrobe.edu.au).

It is evident that American Studies courses which are robustly interdisciplinary and cover a range of American **literatures** (Latin American, Hispanic, Chicana/Chicano, Native American) are in a stronger position to provide content of a transcultural nature that challenges preconceived understandings of nation and culture than isolated units in American literature can. Our situation is complicated by the fact that we are teaching the literature of another country within the national boundaries of our own, and while this is by no means a unique situation, it does require a repositioning of cultural and pedagogic co-ordinates if we are to justice to an internationalised or intercultural mode of teaching and learning respecting the cultural diversities within the country of origin.

Teaching approaches and pedagogic practicalities

Sharma notes that "a persistent criticism against the conceptually driven work of critical pedagogy has been its application to the actual 'messy realities' of teaching" (2006, 205). The gap between theory and practice, between good ideas about internationalising the curriculum and the practicalities of implementing them in the classroom is one that looms

large in our project as well. If the problem of which texts to set for study in a unit on American literature is an initial issue in terms of attempts to 'internationalise' it at the level of content, to open it up rather than close it down in terms of cultural and national spaces, what about the practicalities or messy realities of teaching and assessing such a unit using this philosophical framing? Haigh argues that internationalisation of the curriculum "requires that local educational structures are reformed into new paths" (2009, 280). How does one go about this in terms of the specifics of classroom practice? This is not an easy task and it may require, as some suggest, a radical restructuring of traditional design, based on creative and self-reflective ways of thinking (Sharma, 2006, 212). Meyer and Land (2003), following on from research by Perkins (1999), find that one way to tackle this restructuring problem is to acknowledge it and highlight that there is "troublesome knowledge". This troublesome knowledge should not be seen as a negative in students' learning but a positive recognition that their worldview is not the only view and there may be other ways of knowing. Mestenhauser refers to this as a form of "meta-analysis", in that it requires us to think differently about the "universality of knowledge", the role culture plays in the construction of knowledge and how this has traditionally shaped our curricula (as cited in Leask, 2008, 22-23). A desirable goal; but the task remains as to how these abstract and sometimes abstruse concepts make their way into curriculum design and pedagogic and classroom practice.

Assessing for intercultural, international competencies

One of the key practicalities that needs to be addressed when planning a unit of work in which intercultural/international competencies are stated goals, is the assessment, and this remains one of the major concerns of this project. Our research thus far has disclosed that little has been done other than in a general way to indicate what it might look like. The overarching problem is the question of why and what is it that we are actually assessing? Should the assessment be formative or summative? How does one grade and set a criteria sheet of clearly outlined rubrics when the knowledge is "troublesome"— when we are attempting to teach mostly extended and abstract knowledge and understanding?

A key issue augments around the question - are there measurable outcomes or are we involved in establishing processes which have their most potent possibilities beyond the spatial and temporal parameters of the classroom? Leask discovered in her research into internationalising the curriculum in the University of South Australia that neither staff nor students interviewed believed international perspectives could be evaluated through specific assessment tasks (2008, 17). Leask claims that many staff could identify desirable outcomes such as "personal growth", "respect for difference" and the "ability to actively and effectively engage with cultural others", but how these are aligned with specific assessment tasks requires more research and attention (17). Manning on the other hand believes that an effective classroom learning environment is one where there is a partnership between teachers and students and that specific and mutually acceptable learning contracts can be clearly drawn up and managed. One such contract in an internationalised classroom might be to "agree to include assessment criteria and to attribute marks in assignments and examinations to an interrogation of cultural perspectives" (Manning, 2006, 50). Other researchers are not so convinced that student outcomes can be so successfully pinned down and examined. Sharma suggests that internationalising the curriculum student learning experiences are not easily assessed because they go "against the drift towards rational packaged curriculum and measurable learning outcomes" and because they tend towards "open-endedness, creativity and exploration" (2006, 212). What we are clear about is that the

assessment should reinforce learning but what form it takes and how we can formulate it in order to capture complex meaning-making practices and skills is more complicated and indeed more elusive.

Working towards a model of teaching and learning

The second stage of our research will be to address in more specific ways the content, pedagogy and assessment that could be implemented in teaching a unit of American literature from and within an 'internationalised' perspective. It is evident that there must be clear objectives that can be translated into practical, if not always easily measureable outcomes. Mestenhauser suggests that the following repository of questions could guide teachers committed to internationalising and intercultural approaches to pedagogy, whatever the discipline area. Inherent in these questions is the belief that teachers and students are involved in a collaborative approach, that they are *equally* engaged in the practice of defamiliarisation, and a continuing process of adjusting epistemological and cultural lenses.

- *How is what I will be teaching culturally constructed and shaped?*
- *How is thinking in the discipline unique and culturally constructed?*
- *What does this mean for the way I teach it?*
- *What skills do I need to develop in students to assist them to understand the cultural construction of knowledge?*
- *What possibilities are there in this course for students to explore the ways in which their own and other cultures organise knowledge and approach professional practice?* (Mestenhauser, as cited in Leask, 2008, 21)

These questions are important ones if there is to be a genuine attempt to internationalise curricular and may not be easily reducible to a set of teaching strategies or a desirable taxonomy of student skills in the one-size-fits-all model of teaching and learning that is favoured in many of our institutes of higher learning. With respect to the teaching of American literature within the Australian context, the foundational questions regarding interrogation of self and others in the cultural, national or international field, might translate into how being an Australian or international student impacts on an understanding of the American texts being explored; or it might mean considering texts on America by non-American writers (eg Kafka's novel *America)* or it might mean broadening the idea of American literature beyond the borders of the United Stated and Canada. Gesche and Makeham draw our attention to the fact that before the act of transformation can occur in learning, the student has to first become aware of and to understand their own "cultural situatedness" (2008, 245). Students need to understand how they see the world before they can begin to understand that other people may see it and interpret it quite differently.

Our research has disclosed a strong interest in adopting teaching approaches and strategies that are student rather than teacher driven although they may be teacher initiated. These are the types of activities and experiences that demand student interaction and involvement. In some instances they are more familiarly encountered in good secondary education practices and they contest the teacher dominated lecture /tutorial model central to many universities and colleges of higher education. In Leask's study, a number of staff strongly supported tutorials as the forums best able to expedite and even assess intercultural and international competencies (2008, 21). These sites foster things such as creative role-playing; group discussions on significant issues; assuming another cultural space outside one's own; drawing

on the subjective experiences of students to create intersubjective contact zones; establishing hypothetical situations that advance dialogue and culturally transformative experiences. In terms of a unit on American literature role-playing exercises might involve asking students to either perform or write as if they are a character from one of the texts but with a cultural origin and setting that differs from it (Ward, as cited in Barber et al 2007, 110).

It is clear that a more fulsome re-consideration of our current ways of teaching and learning may require a complete re-thinking, even a pedagogic revolution that challenges the foundational ideas of higher education in Western epistemologies. Indeed researchers have pointed out the importance of recognising that teaching practices and their underpinning philosophies are always culturally embedded. This is demonstrated in an interesting 2008 case study in which UK university teachers Haigh and Parker taught an advanced-level British undergraduate course in psychogeography not from a conventional European approach but from one grounded by the principles of Samkhya, an Indian philosophical system (2009, 272). This required students to respond to issues at a more "internal subjective" level rather than at an external and "objectively measurable" one, thus confounding some students who sought comfort in their own cultural space rather than that of an/ 'other'. This outcome had implications for the ways in which assessment for the course was carried out; the researchers reflected that a learning journal which requiring students to report their personal and reading reflections might have been more instrumental in shifting viewpoints than the more traditional assessment they had inaugurated.

Indeed many researchers emphasise the importance of reflective and self-reflective tasks that identify affective and social aspirations because these can "play a key role in attitudinal transformation" (Gesche and Makeham, 2008, 254). The affective aspects which include motivation, adaptation, openness to others and self-reflection enable students to get beyond a reductive cultural tourism approach to internationalising the curriculum and become involved in experientially as well as intellectually. In operational terms, these might take the form of keeping a personal as well as a class journal; writing exercises that focus on intercultural issues; re-writing a story form a different cultural perspective; problem solving exercises focusing on international and/or intercultural contexts. In many of our current creative writing and literary studies units, we have instituted the journal as a crucial site of reflective and self-reflective learning. It no doubt will play an equally important role in the formative and summative assessment for our unit on American literature targeting internationalising objectives. Clearly there is a need to carefully and effectively scaffold such activities in terms of higher learning objectives and outcomes, but importantly they represent a move to combine the cognitive with the affective that is conducive to life-long, not just institutionalised, learning.

Another pedagogic approach favoured in internationalising the curriculum within the classroom is group work in which students work through the processes of participation in a community where diversity of opinion, consensus and recontextualisation are negotiated around a project (Hirst and Brown as cited in Leask, 2008, 183). In this the student population does not necessarily have to be culturally diverse, as group work requires the cultivation of social and interactional skills that are brought into play in any contact between individuals from different familial and social/cultural backgrounds. This type of interaction might be formally noted and assessed as part of the learner contract. This said there have been documented instances where group work involving a mix of 'at home' and international

students has served to reify cultural stereotypes rather than renounce or rethink them. Turner for example noted that in her use of group work to create an intercultural learning space between UK and International students, assessed feedback from the project disclosed that although all students can "intellectually account for the challenges of working in intercultural groups" they are "less able to respond behaviourally or affectively"(Turner, 2002, 252). This is an interesting finding as it becomes clear that group work alone does not necessarily extend or challenge a student's learning experience, although it has the potential to.

The learner-directed approach is particularly relevant to the use of communication technologies such as those provided through the internet. Researchers have been quick to identify the internet as a powerful tool for the internationalising agenda, but as Huijser points out, teachers should be aware that their experiences of the new technologies may be vastly different to those of their students. He also cautions against a "bolted on" approach that involves wholesale importation of offline material online (2006, 29) without due critical attention to contextualisation and critical engagement. The transnational/ international aspect of online technologies for learning and teaching would provide substantial benefits for our unit with the possibility of facilitating content and idea sharing with students and teachers in other countries and regional communities (Ward as cited in Barber et al 2007, 111; Blystone, 2008). For example it would be of great benefit for Australian teachers of American literature to be cognisant of the ways in which American literature is taught within other national or regional contexts.

Conclusion

There have been many and varied approaches worldwide to internationalizing the curriculum within and across disciplines in undergraduate and postgraduate studies in the academy. Our project, which aims to internationalise teaching and learning approaches to the implementation of a unit in American literature, seeks to identify those educative philosophies and practices (especially assessment) that would best realise these goals. This has involved engaging with the numerous meanings of internationalising the curriculum within the many contexts in which it is used and for the manifold reasons (political, economic, social, cultural) it is instituted within the academy. It is evident that this is not a straightforward task complicated as it is by the fact that, inherently, internationalising the curriculum challenges established knowledge systems and national boundaries and mandates the participation of both students and teachers in new and challenging ways. What has become clear throughout this exploration of processes and approaches to internationalising the curriculum is the need for continued and ongoing support from the educational institutions in which they are embedded. For instance, study abroad programs for teachers and students need to be funded, not as an extra curriculum activity but as a necessary part of the global learning process. Staff development in this area needs to be encouraged and while we are not saying that one template fits all there does need to be more discussion cross disciplines on the process of internationalising the curriculum. However, what has also become evident is that it is not only the top-down approach and support that is needed for the success of internationalising but also the bottom-up approach.[5] The big overarching ideas are

---

[5] Cogan identifies a number of co-extensive strategies that can be operationalised at both levels from assessing individual course syllabi and rethinking course goals in terms of internationalization to study abroad programs, international guest speakers and more productively utilizing international students and their experiences. (1998, 115-116).

necessary but so too are the everyday face-face classroom activities. This paper has engaged with some of the major debates and issues issuing from these challenges in working towards a pedagogic model capable of negotiating them and taking them into the future.

References

Adams, T. (2007). The Development of International Education in Australia: A Framework for the Future. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 410-420.

Barber, B., Casell, M., Ingegritsen, C., Lamy, S., Leslie, I., Martin, P., & Ward, D. (2007). Internationalizing the Undergraduate Curriculum. Political Science and Politics, 40: 1, 105-120.

Blystone, R. (2008). Faculty Workshop Focuses on Internationalization of Curriculum. University of San Diego, News Centre, Friday, 5th December, 2008. http://www.sandiego.edu/insideus/?p=540 (accesses March 9, 2010).

Childress, L. (2009). Internationalization Plans for Higher Education Institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13, 289-309.

Cogan, J. (1998). Internationalizing through Networking and Curricular Infusion. *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum*. ed. J. Mestenhauser & B. Ellingboe. Arizona: The Oryx Press.

Cooper, M. (2007). Creating Universities for a Multiethnic and Multicultural World: A Utopia? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 522-530.

Deardorff, D. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10, 241-266.

Gesche, A. & Makeham, P. (2008). Creating Conditions for Intercultural and International Learning and Teaching. In M. Hellsten & A. Reid (Eds.), *Researching International Pedagogies*. London: Springer, 241-258.

Green, M. (2002). Joining the World. *Change*, 34(3), 12-22.

Haigh, M. & Parker, A. (2009). Fostering Cross-Cultural Empathy With Non-Western Curricular Structures. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13, 217-284.

Hellsten, M. & Reid, A. (Eds.), *Researching International Pedagogies*. London: Springer.

Huijser, H. (2006). Refocusing Multiliteracies for the Net Generation. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, 2*(1), 21-33.

Kehm, M., & Teichler, U. (2007). Research on Internationalisation in Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*, 260-273.

Knight, J. (2003). Updating the Definition of Internationalization. *International Higher Education*. http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News33/text001.htm (accessed March 9, 2010).

Kostogriz, A. & Tsolidis, G. (2008). Transcultural literacy: between the global and the local. Pedagogy. *Culture and Society*, 16(2), 125-136.

La Trobe University, Australia. http://www.latrobe.edu.au (accessed March 14, 2010).

Leask, B. (2008). Internationalisation, Globalisation and Curriculum Innovation. In M. Hellsten & A. Reid (Eds.), *Researching International Pedagogies*. London: Springer, 9-43.

Leask, B. (2009). Using Formal and Informal Curricula to Improve interactions Between Home and International Students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13, 205-220.

Luxon, T & Peelo, M. (2009). Internationalisation: its implications for curriculum design and course development in UK higher education. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International,* 46(1), 51-61.

Manning, D. (2006). Constructing Meaning and Metaphor for Cultural Pedagogy. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning,* 2(1), 48-62.

Meyer & Land, M. (2003). Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge: Linkages to Ways of Thinking and Practising Within the Disciplines. *Improving Students Learning Theory and Practice*. Rust: Oxford, 412- 424.

Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Otten, M. (2003). Intercultural Learning and Diversity in Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(12), 12-26.

Perkins, D. (1999). The Many faces of Constructivism. *Educational Leadership*, 57(3).

Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher Education: towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, 1(2), 248-270.

QUT The International Strategy Information System (ISIS) http://www.international.qut.edu.au/internationalisation/index.jsp (accessed February 4, 2010).

Sharma, S. (2006). Teaching Diversity – im/possible pedagogy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 4(2), 203-216.

Smith, P. (2001). *Cultural Theory: An Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Tanaka, G. (2002). Higher Education's Self-Reflexive Turn: Toward an Intercultural Theory of Student Development. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(2), 263-296.

Turner, Y. (2009). "Knowing Me, Knowing You," Is There Nothing We Can Do? Pedagogic Challenges in Using Group Work to Create an Intercultural Learning Space. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13, 240-255.

Williams, S. (2008). *Internationalization of the Curriculum: A Remedy for International Students' Academic Adjustment Difficulties?* Unpublished final paper for the degree of Master of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St John's.

Ward, B., Cassell, M., Ingebritsen, C., Lamy, S., Leslie, I., Martin, P. & Ward, D. (2007). Internationalizing the Undergraduate Curriculum. *Political Science and Politics*, 40(1), 105-120.

Wylie, M. (2008). Internationalizing Curriculum: Framing Theory and Practice in International Schools. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 7(5), 5-19.