Academic development to support the internationalization of the curriculum (IoC): A qualitative research synthesis

Wimpenny, K., Beelen, J. & King, V.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in International Journal for Academic Development, on 15/11/2019, available online: http://www.tandfonline.com/ 10.1080/1360144X.2019.1691559

Academic development to support the internationalization of the curriculum (IoC): A qualitative research synthesis

Katherine Wimpenny[a]* , Jos Beelen[b] and Virginia King[a]

[a]*Centre for Global Learning: Education and Attainment, Coventry University, Coventry, United Kingdom;* [b]*Faculty of Management and Organisation, The Hague University of Applied Sciences, The Hague, The Netherlands*

*Professor Katherine Wimpenny, Centre for Global Learning: Education and Attainment, Coventry University, Priory Street, Coventry CV1 5FB United Kingdom; e-mail: K.Wimpenny@coventry.ac.uk

Dr Katherine Wimpenny is Professor of Research in Global Education at Coventry University in the Research Centre for Global Learning: Education and Attainment. Her national and international collaborations research internationalization of the curriculum, the inclusive curriculum, open educational practices and interculturality in teaching and learning.

Dr. Jos Beelen is Professor of Global Learning at The Hague University of Applied Sciences, where he leads a research group exploring the internationalization of home curricula in higher education. For fifteen years, he has shared this expertise in Europe, South Africa, Australia, and South America; collaborating, leading, and publishing.

Dr Virginia King works with the Research Centre for Global Learning: Education and Attainment at Coventry University. She studies the staff experience in higher education, using metaphor, visualization, and corpus analytics.

Academic development to support the internationalization of the curriculum (IoC): A qualitative research synthesis

While the literature acknowledges the central role of academics in internationalization of the curriculum (IoC), little has been published regarding training of academic developers themselves to support IoC initiatives. However, higher education institutions around the globe are responding to strategic demands for IoC which prepare students as global citizens. We employed qualitative research synthesis to identify journal articles which consider academic development to support IoC. Despite their diversity, we found common themes in the five selected studies. We weave these themes with Betty Leask's five-stage model of the IoC process, and Cynthia Joseph's call for a pedagogy of social justice.

Keywords: educational development; faculty development; internationalization of the curriculum; pedagogy of social justice; qualitative research synthesis

Introduction

Higher education institutions (HEIs) around the globe are responding to strategic demands to internationalize their curricula, providing students with relevant global perspectives of their discipline and preparing them as 'world-ready' graduates, able to function within complex and multicultural environments (Higher Education Academy, 2014; Jones & Killick, 2013). Over the past ten years, the values of internationalization have been re-examined due to concerns that too much focus was on revenue-generation (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011). Consequently, universities' interntionalization missions have broadened to embrace diversity as key to success (van der Wende, 2017). Students as global citizens and as global graduates, informed in whole-world philosophies and sensitivies, capable of recognizing their relationships to global others and to global inequalities, have brought together internationalization and equity and diversity agendas (Caruana & Ploner, 2010; Killick, 2015). Whilst the internationalization of higher

education continues to expand – and be defined – by largely under-problematized constructs, and as this expansion brings with it greater diversity of experience, expectation and aspiration, important implications concern how faculty and individual practices are steered, resourced, and supported. Egron-Polak and Hudson (2014, p. 11) report that, worldwide, "the limited experience and expertise of faculty and staff" is a key obstacle to HEIs' internationalization ambitions. As Leask (2015) contends, internationalization must be an all-embracing institutional approach, reflected in strategy, training, institutional values, and culture.

In the discourse of internationalization, Brandenburg and de Wit (2011), de Wit (2016), Knight (2013), and Jones (2015) have called for review of the increasing commodification of the internationalization of HE, with its range of forms, providers, products, dimensions, and views, to reflect more effectively on the diversity and complexity of this growing field. In this paper, we draw on Joseph (2011) who identifies three conceptual approaches which HEIs employ to drive the internationalization agenda. The "economic rationalist approach" views the student as a "customer", with academics delivering "pre-packaged education" (p. 241). Focus is on the recruitment of overseas students, strategic business planning, university rankings, branch campuses, and political manoeuvring to maintain buoyancy in competitive global education markets (Van Damme, 2001; Deardoff, 2015). The "integrative approach", sees academics incorporate intercultural references into an existing curriculum: here, western perspectives are viewed as normative, and the non-western discourse as "other" (Joseph, 2011, p. 241). By contrast, a "transformative approach" values IoC as a shared endeavour, with staff and students embracing cultural difference and knowledge while embracing ethical challenges, ambiguity, and risk (Joseph, 2011, p. 242).

We recognize that our own institutions, one in the United Kingdom and one in the Netherlands, actively pursue all these approaches to internationalization. One has a teaching and learning centre, the other, a unit for academic development. Both have research centres dedicated to examining how international and intercultural dimensions can be integrated into curricula and staff expertise. With Joseph's (2011) approaches to institution-oriented and student/staff-focused learning in mind, the provision of a quality, and comprehensive (internationalized) curriculum remains a critical challenge for HE (Van Damme, 2001).

While we concur with Leask (2013), that IoC "is best tackled as a planned, developmental and cyclical process" (p. 116), we wanted to explore how institutional internationalization targets are met in different institutional contexts, and how these are related to IoC. We also wanted to explore how internationalization is embedded into academic practices, including university culture and attitudes, so that a more transformative approach, as identified by Joseph (2011), might be achieved. Hence, we present the results of a research review undertaken to identify academic development efforts to support IoC, the roles undertaken by academic developers in IoC, and the extent to which academic developers are equipped to support IoC. Our synthesis thereby provides insights into academic capacity-building around curriculum development; and, importantly, the means of re-shaping a quality learning framework for internationalization amongst students and staff through mutual understandings, shared values, and multiple perspectives.

Methodology

Qualitative research synthesis (QRS)

Research reviews underpin much of the activity in the field of educational research

(Tight, 2012), and should provide a synthesis of the published work on a particular topic, be systematic so as to be repeatable by others, and identify and critically analyse the key works in order that their insights may be applied to other contexts (Cooper, Hedges, & Valentine, 2009). The interpretive synthesis or qualitative research synthesis (QRS) approach to research review arose from the need "to enhance the practical value of qualitative research in policy making and informing practice at a broader level" (Suri & Clarke, 2009, p. 402). QRS grew out of meta-ethnography (Noblit & Hare, 1988) which sought to reveal the significance of findings within different qualitative studies through an interpretation that acknowledged the researcher's own positioning. Major and Savin-Baden (2010) argue that a QRS differs from a literature review by virtue of its critical, interpretive stance, and from a meta-analysis through its focus on qualitative rather than quantitative evidence. We adopted QRS to make sense of the rich and more personal perspectives that qualitative data normally reveals (Wimpenny & Savin-Baden, 2013).

Issues of plausibility

Plausibility requires us to optimize transparency of both the process and the stance of those involved (Major & Savin-Baden, 2010). The three-person team comprised a researcher in intercultural and global learning from the UK, with previous experience of conducting QRS; a researcher in global education from the Netherlands; and a UK-based academic developer who has a background in collaborative research. This team approach was beneficial in sharing tasks, and provided opportunities for greater meaning to be constructed through collaboration (Wimpenny & Savin-Baden, 2013).

Application of the QRS process

We largely followed Major and Savin-Baden's (2010) QRS model. Beginning by

identifying studies that addressed our research question: 'What does the literature report on academic development to support IoC initiatives, and to what extent does this concern the development of academic developers themselves?' To this end, we developed a search algorithm which identified publications combining variants of the term 'IoC' and 'academic development' (or its synonyms, for example, 'faculty development' or 'educational development'), in the previous five years (Figure 1).

Figure 1. (about here) The filtering process employed

When applied to academic publication databases covered by Elsevier's Scopus™ resource (www.scopus.com), the search identified 111 relevant documents. Within EBSCO's Academic Search Complete (ASC) 148 appropriate documents were found, of which only 22 matched those identified by Scopus. However, many of the other ASC documents were self-duplicates, or had misleading or mis-translated metadata. Eighty-two unique journal articles were identified. We validated completeness by checking for particular journal articles, identified through citation cross-reference.

The next step was to filter the articles according to our pre-determined inclusion/exclusion criteria (Table 1). These criteria confirmed the appropriateness of each study to the research question, and validated the rigour of the studies as expressed in their abstracts. Articles were excluded where they reported interventions only at a discipline-level (for example, IoC for business studies); others because the research question concerned the support and development of students (rather than staff) within IoC initiatives. Thirdly, articles without a robust qualitative design were excluded so that the remainder contained an explicit researcher stance and extensive participant quotations. Five articles remained. While these exclusion criteria may appear drastic, they achieved the aim of QRS to balance richness of data theming with manageability of analysis (Major & Savin-Baden, 2010).

Table 1. [about here] Criteria for QRS inclusion and exclusion (after Major & Savin-Baden, 2010)

In many cases, sufficient detail was included in the article abstract to form a judgement as to whether it should be excluded from our selection. Where this was not possible, the full article was read. The selected studies were then examined to identify their key themes, and themes were consolidated through analysis and synthesis across studies. Table 2 sets out key features of the selected studies. Finally, findings were interpreted in order to provide a deep understanding.

Search strategy critique

QRS, like qualitative research in general, is vulnerable to critique of its limited sample-size (Major & Savin-Baden, 2010). With QRS, we employed a process that is "interpretive rather than aggregative" (Noblit & Hare, 1988, p. 11), and which relied on the careful selection of exemplars for analysis. Our intention is not generalization, but useful explanation and understanding. Our selection was purposeful rather than exhaustive (Suri & Clarke, 2009), enabling us to reflect on a range of IoC staff development contexts and issues.

The significant body of literature excluded through QRS (books, reports, articles etc.) was still available to us in a more general way as background literature. Although we repeated the database searches in German and Dutch, no additional qualifying journal articles were found. We note, however, that an emerging body of literature from Germany and the Netherlands engages with IoC (Casper-Hehne & Reiffenrath, 2017a; Ittel & Pereira, 2018). This literature acknowledges the lack of skills of academics as a 'missing link', and raises the question how academics can be supported to develop and teach internationalized curricula. The engagement of academic developers into the process of internationalization of curricula has been discussed as a key priority. A

special issue of *Zeitschrift für Hochschulentwicklung* (Journal for Higher Education Development), focused on teaching and learning in HE (Casper-Hehne & Reiffenrath, 2017b) but there is as yet little clarity on the specific role of academic developers, and contributions from their own perspective are still largely lacking.

This literature, published partly in German and partly in English, approaches the internationalization of teaching and learning in contexts in which English is not the standard language of instruction. It therefore often includes discussions on the foreign language proficiency of academics. In the German and Dutch contexts, the "economic rationalist" approach (Joseph, 2011, p. 241) is much less pronounced, setting the emerging body of literature from those countries apart from the papers discussed here.

Table 2. [about here] Selected studies and their key attributes

Analysis and interpretation

Overview

While the literature relating to IoC is extensive, much of it considers IoC interventions in different disciplines and contexts, and is largely student-focussed. The five studies we selected consider IoC academic development undertaken in different countries (Australia, Canada, Singapore, the UK, and the United States); employ a variety of methods and methodologies to obtain qualitative data (ethnography, critical reflection, focus groups, interviews), and are grounded in a range of underpinning theories. The dominance of literature from globally recruiting countries reflects national strategic interests.

We identified four overarching themes in the selected studies: Understanding the Need for IoC; Raising Awareness; Practitioner Transformation; and Messy Understandings. Each of these themes is now explored.

Understanding the need for IoC

The necessity of establishing a baseline understanding of the need for IoC is an important theme in all the papers. Green and Whitsed (2013, pp.155-156) exemplify the need for a cross-institutional, collaborative approach to the examination of existing curricula:

> As Participant 3 said, 'I think it was much easier when we sat and did it together, kind of went through it and talked about it—I found it very difficult on my own, and you definitely need a bit of a club'.

The significance that a reflective review of curricula can have on individuals is highlighted by (Garson, Bourassa, & Odgers, 2016, p. 468):

> I am aware of how little intercultural content I have had in my course material throughout my teaching experience. (History Instructor)

McKinnon, Hammond, and Foster (2019) elicited a similar reflective comment:

> From my observations, I think that … the curriculum appears restricted in terms of providing adequate cross-cultural dimensions … apart from the issue of adaptability, the curriculum appears more westernised. (p. 143)

One paper (Hoare, 2013), focuses on transnational teaching, and suggests that review of the curriculum by flying faculty is dependent on individual academics' perceptions of need as they undertake delivery in the partner HEI. Some participants in that study dismissed the necessity to revise curricula, even to meet an integrative approach (Joseph, 2011) to better support the students they taught overseas. One example participant of Hoare's said:

> There is a market for the educational values that we espouse … these people have selfnominated for the course, so these are people who are attracted to a western model of learning (2013, p. 567).

This kind of rejection of the need for international adaptation of the curriculum by individuals, highlights the necessity that a more transformative approach to IoC be espoused and communicated in a consistent manner by academic developers. This underpins communicating universities' moral and social obligations of educating students to be respectful, caring, and responsible global citizens.

Raising awareness

Niehaus and Williams (2016) illustrate how a faculty development course in IoC changed participants' perspectives on internationalization – using metaphors such as expanded, broadened, and deepened. They also discuss how reflecting on IoC opened participants' eyes to the potential of teaching resources that were more authentic than those they would previously have selected, for example:

> I would have thought, 'Oh, I can just read a book written by a U.S. author on South Africa or apartheid.' But for me, getting that international perspective was much more of an importance…For me the idea of authenticity became much more important (Niehaus & Williams, 2016, p. 69)

Awareness of the benefits of engaging with resources which enable cross-cultural exchange was also raised through open debate about the underpinnings and purposes of IoC, and this can force a critical review of current practices. Green and Whitsed (2013) demonstrate this though the quotation:

> We had a lot of discomfort with the term 'internationalization' . . . because everything we do is international, but dominated by the US, the UK. These perspectives dominate the research paradigm of the School. Our books are from the US or the UK. There's no unique Australian theory or contribution to research. This is problematic because most of our students are from the East and the South— predominantly the South. And we have a unique situation—our distance from the

North. We need to be more critical of theory … often what passes for knowledge are simply routinised practices. (Participant 4) (p. 157)

It is necessary to allow time for individual staff to reflect on education which promotes critical understandings from anti-racist and postcolonial pedagogies (Joseph, 2011). Visualizing a transformative curriculum as (im)possible is similarly emphasized by Garson et al. (2016, p. 458) who characterize this IoC academic development activity as providing a "space for reflective practice and curricular re-visioning". By contrast, Green and Whitsed (2013) highlight the crucial role that academic developers play in moving "from critique to action" (p. 158) as part of a strategic, institution-level IoC initiative.

Practitioner transformation

The theme of transformation is implicit in all the articles, but explicitly discussed in two of them (Garson et al. 2016; Niehaus & Williams, 2016) where it is presented as an individual metamorphosis resulting from academic development IoC interventions. Both articles conceptualize this through Mezirow's (1991) transformational learning theory which concerns the changes that result in an adult individual's worldview when their previous understandings are challenged. Transformation potentially develops out of changed perspectives but is not the inevitable result of IoC interventions. Garson et al. (2016) illustrate ways in which their professional development interventions have transformed both the academics' and their student's intercultural awareness:

It was a turning point for me. (Instructional Designer) (p. 465)

> The concept of empathy is challenging, disruptive, and generative. It's humbling. It forced me to step back from my assumptions on how I went into the class. (Communications Instructor) (p. 467)

> For students it is a real revelation [to have the] language to talk about differences. (Psychology Instructor) (p. 465)

Niehaus and Williams (2016) illustrate how change resulting from participation in a global faculty development program transformed not just individuals' teaching, but also their research and cultural perspectives:

> …reflecting on how her personal experience as a Korean American influenced her role in internationalization. She concluded, 'I better understand now how I am – it's weird to say it this way, because I haven't really thought about it – but I am an actor and agent in the on-going internationalization [process].' (p. 71)

The theme of transformation runs through the article by Hoare (2013) which draws out the ways academics viewed their teaching practice in the light of TNE experiences. She explains that "the depth and quality of intercultural learning that resulted [from the TNE experience] was inconsistent and was dependent on the manner in which individual personalities experienced moments of insight into the effects of culture distance" (Hoare, 2013, p. 570). This highlights an important gap in the way that academic developers interact with colleagues working in overseas locations, suggesting the need for an ongoing relationship. Green and Whitsed (2013, p. 159) suggest that academic developers can offer inter-disciplinary insights while "introducing a theoretical framework, guiding the process, creating a place to play, and understanding IoC as a social process".

Messy understandings

The academic development evaluated by Garson et al. (2016) addresses "Increasing Intercultural Understanding, one of [the institution's] five strategic priorities" (p. 460). Garson et al. (2016) show how individuals' perspectives, once changed, can have wider IoC influence by quoting the example of a History instructor:

> This summer I am going to apply this further to other courses and to the department to have intercultural outcomes. I think before, the Arts Faculty only thought internationalization/interculturalization meant only 'how do we get more international students in our classes, full stop.' But that's not what it's about. (p. 468)

The difficulties of enacting an institution-wide IoC strategy are explored in Green and Whitsed's study (2013) who begin their evaluation of their involvement as academic developers in an IoC strategic implementation, with the following participant quotation:

> I know the university does have an articulated commitment to internationalization, but I'm not sure how it applies at my level. As with a lot of strategic goals that the university has, this doesn't translate well down to the coalface ... It gets discussed a lot—that internationalization is a good thing and we should do it—but I don't think there's any discussion about why, and what impact it has and so on ... I've got no idea how to do it. (p. 149)

Green and Whitsed (2013) contrast the bewilderment expressed by this participant with the conversations they, as academic developers, eventually succeeded in starting "between management and representatives of disciplinary perspectives" (p. 161-2). It appears that these conversations could take place only when IoC had been embedded.

The case studies presented by Garson et al. (2016) and McKinnon et al. (2019), consider the effect of academic development interventions on individuals' practice, rather than on the wider institution. However, Niehaus and Williams (2016) argue that

even where IoC interventions (such as small-scale workshops) are intended to impact individuals and their practice, they should be part of a wider strategy:

> Curriculum transformation can clearly not be successful in a vacuum; rather it should be part of a broader internationalization strategy that provides a foundation for expanding individual faculty members' internationalization work … faculty members cannot be expected to engage in the work necessary to transform the curriculum without adequate support to do so. (p. 73)

The article by Hoare (2013) differs in that it considers the effect of a lack of academic development, thereby illustrating the need for "recognition and provision of appropriate, ethical and timely learning and development interventions" (p. 572) for staff involved in transnational education. Meanwhile, Green and Whitsed (2013) consider the short-term gains, individual contributions, and disciplinary divergences they have encountered as academic development facilitators of IoC. They conclude that:

> our participation in this project has highlighted the possibilities for imagining and doing when agency is exercised within and across disciplinary communities of practice working on IoC. If these communities are to be sustained and broadened, the key conditions of effective multilevel leadership, institutional readiness, and appropriate resourcing and funding for all teaching staff will need to be met (p. 161)

It appears that commitment to internationalization must be translatable from top-level institutional strategy through to individual academic practice. HEIs should organize themselves according to local need, acknowledging that investment in infrastructure is required to ease IoC processes, and train and support staff.

Discussion

In synthesizing our QRS findings, it became apparent that our research could be interpreted in relation to Leask's (2013) model of the process of IoC. In this model, the

five stages: (1) Review and reflect, (2) Imagine, (3) Revise and plan, (4) Act, (5)

Evaluate, are linked by negotiation arrows, and form a circular process which can be

repeated, always starting with 'Review and reflect'. These five stages are woven into

our discussion, along with Joseph's (2011) call for a pedagogy of social justice as part

of IoC, with particular focus on the role and contribution of academic development in

supporting transformation of the curriculum.

   The initial stage of the IoC model focuses on finding the extent to which

curricula are already internationalized (Leask, 2013). In reviewing the findings from our

QRS, we note a variety of problems encountered in how initial review is undertaken.

Many of the challenges to successful IoC, and associated academic development

activities, appear to be rooted in internal politics, conflicting priorities, and lack of

investment in the time and resources required to make change happen. The ambivalent

role of academic development 'on the margins' of other organizational units in HEIs

can be seen as both a challenge and an opportunity (Green & Little, 2013).

Metaphorically, academic development may stand on the sidelines as "competing

factions stake their claim on plots of land, defending borders and attempting to annex

others" (Green & Little, 2013, p. 524). IoC policy, especially when framed within the

economic rationalist approach, could be seen as part of these hostilities. Indeed, a knee-

jerk response to the language of internationalization, with staff not seeing its relevance,

may account for academic reticence, and messy understandings. Whitsed and Green

(2016) characterized IoC as an "unwinnable game" (p. 287) which they challenge

academic developers not to accept at face value. Certainly, it is important to be mindful

that institutional strategies can promote distrust, which accounts for staff resistance to

their alignment.

The 'Imagine' stage of Leask's (2013) model facilitates the exploration of the best possible IoC approaches, unconstrained by what is currently done or deemed possible. Like Kreber (2009), we feel it is vital to share an understanding of the different drivers for internationalization prior to embarking on IoC activity with the staff involved. We also support the communication of universities' moral and social obligations of educating students to be respectful, caring, and responsible global citizens (Patel, 2017). Furthermore, it seems foolhardy to undertake such activity if the strategic contribution of IoC has not already been agreed. Unfortunately, along with Green and Little (2013), we must acknowledge that academic development often attains only "tangential involvement in institutional policy-making" (p. 534).

As highlighted in 'Revise and plan' (Leask, 2013), the practical implementation of IoC should recognize individual practitioners' commitment as well as institutional enablers and blockers. From our QRS, it appears that IoC interventions are rarely premised on cross-institution strategy, but instead represent ad hoc tactical responses to international opportunities, lacking coherence and organizational consistency. This piecemeal approach is detrimental to the wider institution because small-scale successes and failures are replicated, but not harnessed strategically. However, Whitsed and Green's (2016) suggestion of working across established organizational boundaries may be the pragmatic way forward. Our preferred recommendation would be that the academic development function should involve itself in the setting of institutional strategy regarding internationalization and associated budgets.

Alongside the implementation of IoC activities, the 'Act' stage of the Leask (2013) model anticipates that staff have the means to transition and transform their academic practices to effect change. Our QRS suggests that academic development for IoC offers an opportunity for 'transformation': not only of the curriculum, but of both

individuals and of their institution. Mezirow's (1991) transformational learning theory has been employed by Howie and Bagnall (2013) as a way of recognizing the fundamental changes that IoC can inspire in academic staff, and potentially, in their students. Howie and Bagnall (2013) argue that transformative learning theory is best understood, not as a theory, but as a metaphor for some "revolutionary enlightenment in a person's psyche … an awakening that leads to new learning that otherwise would not have occurred" (p. 822). We concur. Dirkx and Smith (2009, p. 65) suggest that transformative learning involves a kind of metamorphosis from "caterpillar … into a beautiful, majestic and soaring butterfly". However, this metaphor fails to convey individuals' potential for ongoing transformation.

Our main concern, however, is the lack of discrimination evidenced in the articles we shortlisted, none of which suggested that different academics and/or academic developers would have different IoC development needs. Some of these perceived 'caterpillars' may already be 'butterflies'! Hence, we argue that IoC deficit should not be assumed. Rather, the support given to (and by) academic developers in preparing IoC materials and strategies, should take an open, enquiring, and collaborative approach. Furthermore, IoC academic development should be suited to any staff member, from any culture, working in any culture.

The active involvement of academic development is crucial to the 'Evaluate' stage of Leask's (2013) model where evidence of IoC activities is gathered together and appraised. Our selected articles each represent an evaluation for particular audiences. The case studies presented by Garson et al. (2016) and McKinnon et al. (2019), consider the effect of academic development interventions on individuals' practice, rather than on the wider institution. Leask's model "avoid[s] the situation of the academic developer and the researcher being seen as the outside experts coming in to take over

the curriculum review process, thereby disempowering the academic staff" (Leask, 2013, p. 107). Nonetheless, the ambiguous status of academic development in many HEIs risks that academic developers are viewed by academics as carrying out the will of senior management, while viewed by management as undermining it (Green & Little, 2013).

More opportunities for a principled, responsive, and agile approach to the ethics and socially-just framework underpinning IoC are required. Building on Joseph's (2011) transformational approach, this includes due regard to indigenous knowledgies and languages as reciprocal exchanges of cultural wealth (Patel, 2017). This, we argue, is for the creation of all-encompassing learning environments, supported through the role and function of academic development, and requiring clear strategic partnership work.

Future research

This study is an initial exploration of the role of academic developers in IoC. It is limited to western practices. However, as Killick (2018) argues, many good practices stem from the western, Anglophone world. Future research should include studies of universities in non-western contexts, and learning environments outside tertiary education where the foundations are laid for student learning in higher education.

The Barometer of the European Association for International Education (Sandström and Hudson, 2019) reports a correlation between offering 'training' for and perceiving progress in internationalization. This correlation includes training on "international learning outcomes, internationalization of the curriculum and teaching methods" (p. 20). However, currently, little is known regarding how universities 'mainstream' internationalization in their professional development for teaching, and to what extent they follow a systemic approach to internationalization. We also need to

discover how, outside the Anglophone world, requirements of professional development differ between education delivered in English versus that delivered in the local language. After all, education in the local language will be also focus on a diverse student body, and will also include international perspectives. Further, we need to find out how universities integrate specific aspects of internationalization into professional development, such as sustainable development goals, local versus global perspectives, notions of social responsibility, and global citizenship.

Crucial to all these aspects of professional development is the academic developer. Much is still to be learned about how academic developers handle their tasks for internationalization, how they prepare for them, and what stimulates and motivates them. Another dimension of this is institutional leadership that enables academic developers to assume ownership of their role in internationalization. Sharing institutional case studies will help us understand the requirements of different types of universities, the role of the disciplines within those universities, and academic developers' responses to, potentially, very different requirements.

Conclusion

Our QRS found common themes in diverse IoC articles whilst also validating our perception that little had been published regarding the training of academic developers themselves to support IoC initiatives.

HEIs committed to strengthening their IoC are faced with the need for potentially profound change. We argue that adopting empowering approaches through collaboration of strategic management, academic staff, and academic developers will facilitate transformative IoC processes. If universities are to achieve their aim of delivering internationalization to all their students instead of only the mobile 'cultural elite' or those studying in international programmes, many more than the 'champions'

of internationalization must be involved. This in turn requires a systemic approach to the integration of international perspectives in socially just pedagogy. Only then will the benefits of internationalization reach all students.

References

Brandenburg, U., & De Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 62, 15–17. https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2011.62.8533

Caruana, V., & Ploner, J. (2010). *Internationalisation and equality and diversity: Merging identities.* London: Equality Challenge Unity.

Casper-Hehne, H., & Reiffenrath, T. (Eds.) (2017a). *Internationalisierung der Curricula an Hochschulen [Internationalizing university curricula].* Bielefeld: W. Bertelsmann Verlag GmbH.

Casper-Hehne, H., & Reiffenrath, T. (2017b). Editorial: Internationalisierung der Curricula [Internationalizing curricula]. *Zeitschrift für Hochschulentwicklung 12* (4), 9–18.

Cooper, H., Hedges, L. V., & Valentine, J. C. (Eds.). (2009). *The handbook of research synthesis and meta-analysis* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Russel Sage Foundation.

de Wit, H. (2016).Internationalisation and the role of online intercultural exchange. In R. O'Dowd, & Lewis, T. (Eds.), *Online intercultural exchange: Policy, pedagogy, practice* (pp. 69-82). London: Routledge.

Deardoff, D (2015). Preface. In J. H. C. Walenkamp, (Ed.), *The world's mine oyster: Studies in support of internationalisation in higher education* (p. 7). The Hague: Eburon.

Dirkx, J. M., & Smith, R. O. (2009). Facilitating transformative learning: Engaging emotions in an online context. In Mezirow, J., Taylor, E., & Associates (Eds.), *Transformative learning in practice: Insights from community, workplace, and higher education* (pp. 57–66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Egron-Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2014). *Internationalization of higher education: Growing expectations, fundamental values*: *IAU 4th global survey*. Paris: International Association of Universities. Retrieved from https://www.iau-aiu.net/Internationalization?lang=en [16.04.2018]

Garson, K., Bourassa, E., & Odgers, T. (2016). Interculturalising the curriculum: Faculty professional development. *Intercultural Education*, *27*, 457–473. doi:10.1080/14675986.2016.1240506

Green, D. A., & Little, D. (2013). Academic development on the margins. *Studies in Higher Education*, *38*, 523–537. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.583640

Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2013). Reflections on an alternative approach to continuing professional learning for internationalization of the curriculum across disciplines. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*, 148–164. doi:10.1177/1028315312463825

Higher Education Academy. (2014). *Internationalising the curriculum*. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/internationalising_the_curriculum.pdf [30.08.2018]

Hoare, L. (2013). Swimming in the deep end: Transnational teaching as culture learning? *Higher Education Research & Development*, *32*, 561–574. doi:10.1080/07294360.2012.700918

Howie, P., & Bagnall, R. (2013). A beautiful metaphor: Transformative learning theory. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *32*, 816–836. doi:10.1080/02601370.2013.817486

Ittel, A., & Pereira, A. M. N. (Eds.). (2018). *Internationalisierung der Curricula in den MINT-Fächern [Internationalization of the curricula in STEM subjects]*. Bielefeld: wbv Publikation.

Jones, E. (2015). Series editor's foreword, In Killick, D. (2015). *Developing the Global Student: Higher education in an era of globalization* (pp. xi-xiii). London: Routledge.

Jones, E., & Killick, D. (2013). Graduate attributes and the internationalized curriculum: Embedding a global outlook in disciplinary learning outcomes. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*, 165–182. doi:10.1177/1028315312473655

Joseph, C. (2011). Internationalizing the curriculum: Pedagogy for social justice. *Current Sociology*, *60*, 239–257. doi:10.1177/0011392111429225

Killick, D. (2015). *Developing the global student: Higher education in an era of globalization.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Killick, D. (2018). *Developing intercultural practice: Academic development in a multicultural and globalizing world*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalisation – for better or worse? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *17,* 84-90. doi:10.1080/13603108.2012.753957

Kreber, C. (2009). Different perspectives on internationalization in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 118,* 1–14. doi:10.1002/tl.348

Leask, B. (2013). Internationalizing the curriculum in the disciplines-Imagining new possibilities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *17*, 103–118. doi:10.1177/1028315312475090

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the curriculum*. London: Routledge.

Major, C., & Savin-Baden, M. (2010). *An introduction to qualitative research synthesis: Managing the information explosion in social science research*. Abingdon: Routledge.

McKinnon, S., Hammond, A., & Foster, M. (2019). Reflecting on the value of resources for internationalising the curriculum: Exploring academic perspectives. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *43*, 138–147. doi:10.1080/0309877X.2017.1359506

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Niehaus, E., & Williams, L. (2016). Faculty transformation in curriculum transformation: The role of faculty development in campus internationalization. *Innovative Higher Education, 41*, 59–74. doi:10.1007/s10755-015-9334-7

Noblit, G. W., & Hare, R. D. (1988). *Meta-ethnography: Synthesizing qualitative studies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patel, F. (2017). Deconstructing internationalization: Advocating glocalization in international higher education. *Journal of International and Global Studies, 8* (2) 64–82.

Sandström, A.-M., & Hudson, R. (2019). *The EAIE Barometer: Internationalisation in Europe* (second edition); signposts of success. Amsterdam: EAIE.

Suri, H., & Clarke, D. (2009). Advancements in research synthesis methods: From a methodologically inclusive perspective. *Review of Educational Research*, *79*, 395–430. doi:10.3102/0034654308326349

Tight, M. (2012). *Researching higher education* (2nd ed.). Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education.

van Damme, D. (2001). Quality issues in the internationalisation of higher education, *Higher Education*, *41,* 415–441. doi:10.1023/A:1017598422297

van der Wende, M. (2017). Reframing global engagement. *International Higher Education*, 90, 10–12. doi:10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9996

Whitsed, C., & Green, W. (2016). Lessons from Star Trek: engaging academic staff in the internationalisation of the curriculum. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *21*(4), 286–298.

Wimpenny, K., & Savin-Baden, M. (2013). Alienation, agency and authenticity: a synthesis of the literature on student engagement. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *18,* 311–326.

Table 1. Criteria for QRS inclusion and exclusion (after Major & Savin-Baden, 2010).

Criterion	Include studies	Exclude studies
Topic	Academic development to support IoC	Other academic development activities
Research question	Concerning development of academic developers or other academic staff	Concerning students or non-academic staff
Research design	Using an interpretative qualitative design	Using a quantitative design
Researcher stance	Acknowledged and congruent with methodology deployed	Not acknowledged and/or not congruent with methodology deployed
Included data	Congruent with research questions, methodology, and findings	Unclear, omitted, or lacking congruity with research questions, methodology, and findings

Table 2. Selected studies and their key attributes

Selected Study:	Garson, Bourassa & Odgers (2016)	Green & Whitsed (2013)	Hoare (2013)	McKinnon, Hammond & Foster (2019)	Niehaus & Williams (2016)
Source:	Scopus and ASC	Scopus and ASC	Scopus	Scopus	ASC
Location:	Canada	Australia	Australia and Singapore	United Kingdom	United States
Focus:	Explores faculty perceptions of the impacts of a professional development programme on IoC.	Explores the role of academic development in supporting IoC through creating critical (inter)disciplinary spaces	Explores the need for formal institution-level academic development that prepares individuals for teaching overseas	Evaluates the effectiveness of academic development resources for IoC, and highlights the issues in moving from learning to practice	Examines the transformative outcomes necessary to internationalize the curriculum resulting from a professional development IoC programme

Number of participants:	Twenty out of a potential 60 who had attended the IoC programme	Nine from 2 HEIs plus research team members	Five 'flying faculty'	Eighteen interviewees from 2 HEIs plus 20 scripts from a 3rd HEI	Fifteen out of a potential 22 who had attended an IoC course plus 2 academic developers
Methodology:	Case study	Action research	Ethnography	Case study	Case study
Methods:	Questionnaires and 1:1 interviews	Participant survey, recordings and transcriptions of a meeting, interview with overall project leader	Three "in-depth" (p. 562) (longitudinal interviews per participant	Semi-structured interviews plus "written commentar[ies]" (p. 141)	Semi-structured interviews plus "participant observations and documentary analysis" (p. 63)
Theory/ies espoused:	Transformative Learning	Communities of Practice	Culture shock	Change and Resistance to Change introduced but not	Transformative Learning

			theorized	
Author'/s' positionality	Facilitators of an IoC programme for staff	Academic developers in 2 HEIs and "disciplinary outsiders" (p. 149)	Academic outsider: a human resources development director	Academic developers in 3 HEIs	One academic developer plus 1 external assessor

Figure 1. The filtering process employed.