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INTERNATIONALISATION THROUGH RESEARCH: PROBLEMS AND PROCESSES

James O'Meara1 and Michael Spittle2
1University of Ballarat, Australia
2Deakin University, Australia

When a professional association like ICET suggests it is involved in an internationalisation activity what does that mean? Defining internationalisation has presented an ongoing challenge for academics (see for example Backhouse, 2005; Stone, 2006), for more than a decade. Knight (2003) provides a useful definition that reflects both the cultural and research dimensions reflected in ICET’s Research and Dissemination Committee. She suggests that internationalisation of higher education involves an integration of international and intercultural dimensions into among other things, the research functions of an institution, or in this case a professional association. The Research and Dissemination Committee of ICET is an international group as it represents many countries. The individual members also bring an intercultural dimension to the committee as many work at institutions with colleagues from different ethnic and or cultural backgrounds. As these members and colleagues participate in internationalisation activities there is the potential for the development of intercultural awareness through use of personal and interpersonal knowledge to interpret and/or value the research efforts of others (adapted from Bryam, 1997). While the potential exists for this type of internationalisation to occur, without an explicit motivation this potential may remain unrealised.

Researchers (Davies, 1992, Johnston and Eddlestein, 1993; Scott, 1998; Warner, 1992) have long speculated on rationales for Internationalisation in Higher Education (Quiang, 2003). More recently, some have identified political, economic, academic and social rationales as four motives for internationalisation (deWit, 1995; Knight, 2004; Knight and de Wit, 19951997, 1999). The political rationale is linked to concerns of foreign policy and national security. The economic rationale is driven by a desire to maintain a country’s competitive edge through an educated population. The academic rationale involves the desire to achieve international standards of excellence in areas such as scholarship and research. The social rationale differs from the previous three as the focus shifts to the development of
intercultural awareness in an individual rather than the development of country, institution, or professional association. Intercultural awareness in some cases (see for example Ross, 1993) is discussed in terms of two separated but interrelated dimensions. One dimension of awareness can involve acknowledging and accommodating differing sets of research beliefs, values, and ideas with the thoughts of the two collaborating researchers. The other dimension involves acknowledging and accommodating the political, economic, social and technological constraints and/or facilitators linked to the location of the individual researchers. Collectively these two dimensions can shape or be shaped by each other. Identifying a social rationale that emphasises intercultural awareness captured both the essence of the intercultural dimension of Knight’s (1994) Internationalisation definition as well reflected the developmental intention of ICET’s catch phrase of ‘enhancing global understanding through local empowerment’. Enhancing cultural awareness provides benefits, which include an increased capacity to self monitor personal biases as well as improved ability to respect, empathise with appreciate cultural differences (Nixon and Bull, 2005). Consequently, the social motivation served as the key rationale behind the internationalisation efforts of the Research and Dissemination Committee of ICET.

Although this collective rationale provided a focus of the ICET, additional work was required to enable individual members of the committee to describe their internationalisation program within the context of their university. While it is possible to create an extensive list of programs, Knight (1994) identifies five key program types. The international reputation program seeks to attract quality students and staff, increase international student numbers and secure funding for research and training projects. The staff and student development program aims to enhance the international and intercultural understanding and skills for students and staff through internationalisation strategies. The income generation program promotes internationalisation as a strategy for creating alternative income streams in a climate of decreased government funding. The strategic alliance program serves as a strategy for focussing efforts on achieving academic, scientific, economic, technological, or cultural objectives common to both institutions. The Research and Knowledge Production program recognises certain research problems are global issues that need global perspectives to address issues at the local. This type of program continues to grow in importance in countries like Australia, where national funding is now linked to the research output of the institution. Of the five program types, staff development represented the type that continued the emphasis on the development of an individual’s intercultural awareness. Since involvement by this individual in an ICET project involved the human resources of the university, there was a need to provide a link with another rationale that created further benefit for the university. The Research and Knowledge production program provided the institution with the relatively short-term, tangible benefits of research output. Strategic alliances represented a longer - term rationale for institutions that shared a common objective linked to internationalisation through research.

The identification of a program type provided a means for discussing internationalisation activities at the committee and institutional levels. Despite this, the need still existed for advice that explained how these internationalisation activities could be operationalised by the ICET academics at their host institutions. Quiang (2003) suggests that researchers (Ainger et al, 1992; Arum and Van de Water, 1992; De Wit, 1995; Knight, 1997) have typically used a ‘similar’ typology to classify approaches to operationalising internationalisation. Activity approaches, which include among other things short-term research initiatives, are the most
common adopted (Quiang, 2003). While a popular approach, these activities are often uncoordinated resulting in a fragmented approach to internationalisation. Competency approaches use activities such as knowledge generation and transfer to development the intercultural skills of the staff. Although a desirable outcome, this approach requires the development of a common and agreed set of intercultural competencies among those adopting this approach (Quiang, 2003). Ethos approaches seek to create a culture that values intercultural perspectives or initiatives. The success of this approach is highly reliant on the support of the academic’s institution (Quiang, 2003). The process approach uses policy and procedures to integrate internationalisation and intercultural initiatives into core university activities. Program sustainability is the key concern of this approach. As most of the academics held senior positions at their institution within a School or faculty there was little opportunity for them to influence culture at the organisational level. Consequently, the most relevant approaches were activity, process, and competency. In practice, this meant conducting international research that aligned with their University policy as a strategy for developing the intercultural skills of individual academics.

The final piece in the planning was identifying specific activities relevant to the preferred approaches. Several activities can contribute to developing collaborative research programs involving international partners. These activities include joint research projects, attendance at international conferences, published research papers (Aigner et al, 1992; Audas, 1991; Francis, 1993; Harari, 1989; Knight, 1991; Norfleet and Wilcox, 1992). Internationalisation served as the common theme connecting the activities of the contributing authors, which reduced the likelihood of fragmented research activities and outputs (Quiang, 2003). Most of them participated in joint research projects, presented preliminary findings at the ICET World Assembly and published these papers in the International Yearbook of Education (the publication linked to the World Assembly).

Identifying a narrow topic for this book was the combined impact of identifying the rationale, approaches, and activities of the ICET initiative. As the title suggests the projects contained in the subsequent chapters focus on the topic of internationalisation. Investigating this topic is an important activity for understanding strategies for developing intercultural awareness in the members the ICET Research Committee. Developing this type of understanding among the Committee members should also assist those involved in promoting internationalisation, developing internationalisation processes, and participating in internationalisation activities at their institution.

**The Problem of Internationalising Higher Education Research Initiatives**

The Research and Dissemination Committee met in 2008 to address a practical problem with the reputation of this group both within the association and in the wider academic community. Within ICET, the Research and Dissemination Committee was responsible for the development of international cooperation through networks to promote quality in educational initiatives. In reality, the group had initiated few if any initiatives that promoted cooperation between higher education institutions, government, and the private sector. Up until that point, most of the dissemination activities had involved fragmented and individual
internationalisation activities. This realisation identified the need for the committee to revise and expand its mission in order to make better use of the limited time available to group members. The expansion included an expectation for the group to conduct, document, and disseminate an internationalisation research program that developed them and individuals as well as developed ICET through the attraction of external funding. The identification of this practical problem motivated the development of a research problem. This problem was to better understand internationalisation in order to design activities that contributed to the intercultural competence of the members and developed the quality of transnational collaborations between their universities.

Knight’s (1994) definition that involved international and intercultural dimensions was one of the more recent attempts to define this concept. In 1998, the International Association of Universities (IAU) collated such definitions along with the views of previous UNESCO internationalisation forums (Havana, 1996; Dakar, 1997; Tokyo, 1997; Palermo, 1997; and Beirut, 1998) to produce the World Declaration On Higher Education For The Twenty-First Century: Vision And Action (UNESCO, 1998). A core belief informing the vision and action items within this document was that ‘international co-operation and exchange are major avenues for advancing higher education throughout the world’. Since 1998, researchers have been working to better understand how to develop a sustainable approach to internationalisation in higher education (Seddo, 2003; Singh, 2002). Increasing our understanding of these issues would help inform the actions of those involved in internationalisation activities at their institution or through their association.

Pertinent to the previous discussion is the notion that that the rationale for the development of an internationalisation framework represents a for desire intercultural skill development at the professional association level as well as increased knowledge exchange and production at the institutional level. Approaches adopted within this framework would include research and knowledge production activities and processes aimed at developing the intercultural competency of those involved. Activities occurring at both the association and institutional level should include research collaborations, conference presentations, and scholarly publications. However, due to the particularisation of local issues, the influence of local culture and exogenous differences in finance and governance, a need still existed to understand how to describe the types of activities that occurred across international boundaries. This problem was captured in the following research question:

How do you distinguish between and discuss different types of internationalisation research occurring at the different institutions?

We identified this question in the belief that access to a robust and pertinent framework could substantially assist researchers in this area by informing the planning and management of intended projects, as well as the intercultural development of those involved in the project.

We also believed that the absence of a strong theoretical framework could result in the application of existing research practices, which included the types of fragmented research activities we were hoping to avoid.

This book has been developed to provide an internationalisation framework capable of being used by researchers to inform their planning, implementation, analysis, and reportage of their individual projects. Overlaying this framework on the suite of projects in this internationalisation program, has allowed the editors to systematically classify and compare
the resulting outcomes of each of the contributing projects. What follows is a discussion of
the way in which we have approached this task, showing how we have integrated an existing
comparative theory and a pedagogical model to create the internationalisation framework that
has been used throughout this book.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTEGRATED
INTERNATIONALISATION FRAMEWORK

The concept of internationalisation originally promoted by the International Association
of Universities (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969) and further developed by Knight (1994)
represented useful attributes for classifying phenomena associated with internationalisation.
This concept is particularly useful in that it has agreed meaning among higher education
groups, but whilst agreement on the meaning of a concept provides the means for efficiently
communicating notions relevant to internationalisation per se, it does little for those
individuals seeking to explain the nature of internationalisation phenomena. This is where we
see a need for a parallel theory that contains a set of concepts presented in a systematic way
(Kerlinger, 1986) to assist researchers with issues associated with the practice and outcomes
of internationalisation in higher education.

To this end, we have found that a theory of comparative inquiry (see for example
Bereday, 1964; King, 1967; Noah and Ekstein, 1969) has been used successfully in the past to
facilitate transnational comparisons within educational settings. King (1967) suggested a
four-step approach was useful for examining among other things academic phenomena at the
conceptual, the institutional, and the operational level. Applied to the phenomena of
internationalisation, this approach proved a useful handrail to guide those involved in
developing an internationalisation framework. Step one provided a set of internationalisation
issues relevant to the participating authors. Step two, resulted in a typology (Bowker and
Starr, 2000) of internationalisation issues, which defined the ‘what’ of internationalisation
and assisted with classifying each case into a particular category of internationalisation
through research. Step three yielded a classification hierarchy enabling an orderly grouping
of internationalisation cases based on the similarity and differences. The final step of this
approach involved a comparative analysis of the writer’s research project. The outcomes of
this step were realised in 2010, once the research manuscripts were completed. In this regard,
it answered the implicit difficulty with a simple definitional approach since the initiatives we
are concerned with involve complex social and academic phenomena relevant to the
conceptual level of internationalisation. The application of such a theoretical formulation to
real-world initiatives related to internationalisation in higher education provided assistance
with the translation of abstract internationalisation concepts into a developmental framework
to promote a shared understanding between the editors and authors. While this was beneficial
the challenge still existed to relate or relay these conceptual understandings to practical
applications. The solution needed to provide a means for increasing understanding about the
transformation of the ‘conceptual’ aspects of internationalisation into something that could be
used in ‘institutional’, and ‘operational’ contexts (King, 1967). The integration of Bernstein’s
represented the chosen strategy.
THE PEDAGOGIC DEVICE: A MODEL FOR UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESSES OF INTERNATIONALISATION

Bernstein’s (1977, 1993, 2000), model of the pedagogic device presents a complex conceptual model map of the transformation of internationalisation from the conceptual level in Paris, to its relocation as actions at the institutional level in Australia, and its realisation through the various research collaborations. In choosing the Bernstein model, the editors acknowledge that no one model will facilitate the translation of concepts and theories into realities. The power of this model lies in the capacity to reveal and order actions linked to the operationalising (King, 1967) of an internationalisation concepts at the institutional from the perspective or an individual academic leading this initiative. The other rationale for choosing the Bernstein model was an editor’s previous experience with using the framework (see for example, O’Meara, 2005) to distinguish between sociological and educational phenomena occurring at different higher education institutions.

Bernstein felt that sociologists of education had to understand the world of educational institutions and find ways of linking empirical research into the human experiences of educational practices to the larger institutional, societal, and historical factors of which they are a part (Bernstein, 1977). His model aimed to build from the bottom up a set of ‘rules’ of educational process; then to link them to larger structural conditions; and, finally, to place this analysis in the context of the larger educational and policy questions of educators (Bernstein, 1993). Bernstein’s model of a ‘Pedagogic Device’ (Bernstein, 1993) identifies three separate ‘fields’ or locations that can be used as settings for describing the conceptual, institutional, and operational dimensions of internationalisation within higher education.

a pedagogic device can be considered as a set of hierarchical rules, distributive, recontextualizing, evaluative which constitutes its internal grammar ...the internal ordering proposed is common to all pedagogic devices ... (it provides) a model for generating a description of the processes involved in State-regulated realizations of the device, that is, official pedagogic discourse and pedagogic practice.” (Bernstein, 1993, pp. 209-210).

The pedagogic device provides a model for revealing and describing an interpretation of the order used by the internationalising bodies responsible for conceptualising internationalisation within higher education. Constructing an understanding of the history, rules (distributive, recontextualizing, and evaluative) and fields (production, recontextualisation, and realisation) where these discourses are constructed is an important step for those seeking to recontextualise or realise an internationalisation concept or discourse that was constructed outside the context of their institution. Applying this model to a transnational context represents an innovative use of the Bernstein Model that traditionally has been used to describe state –based realisations of educational policy and practices (see for example Bernstein, 2000).

Power and the Field of Production

Bernstein (2000) describes the field of production as the ‘what and the how of the ‘official’ discourse is produced through classification. This discourse reflects a knowledge
discourse used to define the ‘thinkable’ of internationalisation, ‘legitimise’ the authoritative producers of this knowledge, as well as identify the recipients and potential sites for organizing and regulating internationalisation practices. The act of classification provides a structure to this knowledge (Bernstein, 2000). It defines, legitimizes and reproduces boundaries between different concepts representing knowledge. This is achieved by heavily or elaborately classifying the categories and relationships between the categories of knowledge or concepts to be transmitted and acquired. The policies and restrictions imposed by key individuals on the field of production can be described as distributive rules used to control the production of the new discourse by limiting the knowledge and restricting the people involved in producing knowledge on this arena. The combined outcome of the production processes and distributive rules is the creation of a category of ‘essential’ knowledge and category of non-essential or ‘mundane’ knowledge (Bernstein, 1993) by a group of ‘authoritative’ individuals who exerted their influence on this arena. From a comparative perspective (King, 1967), establishing an understanding an ‘official’ view of internationalisation within higher education identifies a definition for internationalisation created by the authoritative group operating at the conceptual level. Locating a definition used at this level creates the potential for mapping the differences between the ‘official’ definition and an operationalised definition constructed by someone not present at the site or time of production.

**Control and the Recontextualising Field**

Recontextualising knowledge is one way of explaining the local actions of individuals integrating literature from external governing bodies with institutional and personal perspectives. Bernstein (1993) believed that individuals involved in these types of activities were transforming an official discourse into a pedagogic discourse, i.e., knowledge for informing the actions of individuals within their local settings. Activities linked to the transformation of this discourse include selectively relocating and refocusing aspects of official knowledge from the Field of Production. He suggested that this transformation or ‘pedagogizing’ (Bernstein, 1996) of knowledge takes place in two significant fields. The Official Recontextualizing Field (ORF) is the space where the official knowledge and its selected ministries and agencies are sited. The Pedagogic Recontextualizing Field (PRF) is the site where the selection of the ‘what’ and the ‘how’ of the instructional process occurs. Bernstein (1996) argues this field is both a site of autonomy and of struggle given that the pedagogic discourse can be produced both independently from and because of influences from the ORF.

On the field of production, classification was linked to power, because of its ability to establish the boundaries between different categories representing the concept of ‘official knowledge’. On the recontextualizing field, the emphasis is on controlling the relationships within the discourse by regulating the way this knowledge is ‘packaged’ before it is taught or transmitted to the public. Framing provides groups on the PRF with a form for realizing a discourse. It represents a form of ‘internal logic’ for pedagogical practice (Bernstein, 2000). Framing is an exercise in control over among other things the selection of the knowledge and the group which makes transmission of the message possible (Bernstein, 2000). Controlling the forms of the concepts being transmitted seek to legitimize the attributes of the concept
contained in the official knowledge. Regulating the nature and number of groups of people who are responsible for pedagogising the official concepts creates a situation where the ORF has a strong control over the messengers and their messages. When the framing is weak, “the messengers operating in PRF have more ‘apparent’ control over the message” (Bernstein, 2000, p.13). At the recontextualising level of the Bernstein model, the main activities involve messengers selectively relocating and refocusing the official knowledge as well as controlling ‘how’ this recontextualised knowledge will be realised locally. In a university setting, policy and procedure documents are good examples of products resulting from this pedagogising process. From a comparative perspective, these policies and procedures provides a means for understanding how official knowledge can be localised at an institutional level prior to handing it over to the academic staff for operationalising (King, 1967).

**THE FIELD OF REPRODUCTION: A SITE OF INTERACTION AND EVALUATION**

Once the official pedagogic discourse has been recontextualised for local use, it is handed over to the acquirers or practitioners responsible for implementing or realizing the ‘policy’ through their practices. The potential to regulate the realisation of policy into practice is captured in Bernstein’s (2000) concept of evaluative rules. Bernstein describes two types of evaluative rules operating on the Field of Reproduction: recognition rules and the realisation rules. The recognition rules enable practitioners to distinguish the special features of a policy or procedure by creating the limits of what it is and what it is not. With respect to the official knowledge, these rules represent the ‘what is’ of an instructional discourse for practitioners. The realisation rules on the other hand tell practitioners ‘how to’ construct the discourse by explaining the relationship between key concepts as well as how to make the discourse public, i.e., pass on the message and the associated knowledge to others. Within the official discourse these ‘how to’ rules serve as a regulative discourse. Collectively these two rules have the potential to regulate what aspects of the pedagogic discourse (i.e., the policies and procedures) are reproduced at universities through individuals involved in international collaboration.

Bernstein (1993) refers to these sites as the ‘Field of Reproduction’. The term ‘potential’ is a key descriptor of this field as it is considered an interactive space where practitioners evaluate the pedagogic discourse being presented to them (Bernstein, 2000). Richards (1990) describes the resulting ‘manual’ discourses of the practitioners as being highly contextualized, practice based, and existing largely to satisfy their needs.

Within an international group of collaborating academics, the differing approaches to how individuals and/or groups approach their research are good examples of how internationalisation policies and procedures can be contextualised for personal use. From a comparative perspective, the contextualising of these policies and procedures provides a means for understanding and discussing differing approaches adopted by the academics when ‘operationalising’ (King, 1967) internationalisation policies and procedures through their research collaborations.
Putting It All Together

A purpose of a model like Bernstein’s pedagogic device is to create an order in a multi-perspective comparative theory for explaining how internationalisation concepts are constructed and contested at the various levels and stages of their realisation. Models are also useful mechanisms for simplifying the reality of a situation to enable researchers to investigate and discuss key relationships (Hoover and Donovan, 2008). In his later work Bernstein (2000) provided readers with a map of his pedagogical device that achieves both of these aims (Figure 1).
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Figure 1. Bernstein’s Pedagogic Device.

The formal model on the left of the device represents the hierarchy or structure of his theory of concerning the pedagogic device. The logic of his model suggests that those located at the top of the hierarchy have the power to create a discourse that classifies important and mundane knowledge within a certain area. The handing over of this knowledge to a new group allows intermediaries within this hierarchy take this knowledge and recontextualise it in a way that controls or regulates the transmission of this knowledge to the eventual users of this knowledge. The producers involved in this process seek to restrict the levels of consciousness within the recontextualizing group, thus enhancing the likelihood of acquisition of the official knowledge. The three key groups involved at the various levels of the formal model are authoritative producers (classification/production of knowledge, official and pedagogic recontextualisers (pedagogizing of knowledge), and the realisers or practical acquirers (recognition and realisation of knowledge). Limiting the model to the left hand side could suggest an expectation of a deterministic outcome. The inclusion of the right hand side indicates Bernstein’s (2000) acknowledgement of the potential for difference between the formal and realised aspects of this model. While the same rules apply to both sides of the model, the double headed arrows between each of the processes indicates the potential for lower levels to impact upon higher levels through their use of the rules relevant to the process occurring at that location.

Bernstein (2000) believes that there are internal and external reasons linked to the pedagogic device that explains why this two-way flow is possible. Firstly, although an internal function of the device is to control what knowledge is available to the acquirers this function results in the identification of invalid knowledge. This process of identifying the invalid creates the potential for acquirers to include this invalid knowledge as part of their
internationalisation realisation activities. Secondly, external to the device, is the use of power and authority in identifying those responsible for the creation of official knowledge. The selection and/or composition of this group by an external group creates the potential for challenge and contestation among those expected to realise or reproduce of their ‘official’ discourse. During the realisation of a discourse, power shifts between the various groups within the models, i.e., recontextualisers and acquirers of the discourse, as they take ownership of the discourse. Each shift locates the internationalisation knowledge on a new arena (recontextualisation and reproduction) for contests over the transmission and acquisition of knowledge.

Up until this point, the discussion on internationalisation has remained squarely in the realms of the conceptual. While the logic of this discussion may be sufficient to build an argument on an internationalisation, the absence of a real-world application limits the capacity of this argument to influence the thoughts and actions of those who wish to influence internationalisation activities at the institutional operational levels. This limitation is addressed throughout the remainder of this chapter by a discussion of how the application of this model lead to the development of a framework that represented the ‘what is’ or recognition rules for ICET internationalisation activities.

**THE FORMAL PEDAGOGIC DEVICE: A FRAMEWORK FOR INVESTIGATING INTERNATIONALISATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

Given the complexities of investigating a process involving a group of researchers spread across the globe, there was a need for establishing a model that provided both structure and simplicity for those leading as well as those participating in the process. Within the hierarchy of the pedagogic device, the highest and potentially the most powerful group identified are the producers of knowledge. Typical activities completed by this group include classifying the content categories and relationships between the categories of knowledge to be transmitted and/ or acquired by groups lower in the hierarchy. In 1998, participants in the World Conference on Higher Education (WCHE), included internationalisation authorities brought to UNESCO Headquarters in Paris. The following quotation highlights the complexity of the classification process that occurred in Paris as the assembled group considered a large number of documents when classifying the World Declaration On Higher Education For The Twenty-First Century: Vision and Action (UNESCO, 1998).

Taking into account the recommendations concerning higher education of major commissions and conferences, inter alia, the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century, the World Commission on Culture and Development, the 44th and 45th sessions of the International Conference on Education (Geneva, 1994 and 1996), the decisions taken at the 27th and 29th sessions of UNESCO’s General Conference, in particular regarding the Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel, the World Conference on Education for All (Jomtien, Thailand, 1990), the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Rio de Janeiro, 1992), the Conference on Academic Freedom and University Autonomy (Sinaia, 1992), the World Conference on Human Rights (Vienna, 1993), the World Summit for Social Development (Copenhagen,
1995), the fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing, 1995), the International Congress on Education and Informatics (Moscow, 1996), the World Congress on Higher Education and Human Resources Development for the Twenty-First Century (Manila, 1997), the fifth International Conference on Adult Education (Hamburg, 1997) and especially the Agenda for the Future under Theme 2 (Improving the conditions and quality of learning) stating: ‘We commit ourselves to ... (UNESCO, 1998).

The documented outcomes of this process were a new mission and vision for higher education and a plan for action. From a Bernstein perspective, this new vision could be presented as a new classification of the knowledge on what higher education was and what it was not. The purposes of universities in this new conceptualisation of higher education included educating, training and to undertaking research in ethical, autonomous, responsible and a participatory manner. The set of internationalisation attributes provided for these new universities included: increased equity, advanced knowledge, increased relevance, stronger collaborations, increased innovation, and developed staff. The roadmap for realising this vision included action items about: quality, technology, management, finance, knowledge sharing, ‘brain gain’, and partnerships. A final attribute internationalisation included within this document was advice about the important priorities for universities, these included: revisiting its mission, restructuring institutional processes and programs, embracing technology and enhancing access for adult learners. While these attributes contained little information about the concepts or ‘the what’ of internationalisation they did represent the how of internationalisation. This can be referred to as a ‘regulative’ discourse (Bernstein, 2000) that outlines the desired social order for universities to follow when implementing internationalisation activities.

The final proclamation or ‘classification’ (Bernstein, 2000) synthesised the recommendations of around 15 major commissions and conferences into a single document that reduced the existing understandings of internationalisation to less than 7,000 words. Arriving at that point would have involved emphasising certain aspects of these documents, while at the same time identifying the knowledge that ‘could’ be omitted from or captured within the official definition. In each of these statement articles and points within these articles can be defined as distributive rules (Bernstein, 2000), put in place to define the limits of the new regulative knowledge. Additionally, although a large number of documents informed the final declaration, the number of people having direct input into the final draft of the document would have been limited to a select group of authorities. This restricting of the number, along with the final selection of authors also signify examples of how distributive rules can be used to authorise a group to create a new classification of knowledge about what internationalisation is and what it is not.

**RECONTEXTUALISING A DECLARATION FOR A LOCAL SETTING**

Recontextualising the concept of internationalisation contained within the World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century for use in universities requires the involvement of individuals or groups not present at the site or time of production. Their role is to contextualise the official concept of internationalisation by selectively relocating and refocusing the official knowledge contained within the declaration to facilitate local
adoption. Recontextualising or ‘pedagogizing’ (Bernstein, 1996) this knowledge begins on the Official Recontextualizing Field (ORF) where official knowledge and its relevant institutions (i.e., Universities) are sited. Information linked to the ORF at the University of Ballarat (UB) is best reflected in our policies. A policy at UB is only used for documents with University-wide or Higher Education / Technical and Further Education (TAFE) Portfolio application. These policies represent a governing principle or set of principles that guides University practice. The purpose of these principles is to clarify the official approach being adopted by the University in realising this legislation or quality standard at the institutional level. At UB, the official approach to implementing the 17 articles and 14 priorities listed in the World Declaration On Higher Education For The Twenty-First Century, is captured in the following policy excerpts from its internationalisation policy (University of Ballarat, 2009). This policy states that the core university actions (education, research and training) linked to internationalisation would need to occur in borderless domains involving cultural, academic and social issues.

Internationalisation encompasses a set of actions and domains, but is also a state of mind that is borderless and determines responses to a variety of cultural, academic, administrative and social issues. Internationalisation requires an integration of an international dimension into all we do and is the University’s response to the globalisation of education training and research. (University of Ballarat, 2009).

Several other principles linked to these core activities were included in the ‘official’ internationalisation policy of the University. Education involved the development of global learners and citizens, research facilitated the formation of collaborative links between international communities and training lead to the development of international researchers capable of performing to international standards. Collectively these principles support the achievement of quality outcomes in internationalisation initiatives at UB, within the Bernstein model, they represent a product of the ORF at UB.

Once completed the policies are made available to a selected number of academics or practitioners on the Pedagogic Recontextualizing Field (PRF) who begin the work of transforming the policy generated on the ORF to procedures that support the implementation of a policy. A procedure describes a process that must be followed to achieve the desired results, as stated in the parent policy (University of Ballarat, 2004). A procedure is directly linked to the specific policy and details action – orientated practices linked to implementing the policy. Bernstein (2000) could describe the process of transforming a policy into a useable form as framing. Useable in this case is a subjective term as there is some potential for individuals or groups leading the framing exercise to create an ‘internal logic’ for how a policy be realised through practice. The potential of this group is influenced by the strength of the message created on the ORF. If this message is clearly outlined and prescriptive then the ORF has a strong control over the implementation of a policy. When this is not the case, the internal logic of those involved at the PRF is more evident. Indicators of influence on the PRF include suggestions on what counts as knowledge and criteria to validate its acquisition. Typically, at UB this type of evidence would be located in the procedure, however, in the case of the internationalisation policy, a procedure for the internationalisation policy does not exist. The absence of this procedure was both a both a facilitator and barrier to
implementation. On the one hand, the absence of a procedure at UB meant that there were no university-wide guidelines for implementing the principles outlined in the Internationalisation policy.

Alternatively, this same absence provided an opportunity for staff to influence the implementation of the internationalisation at UB and through the trans-national universities collaborating via research projects.

REALISING A DECLARATION FOR A LOCAL SETTING AND GLOBAL PARTNERS

The establishment of a policy at a university both legitimates the types of activities associated with the policy as well as provides a stimulus for academics to realise the policy through their practice. Bernstein’s (2000) evaluative rules provide one way of understanding how this occurred at UB. The recognition rules provided a framework for interpreting what did and did not constitute internationalisation at UB. This framework, supported by realisation rules, can assist with explaining the relationship between key aspects of internationalisation as well as how to make this discourse public, i.e., pass on the message to others.

The absence of an internationalisation procedure at UB created a situation where there were no ‘how to’ rules. This absence created an opportunity for practitioners at UB to create a ‘realisation’ (Bernstein, 2000) or ‘manual’ (Richards, 2000) discourse that satisfied their needs, the needs of collaborating ICET Researchers and the needs of international governing bodies such as UNESCO.

As this was a first attempt at a realisation discourse for internationalisation at UB, the emphasis was on the integration of the messages contained on the fields represented by the UNESCO, ICET and UB internationalisation discourses. From the Field of Production (UNESCO), internationalisation would need to involve a shared purpose of undertaking research in an ethical and participatory manner. The indicators of a quality internationalisation process would include advancing knowledge and developing the cultural awareness among the participating academics. The examination of the trans-national Official Recontextualising Field involved a review of internationalisation messages from both ICET and UB.

From ICET, the message was a need to build research capacity and promote research activities. The indicators of quality on this level included securing funding from external agencies and instances of collaboration where enhancing global understanding occurs through local empowerment.

From a UB perspective, internationalisation approaches included policies and activities involving research activity and the development of staff capable of performing to international standards. As an individual occupying a place on the ORF (ICET) and the PRF (Book Editor), I was well placed to exert some degree of influence over the ‘how to’ rules for realising this internationalisation initiative. For the participating authors, internationalisation research would need to reflect activities including collaborative innovative and ethical
research programs that lead to scholarly output and staff development in the area of cultural awareness. Given the continued emphasis on cultural awareness, a short explanation at this time is warranted.

**DESIGNING AN APPROACH FOR CLASSIFYING AND COMPARING**

The identified internationalisation issues provided the writers with a useful framework for identifying internationalisation issues that could apply to authors in this book. Moody (2008) considers identifying issues and important first step in a four-step comparative methodology.

Step Two involves creating an issues – based typology (see for example Bartlese and Van Vught, 2007 to facilitate a classification of efforts based on similarity (Bailey, 1994; Bowker and Starr, 2000). This would involve identifying these issues and their attributes to sort the internationalisation efforts of the contributing authors. The four identified attributes of internationalisation, i.e., research, collaboration, impact, and sustainability are outlined in Table 1.

Step Three in the comparative process involved designing a classification system to facilitate an orderly grouping of internationalisation cases based on the similarity and differences between the approaches adopted by the authors contributing to this book. This grouping involved collating the attributes from similar levels from each of the four typologies and assigning a descriptor to each grouping. In order for these grouping to make sense for the intended audience, they had to contain labels and a hierarchy that made sense. Given the current emphasis on research output (see for example Excellence in Research for Australia [ERA]; Research Excellence Framework for Britain [REF]) a grouping system based on impact appeared a logical choice. The H-index (Hirsch, 2005), which extends the focus from the impact of the journal to the impact of an academic’s efforts, served as a useful model for creating a system for comparing the efforts of academics involved in internationalisation through ICET. As discussed previously, increasing the quantity of ICET research publications does not equate to increasing the quality of ICET internationalisation activities involving research collaborations. While the ICET internationalisation attributes did include and emphasis on research and impact, collaboration and sustainability were also important considerations. The inclusion of these social attributes created the need for a system with a non-mathematical basis for differentiating impact, and the capacity to influence the actions of ICET researchers working on generating knowledge, collaborating with partners and promoting sustainability during internationalisation activities. The ‘I’ or Internationalisation framework provided in Table 2 represents the ICET response to this need. Each level uses accessible language to identify the attributes of quality for each category of internationalisation. Quality at each level reflected some consideration of the agreed ICET emphases of development of intercultural awareness (research and collaboration attributes), research and knowledge production (research attributes) and the formation of strategic alliances (sustainability dimension). The attributes attached to each level reinforced the
agreed ICET approaches of collaborative research activity, institutional alignment, and intercultural competency development. The activities linked to each attribute promoted involvement in research projects, dissemination of results, and the development of research themes linked to the agenda of suitable funding bodies.

**Table 1. Relevant Attributes of Internationalisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>designing a project for using the existing knowledge of the collaborating researchers in new or creative ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designing a project and obtaining institutional ethical approval for creating new knowledge in new or creative ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designing a project that reflects the expertise, knowledge and an awareness of the socio-cultural dimensions relevant to the participating researchers, as well as obtaining institutional ethical approval for creating new knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designing a project that reflects the expertise, knowledge and an awareness of the academic and the socio-cultural dimensions relevant to the participating researchers, obtaining institutional ethical approval for creating new knowledge, and publishes findings that are cited by others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>individualism: one author writes a chapter that reflects individual goals and research interests bonding capital: a homogeneous group of collaborating authors (developed and developing, East-West/ North South) write a chapter that reflects their collective goals and research approaches in preference to the goals of the community of co-authors bridging capital: a heterogeneous of collaborating authors (developed and developing, East-West/ North South) write a chapter that reflects their collective goals and research approaches as well as goals of the community of co-authors. linking capital: a heterogeneous of collaborating authors (developed and developing, East-West/ North South) write a chapter that reflects the collective goals and research approaches, the community of co-authors and external funding bodies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>would be unlikely to be cited and/or is unlikely to attract support from relevant internal grants may be cited within existing networks and/or is likely to attract support from relevant internal funding bodies is likely to be cited within the country of the author and/or is likely to attract support from relevant regional and state level funding bodies is likely to be cited outside the country of the author and/or is likely to attract support from relevant national and international funding bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maintaining and developing existing research networks maintaining and developing the existing research networks and creating new standards of research practice among this network maintaining and developing existing research networks, creating new standards of research practice among this network, and establishing local institutional processes for re-use in future collaborations with researchers maintaining and developing existing research networks, creating new standards of research practice among this network, establishing local institutional processes that can be re-used in future collaborations with researchers, and integrating this research within an established research program at a university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Internationalisation Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internationalisation Level 1 (Individual Process- Personal Focus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>designing a project for using the existing knowledge of in new or creative ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individualism: one author writes a chapter that reflects individual goals and research interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research unlikely to be cited and/or is unlikely to attract support from relevant internal grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintaining and developing the ICET research networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internationalisation Level 2 (Collaborative Process- Homogenous Focus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internationalisation activities involving:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designing a project and obtaining institutional ethical approval for creating new knowledge in new or creative ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bonding capital: a homogenous group of collaborating authors (developed and developing, East-West/ North South ) write a chapter that reflects their collective goals and research approaches in preference to the goals of the community of co-authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research that may be cited within existing networks and/or is likely to attract support from relevant internal funding bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintaining and developing the existing research networks and creating new standards of research practice among this network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internationalisation Level 3 (Collaborative Process- Heterogeneous Focus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>designing a project that reflects the expertise, knowledge and an awareness of the socio-cultural dimensions relevant to the participating researchers, as well as obtaining institutional ethical approval for creating new knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridging capital: a heterogeneous of collaborating authors (developed and developing, East-West/ North South ) write a chapter that reflects their collective goals and research approaches as well as goals of the community of co-authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is likely to be cited within the country of the author and/or is likely to attract support from relevant regional and state level funding bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintaining and developing existing research networks, creating new standards of research practice among this network, and establishing local institutional processes for re-use in future collaborations with researchers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internationalisation Level 4 (Collaborative Process- Strategic Focus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>designing a project that reflects the expertise, knowledge and an awareness of the academic and the socio-cultural dimensions relevant to the participating researchers, obtaining institutional ethical approval for creating new knowledge, and publishes findings that are cited by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linking capital: a heterogeneous of collaborating authors (developed and developing, East-West/ North South ) write a chapter that reflects the collective goals and research approaches, the community of co-authors and external funding bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research is likely to be cited within the country of the author and/or is likely to attract support from relevant regional and state level funding bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintaining and developing the ICET research networks, creating new standards of research practice among this network, establishing local institutional approaches that can be re-used in future collaborations with ICET researchers, and integrating this research within an established research program at your university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The shift from a quantitative index of productivity to qualitative descriptors of desirable behaviours provided two benefits for the researchers. The descriptors within the ‘I’ Framework provided a reference that allowed ICET researchers to assess if what they were doing represented an ICET internationalisation activity. This reference provided a stimulus for ICET researchers to review and extend their existing views on internationalisation as well
as modify their behaviours or thinking where appropriate. The ‘I’ framework also provided benefits for the editors of the book. These benefits included the potential for a consistent approach to the classification of internationalisation activities. This classification system was built on four kinds of internationalisation displayed as a hierarchical taxonomy. Level One internationalisation involved an individual process and personal focus where the research worked in isolation a personal interest area. Level Two internationalisation represented collaboration between a homogenous group that shared a common research interest. Level Three internationalisation represented collaboration between a heterogeneous group that used their collective expertise to explore a common research interest. Level Four internationalisation represented collaboration between a heterogeneous group that used their collective expertise to explore a strategic research interest.

While no group is expected to neatly fit into one category, the descriptors allowed the editor to highlight the achievements of each of the collaboration as well as the behaviours that may need some modification to enhance the quality of the internationalisation activity.

**CHECKING PROGRESS WITH THE PROBLEM**

Throughout this chapter we have begun to address some of the issues linked to the internationalisation problem we identified as the focus for this book. The framework presented in Table 2, identified a set of internationalisation attributes contained within a hierarchical classification system. Creating this framework involved the key steps of:

- identifying key issues or attributes of the concept of Internationalisation through higher education research,
- presenting a set of understandings of internationalisation suitable for application at the conceptual, institutional and operational levels,
- using the pedagogic device for discussing the operationalisation of internationalisation activities at and between collaborating institutions.

Identifying key attributes of the internationalisation linked to the concept of Internationalisation in higher education contributed to the development of a working definition of internationalisation for the collaborating authors. The integration of King’s (1967) Comparative theory and Bernstein’s (2000) Pedagogic Device model provided a means for introducing some of the roles individuals can play when promoting internationalisation research at and through their institution. Constructing a typology of internationalisation attributes generated classifications of internationalisation that enhanced understanding among the authors and assisted the editors classify the different research outputs presented in the following chapters. The final chapter documents the reintroduction of the ‘I’ Framework to complete the last step of King’s (1967) comparative process. This step involved generalising by identifying patterns, trends, or principles occurring in the internationalisation efforts of the authors.

The search for a means to distinguish between and discuss different types of internationalisation research occurring at the different institutions is the key focus of this book. The completion of the first three steps of King’s comparative process has created a
potential answer to this question. The potential of the I framework still needs to be tested for its capacity to substantially assist researchers in this area by informing the planning and management of intended projects, as well as the intercultural development of those involved in the project. The discussion on the degree to which the I Framework met these criteria forms the basis of the introduction to the final chapter in this book.
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