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 internationalisation 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 is a Research Associate in the Research Centre for Global Learning: Education and Attainment at Coventry University. Her current research relates the staff experience in higher education to academic development needs. She explores this, often collaboratively, through qualitative research approaches such as metaphor, visualization, and corpus analytics.

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

Little has been published regarding the training of academic developers themselves to support internationalization of the curriculum (IoC) initiatives. However, higher education institutions around the globe are responding to strategic demands for IoC which prepare students as 'world-ready' graduates. We employed qualitative research synthesis to identify recent journal articles which consider current trends in academic development to support IoC. Despite their diversity, we found common themes in the five selected studies. Our discussion and recommendations weave these themes with Betty Leask's five-stage model of the process of IoC 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). However, 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 involving the whole university community. Internationalization of the curriculum (IoC) 'is situated at the intersection of policy and practice in universities' (Leask, 2015, p. 3).

Joseph (2011) 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 already 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 elements of our own institutions, one in the United Kingdom and one in the Netherlands, actively pursue all these approaches to internationalization. Our universities have either a teaching and learning centre or a unit for academic development; and research centres dedicated to examining ways in which 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 higher education (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 the challenges of meeting institutional internationalization targets, and how a more transformative approach might be achieved. Hence, we present the results of a research review undertaken to identify current trends in academic development to support IoC. We share

our findings regarding academic development 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 evidence to inform 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.

The structure of this article is, firstly, an overview of the qualitative research synthesis approach, and how our own synthesis was conducted. Next, our findings are presented under four main themes: Understanding the Need for IoC; Raising Awareness; Practitioner Transformation; and Messy Understandings. Our discussion then relates these findings to Leask's (2013) model of IoC and Joseph's approaches for framing internationalization as a means to encompass a more responsive, transformative, and socially just ethic for IoC. Finally, recommendations for theory, practice, and further research are considered.

Methodology

Qualitative research synthesis (QRS)

Research reviews underpin much of the activity in the field of educational research (Tight, 2012). Any research review should provide a synthesis of the published work on a particular topic, should be systematic so as to be repeatable by others, and should 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 recognition of 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). Our broad and deep examination (Sandelowski & Barroso, 2007) explores concepts, categories, or themes that have recurred across the education research literature on ways of supporting academics in IoC.

Like Pawson, Greenhalgh, Harvey, and Walshe (2005), our objective has been to ascertain 'what works for whom, in what circumstances, in what respects and how' (p. 21). Therefore we associated the findings of relevant studies with their contexts, reinterpreting the studies through their relationships to one another and to the needs of our intended audience (Suri & Clarke, 2009) which comprised key players in higher education (HE) internationalization initiatives, and academic developers and their management.

Issues of plausibility

In order that results of a QRS are seen as plausible, it is important 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

For this research synthesis, we largely followed Major and Savin-Baden's (2010) QRS model. We began by identifying studies that addressed our research question: '*What does the current 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'), published since 2012.

When applied to academic publications databases covered by Elsevier's Scopus™ resource (www.scopus.com), the search identified 111 relevant documents of which 82 were journal articles, other formats being excluded from this study. 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 rejected because they were self-duplicates, or had misleading or mis-translated metadata. While these searches satisfied the QRS methodology, 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 which are set out in Table 1. These criteria not only confirmed the appropriateness of each study to the research question, but also 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 were excluded 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 series of recommendations.

Alternative search strategies

Publications excluded by the exclusion criteria were 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 (Beelen, 2018). The engagement of academic developers into the process of internationalization of curricula has been discussed as a key priority (Beelen, 2018). This discussion resulted in a special issue of the *Zeitschrift für Hochschulentwicklung*, that focuses on teaching and learning in higher education (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 and in which. It therefore often includes discussions on the foreign language profiency of academics. In the German and Dutch contexts, the 'economic rationalist' approach (Joseph, 2011, p. 241) is much less pronounced.which sets 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 hence largely student-focussed. The five studies we selected represent much of the diversity of writing on IoC (see Table 2). They 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 the papers. Some emphasize 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" (Green & Whitsed, 2013, pp. 155-156)

Other papers highlight the significance that a reflective review of curricula can have on individuals:

> I am aware of how little intercultural content I have had in my course material throughout my teaching experience. (History Instructor) (Garson, Bourassa, & Odgers, 2016, p. 468)

> 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. (Reflective commentary, university 3) (McKinnon, Hammond, & Foster, 2017, p. 6)

One paper (Hoare, 2013), focuses on transnational teaching, and suggests that review of the curriculum by flying faculty is dependent on the individual academic's perception 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. For example:

> 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 (Hoare, 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 IoC course 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. And I was thinking, "Boy, I really would like to make sure that I'm getting books that represent a particular group but from that particular group's perspective." (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. For example:

> 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) (Green & Whitsed, 2013, p. 157).

The necessity to allow time for individual staff to reflect on education which promotes critical understandings from anti-racist and postcolonial pedagogies (Joseph, 2011) is required. 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 that the 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).

Although it targets individuals' perspectives, it derived wider influence through subsequent IoC, for example:

> 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.
> (History Instructor) (Garson et al. 2016, p. 468)

Yet, 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. (2017), 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, 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 the model, the

five stages: (1) Review and reflect, (2) Imagine, (3) Revise and plan, (4) Act, and (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. Indeed, 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, we contend it would be 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'. This may be a metaphor too far, but it does capture the idea of individual transformation. Our 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, we feel, 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 are gathered together and appraised. Our selected articles each represents an evaluation for particular audiences. The case studies presented by Garson et al. (2016) and McKinnon, et al. (2017), 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 transformative strategy. Further weight is given to this argument by Coryell et al. (2010) who compared different HEIs' approaches to internationalization and concluded that organization-wide support must underpin the strategy to overcome the silo-effect of HEI internal structures, specialisms, and interests which would otherwise result in barriers. 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). Nontheless, 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 of 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. Finally, whilst outsourcing the academic development function to commercial providers (Dickson, Hughes, & Stephens, 2017) could provide time and cost advantages for HEIs, the associated loss of control would be difficult to justify.

Recommendations

- Use Leask's (2013, 2015) five-stage model of internationalization to help advance IoC through actively collaborating strategic management, academic staff, and academic developers;

- Use Joseph's (2011) framework to identify and discuss institutional drivers for IoC and ways in which transformative approaches can be more widely adopted;

- Involve academic development in the setting of institutional strategy regarding internationalization and associated budgets;

- Employ coordinated and strategic responses to ensure IoC processes are coherent and transferable across disciplines;

- Share successes and failures for the benefit of the wider institutional community as an HEI finds its own way through IoC;

- Undertake robust and diverse studies, researching the development of academic developers in supporting academics in transformative approaches for IoC.

Conclusion

Our QRS sought 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 strengthen their IoC are faced with the need for potentially profound changes in curriculum design culture. We argue that adopting empowering approaches which strengthen collaboration of strategic management, academic staff, and academic developers will facilitate transformative IOC processes. As Kreber (2009) suggests, HEIs tasked with responding to strategic demands to internationalize their curricula should 'resist undue emphasis on economic imperatives on the one hand, and purely cosmetic efforts at internationalizing curriculum on the other, both at the expense of considerations of the common good' (p. 13).

References

Beelen, J. (2018). *A deeper dig into global learning* (inaugural lecture). The Hague: The Hague University of Applied Sciences.

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

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

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.

Coryell, J. E., Durodoye, B. A., Wright, R. R., Pate, E., & Nguyen, S. (2010). Case studies of internationalization in adult and higher education: Inside the processes of four universities in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *16*, 75–98.

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.

Dickson, K., Hughes, K., & Stephens, B. (2017). Outsourcing academic development in higher education: Staff perceptions of an international program. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *22*, 106–119

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.

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

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

Higher Education Academy (2014). *Internationalising the curriculum*. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/internationalising_the_curriculum.pdf [30.08.18]

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

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

Ittel, A. & Pereira, A. D. N. (Eds.). (2018). *Internationalisierung der Curricula in den MINT-Fächern*. Bielefeld: wbv Publikation.

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

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

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

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

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. (2017). Reflecting on the value of resources for internationalising the curriculum: Exploring academic perspectives. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*. Advance online publication. 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.

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.

Pawson, R., Greenhalgh, T., Harvey, G., & Walshe, K. (2005). Realist review - A new method of systematic review designed for complex policy interventions. *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*, *10*(1Supple.), 21–34.

Sandelowski, M., & Barroso, J. (2007). *Handbook for synthesizing qualitative research*. New York: Springer.

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

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.

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.

(5,973 words including abstract, , tables and references)

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

Criteria	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 the methodology deployed	Not acknowledged and/or not congruent with the 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 (2017)	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 of transnational education (TNE),	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' (longitudinal) interviews per participant	Semi-structured interviews plus 'written commentar[ies]'	Semi-structured interviews plus participant observation and documentary analysis'
Theory/ies espoused	Transformative Learning	Communities of Practice	Culture shock	Change and Resistance to Change introduced but not theorized	Transformative Learning

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