Internationalization as a Moral Project

An Exploration of the Emotions, Deliberations, and Concerns of Teaching Faculty

Laura A. *SERVAGE* | ORCID 0000-0003-4054-0733
Faculty of Arts, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada
lservage@ualberta.ca

Lorin G. *Yochim* | ORCID 0000-0003-2212-4576
Faculty of Education, Concordia University of Edmonton, Edmonton, AB,
Canada
lorin.yochim@concordia.ab.ca

Abstract

This article discusses the perspectives of teaching faculty on the growing number of international students in their undergraduate classrooms. Our analysis takes note of expressions of emotion in faculty accounts and uses these to draw attention to the careful deliberations by which faculty reconcile personal commitments with the changing conditions of their work. We highlight moral and epistemological tensions in the project of internationalizing higher education. While these tensions have been considered for some time in critical comparative education circles, they are rarely acknowledged at the level of the mundane, daily practices of teaching. Our findings lead us to propose an alternative figuring of internationalization as a moral project. We believe that shifting the discussion toward moral tensions embedded in the lived reality of the contemporary university provides a rich ground for resolving any number of vexing dilemmas and, perhaps, to realizing the promise of internationalization.

Keywords

faculty – internationalization of higher education – internationalized classroom – international students – teaching

1 Introduction

The internationalization of higher education has fundamentally disrupted almost every aspect of university operations. Global flows of academics, students, and researchers have expanded rapidly over the past 30 years, representing both motivation for and consequences of institutional efforts to internationalize (Goddard & Gibney, 2013; OECD 2016). Although internationalization is a global phenomenon, the majority of student flows have been toward English-speaking and European countries. Critics and pragmatists alike recognize English as a lingua franca, such that English language universities in particular receive the bulk of international students (Choudaha, 2017; OECD, 2017).

Teaching faculty are on the front lines when it comes to responding to the cultural and linguistic diversity that accompanies internationalization. Many internationally mobile students are non-English native speakers, and their now routine presence in post-secondary classrooms challenges curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment norms in the context of Anglophone institutions that have historically assumed a homogenous population of Western-educated, English-speaking students. Despite these challenges, few studies have investigated how faculty perceive and respond to growing numbers of international students in their classrooms (Childress, 2010; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Sawir, 2011; Stohl, 2007).

In this article we develop a method of analysis grounded in our study of the perspectives of teaching faculty at a large, research intensive Canadian university. The impetus for this study was an influx of undergraduate international students, most notably from the People's Republic of China (PRC). The professors we interviewed described the practical challenges of teaching across language and cultural barriers. Participants' accounts of teaching and assessment reveal acute problems in the process of internationalization, including large class sizes, cultural and linguistic differences, weak institutional incentives to improve teaching, and especially, in this context, students who were insufficiently prepared to study in English at a university level. Our findings, reported elsewhere (Yochim & Servage, 2017), add to the body of empirical work documenting similar experiences of internationalization in the classroom (cf. Childress, 2010; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Green & Shoenberg, 2006; Turner & Robson, 2008).

Our analysis in this work shifts our focus to a qualitative feature of the data. Specifically, we noticed that faculty accounts of struggles with matters such as class size and composition, student participation, and grading were often inflected with strong feelings. A simple thematic reading of the faculty

accounts might have led us to interpret—or critique—them as professors’ “complaints and troubles talk” (Haugh, 2016), and to highlight deficiencies in instructional practices, shortfalls in institutional leadership, and conditions that left some students ill-prepared to study in English at a university level. A more critical reading might justifiably raise questions of inequity in internationalized and internationalizing higher education contexts.

In this article we set aside such judgments in favour of strategic empathy, thus allowing a deeper engagement with participants. We contend that the *emotions* expressed by teaching faculty point to the array of moral and epistemological dilemmas they face in the internationalized classroom, the depth and complexity of which are routinely overlooked in internationalization research and policy. By attending to faculty emotions and taking them seriously (Sayer, 2005), we refigure internationalization as a *moral* project rather than a practical one, with implications for institutions that seek to “internationalize” teaching practices.

2 Literature Review

Over at least the past three decades, universities in countries of the advanced capitalist world have greatly increased efforts to recruit international students. As a result, internationalization, at least in terms of numbers of foreign nationals amongst the student body, has proceeded at a rapid pace. The meaning and purposes of internationalization have been thoroughly discussed elsewhere (e.g., Jones, Coelen, Beelen & deWit, 2016; Knight, 2013; Marginson, 2016). Yet in practice, the precise objectives and strategies of internationalization remain unclear, contested, or both when it comes to implementation (Childress, 2010; Turner & Robson, 2008).

2.1 *Internationalization and the Internationalized Classroom*

For our purposes, it is useful to think of internationalization in terms of “export” and “import” functions (Knight, 2004). The former refers to activities in which students and faculty are sent or invited abroad for enrichment experiences, or to create international research partnerships. The latter involves efforts toward “internationalization at home” (IaH) that include the “importation” of personnel, students and ideas as a way of developing the intercultural capacities of domestic institutions, faculty, and students (cf. Nilsson, 2003).

Where “internationalization abroad” by definition exports the challenges associated with integration of new ideas and people, IaH as we describe it poses immediate and intense challenges for the receiving university.

Numerous studies document the less-than-satisfactory experiences of international students (cf. Barron & Gourlay, 2010; Leask & Carroll, 2011). These accounts show that students can struggle academically, financially, and personally. University leadership responds by developing a range of initiatives designed to support international students, both inside and outside of the classroom.

The “internationalized classroom,” is a term used in the literature to describe classrooms with significant numbers of international students. It is also used normatively in scholarship and in universities’ strategic plans. Both call for faculty to make changes to curriculum and teaching practices in response to the needs of students from diverse national, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds (Sawir, 2011). The ability and willingness of teaching faculty to do this work is central to successful IaH (Childress, 2010; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Green & Shoenberg, 2006; Turner & Robson, 2008).

3 Faculty Members’ Support for Internationalization

There are numerous reasons why cultivating faculty buy-in proves difficult. First, many of the changes required to internationalize teaching and learning pose significant practical problems. In studies, faculty have cited linguistic and cultural knowledge gaps in the classroom, developing new curriculum, increased workloads and time constraints as barriers to internationalization (Childress, 2010; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Vogel, 2015). If institutions do not “walk the talk” of their strategic plans by acknowledging these issues and providing needed resources, faculty may become cynical and disengaged (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Green & Whitsed, 2012; Hanson & McNeil, 2012).

The willingness of faculty to engage in internationalization of teaching and learning is also bound to the status of teaching in the academy generally. Investments in teaching are weakly valued in tenure review and may even be penalized (Childress, 2010; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Turner & Robson, 2008). Faculty are often not provided the tools and resources to internationalize. Professional development for internationalization requires sustained and coordinated faculty development efforts, both across campuses and at department levels, yet is often piecemeal and thus ineffective (Childress, 2010; deWit, 2014; Green & Schoenberg, 2006; Turner & Robson, 2008).

Finally, not all faculty concur with their institutions’ visions of or mandates for internationalization. Some are ill-at-ease with the dominance of Western institutions and English as the *lingua franca* on the global higher education

playing field, regarding these as forms of neo-colonialism (Hanson & McNeil, 2012; Joseph, 2012). Others maintain a conviction that the principles of Western liberal education are valuable, and should be preserved (Vinther & Slethaug, 2015). In summary, it cannot be assumed that faculty support their institutions' efforts to internationalize. This key consideration is often overlooked in prescriptions that treat justifications for internationalization as foregone conclusions (deWit, 2014).

4 Ideologies of Internationalization – Review and Justification of Our Framework

Recognizing that actors and stakeholders can bring different value positions to their understanding of internationalization, some have proposed conceptual frameworks to account for these varying views. Such frameworks typically identify at least three key modes or “ideal types” of internationalization (deWit, 2002; Schulz, 2007; Stier, 2004; Stier & Börjesson, 2010). For the purposes of this work, we focus on the framework proposed by Stier (2004), who argues that those most intimately involved in internationalization efforts “seldom...critically scrutinize the ideological underpinnings of internationalization policies” (p. 84). Policy and practice, that is, are driven by ideals and assumptions that remain tacit and “taken-for-granted” (p. 84). In Stier's model, these “ideological” modes of justification comprise three categories: idealism, instrumentalism, and educationalism.

“Idealism,” is characterized by the belief that internationalization in higher education “can contribute to a more democratic, fair and equal world” (Stier, 2004, p. 88). This perspective is manifested in efforts to revise curriculum to include multiple, global perspectives, and redress global scale social and economic injustices. It encourages students, faculty, and university communities to proactively engage with and learn from non-domestic students and peers. Faculty are called upon to develop “intercultural competence,” and teach in ways that are responsive to diversity (e.g. Crose, 2011; Joseph, 2012; Sanderson, 2011; Teekens, 2003). Turner and Robson (2008) describe this approach as “transformative” in that it requires a fundamental shift in the understanding of what higher education is intended to achieve. Others term their approach “ethical internationalization” (Rumbley, Altbach, & Reisberg, 2012; Khoo, Taylor, & Andreotti, 2016) or focus on concepts with an explicit normative locus such as “global citizenship” (Killick, 2012; Shultz, 2007).

Stier's second ideological grouping is the direct target of critiques levelled by idealists (e.g. Joseph, 2012; Teekens, 2003). The “instrumentalist”

approach promotes internationalization primarily to advance economic interests. By internationalizing its universities, a nation can attract talented students, faculty, and researchers from other countries. National policies allocate a strong role for universities in the development of “knowledge economies” that depend heavily on research and development (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Internationalization is also cultivated in the interests of labour force mobility, and employers’ increasing expectations that workers will have globalized sensibilities and skills. Instrumentalism also encompasses the marketization of higher education, as institutions compete for student tuition fees and research funding as sources of both revenue and prestige (Knight, 2013).

The third ideological perspective described by Stier, “educationalism,” is the one most closely aligned with the classical liberal ideal of education as an end unto itself. On the one hand, this perspective may draw upon globalized perspectives and varying worldviews from the standpoint of educational enrichment. In this sense, it overlaps with the idealist’s perspective. On the other hand, the educative tradition is distinctly Western, such that it can contribute to resistance to significant change, and regard internationalized curricula and pedagogy as “add ons” rather than transformational (Green & Shoenberg, 2006). Stier (2004) describes this as higher education’s “own version of ethnocentrism -- *academicentrism*”, in which “foreign” methods, teaching practices, assessments, and administrative practices may be regarded, either tacitly or overtly, as inferior (p. 93). Joseph (2012) characterizes this qualified mindset as an “integrative” approach that does not significantly disrupt Western/Other binaries (p. 242).

We accept the utility of Stier’s model in tracing normative currents in the discourses of internationalization through the construction of ideal types. We contend, however, that such typologies reduce nuanced positions to crude categories of thought or being. Stier’s types can indeed be recognized in the personal positions staked out by individuals in a given university. As our analysis will show, however, the position-taking of a given individual at times locates him or her in two or even all three of Stier’s types. A professor with an idealistic orientation with respect to the non-exploitation of parents of international students, for example, may also subscribe to elements of instrumentalism when she recognizes that international student enrolments factor into the survival of her department or discipline. In practice, that is, ideologies may flow into or be held in tension with one another. Analyses that reduce individuals to mere bearers of ideology conceal how actors actively consider beliefs and values, and how they attempt to reconcile tensions in the positions they adopt.

5 Conceptual Framework: Emotions, Concerns, and Commitments

Stier suggests that ideological positions, typically tacit, underpin motives and actions at both institutional and individual levels. It might be construed that faculty hold determined ideological positions and act upon these ideological commitments more or less mechanistically. Our findings contradict this position. We found little evidence that faculty passively adopt positions based on clear ideological grounds. Instead, we were struck by how faculty engaged in ongoing practical strategizing and moral deliberation in their efforts to adjust their teaching practices to the novel demands of the internationalized classroom.

Our analysis thus aims to take seriously the full content of faculty accounts, including the displays of emotion they contain. Too often, internationalization is put forward by its champions as an unimpeachable quest, reducing faculty concerns to complaints to be assuaged or ignored: faculty dissatisfaction is seen as a barrier to be overcome. We propose instead that close scrutiny of faculty perspectives facilitates needed inquiry into the fundamental aims of internationalization, including their moral dimensions.

A brief foray into the work of Sayer (2004, 2005, 2011) and Archer (2000, 2003) will provide a clearer understanding of relationships, central to our analysis, between the practical work of “professing” in the internationalized classroom, professional identity, moral deliberation, and the emotions and appraisals, tacit or stated, that we have chosen to focus on in our interview data. Sayer and Archer are among theorists who argue that the reflexive deliberation of ordinary people is worthy of more sociological attention than it receives. We will make the case that the moral complexities of internationalization are realized most fully in the reflexivity of those who confront it daily in the contexts of their teaching practices. In summary, the ways in which faculty make sense of internationalization, including the emotions they express when they discuss it, tell us much about the moral weight that accompanies individuals’ commitments for or against the process, and are thus key to assessing the prospects of a morally defensible vision for internationalization.

Archer (2003) frames reflexivity as an “internal conversation,” an ongoing, private dialogue with the self. This capacity for internal dialogue allows us, indeed requires us as a condition of our humanity, to appraise our environment, and to formulate and act upon “concerns,” otherwise put, to choose courses of action or “projects” based on things that matter to us. The array of concerns held by a given individual are numerous and at times contradictory. One’s worries may be focussed on personal needs, such as physical health, financial well-being, or the status of one’s relationships with others. Personal concerns may dovetail or come into conflict with concerns for other people

and things. The internal conversation is, therefore, a process of evaluating and prioritizing one's concerns, whatever these may be.

Emotion work is a component of all internal conversations. Following Sayer (2004) and Archer (2000), we challenge the dominance of rationalist analyses that dismiss emotions as irrelevant by virtue either of being unobservable or "unreasonable." Emotions, in other words, do not indicate the absence of rationality; rather, they are a fundamental feature of purposeful deliberation. Emotion indicates the ordering of "ultimate concerns" and ought to be read as a crucial element of personal commitments arrived upon through the reflexive deliberation of individuals (Archer, 2000).

In Archer's case, emotions lead us to prioritize concerns, which in turn form concrete "projects" as bases for action. For Sayer (2004), emotions are linked to morality in that they are "evaluative judgements of independent or objective situations which have or are imagined to have a serious bearing on our well-being and that of others" (p. 2). Sayer's contribution thus links reflexivity and the enactment of personal concerns to broader questions of what is just and/or justifiable (Sayer, 2005, 2011). Thus, in the context of our discussion, as professors deliberate and determine courses of action, they act on concerns within their immediate personal spheres (Archer, 2003), but also do so within the broader contexts of more or less consciously held conceptualizations of morally defensible outcomes for internationalization.

It is in this manner that we arrive at the concept of *internationalization as a moral project*. In both its normative aims and empirical outcomes, internationalization is an emergent phenomenon. It is the product not of strategic plans and policy documents, but of the concern-driven projects the individual people who formulate, act upon, or resist such directives. As we demonstrate, professors' projects, in the form of their instructional decisions in response to the internationalization of their classrooms, are *moral* projects in that they embody professors' beliefs about the *fairness* of internationalization. Fairness is appraised across several dimensions, including faculty workloads, responsibility for students' wellbeing, grading criteria, tuition costs for international students, and recognition of academic merit. At higher levels of abstraction, professors formulate perspectives on the distribution of the costs and benefits of internationalization, in both economic and cultural terms.

6 Methodology: Analyzing Faculty Accounts of the "Internationalized Classroom"

The analysis herein springs from a study conducted in a comprehensive faculty of arts and social sciences in a research-intensive Canadian university.

This institution actively recruits international students. It seeks ways to support a linguistically and culturally diverse student body, the growth of which has been compounded by international students that now comprise 24% of undergraduate enrolment (Times Higher Education, 2017).

We conducted 18 semi-structured interviews with teaching faculty with a range of teaching experience and from diverse subject areas. This was a convenience sample; email invitations to participate were sent out to approximately 400 faculty members, and we interviewed those who volunteered. Interviews ranged from 30 to 90 minutes. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. To preserve anonymity, we used pseudonyms throughout and avoided attaching department/subject area, age and/or years of experience to our accounts.

Description of study participants. Eleven participants were tenured or tenure track faculty; the rest of the participants were adjunct instructors. Two were graduate students, both with considerable teaching experience. Nine of the faculty's seventeen departments were represented. Two-thirds of respondents identified as female, and none were visible minorities. However, most interviewees mentioned some form of second language teaching or learning in their background. Half had substantial international experience, having studied, taught or learned other languages for significant portions of their academic careers. We did not specifically recruit for or inquire about intersectional factors, leaving it up to instructors to describe the aspects of their backgrounds that they believed were at play in their teaching experiences.

On balance, these individuals were engaged instructors, actively concerned with student success. It is difficult to gauge whether this high level of concern is representative of instructors in the Faculty as a whole. It is likely that those with a strong interest in teaching and the impact of internationalization were more motivated to volunteer for the study.

Data analysis. The study was designed to gather descriptive data on how instructors were adjusting their teaching in response to the influx of international students in the faculty. First-order coding was thus deductive, using categories derived from interview questions. For example, we queried instructors' observations about international students' help-seeking behaviour, whether they adjusted their expectations for international students, and how they adjusted their teaching strategies. Responses were readily classified into categories that described teaching practices.

However, as the interviews were semi-structured, we also encouraged interviewees to share additional ideas or observations as they saw fit, permitting simultaneous analysis of emergent themes. Repeated close listening to audio recordings and reading of transcripts (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Yochim, 2019) drew our attention to not only *what* interviewees said, but also *how* they

expressed their responses. Put succinctly, they peppered their accounts of their teaching work with a range of powerful emotions. These led us to make the passages connected to these emotions the focus of analysis, providing as they did insight into the role of reflective, emotion laden elaboration of personal commitments in ordering faculty concerns in relation to the international imperative (Archer, 2000).

Emotions, in other words, acted as our “sensitizing concept[s]” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Our process was similar to what Saldana (2013) describes as “emotion coding” (p. 86), in which the analyst “label[s] the emotions recalled and/or experienced by the participant, or inferred by the researcher about the participant” (p. 86). We agree with Saldana that emotions provide “deep insight into the participants’ perspectives, worldviews, and life conditions” (p. 86), but further suggest that emotions have significance as signposts pointing to those “constellations of concerns” central to the personal and professional projects of our informants (Archer, 2003).

While coding we looked for instances of both stated and inferred emotion. In our analysis, we focus on representative passages that demonstrate the connection of emotionally loaded accounts of struggles in the classroom to the broader personal commitments of faculty. In each case, we proceeded as follows. First, we asked, what is the emotion implied or on display? Second, we asked, through what deliberative process do respondents make sense of their emotional response? Third, we arrived at our destination by asking, what concern, valued by teaching faculty, is being validated or violated under conditions induced by internationalization? These valued concerns, recognized in the emotional dimensions of faculty accounts/deliberations, are critical tools in appraising both the moral aims and failings of internationalization.

7 Emotion Analysis: Revealing the Concerns of Teaching Faculty

The following analysis flows from our focus on a select set of emotions identified in our data. Recall that our aim here is not to present an exhaustive analysis of our data set. Rather, it is to demonstrate the utility of our method in identifying and clarifying the nature of faculty concerns and how these come into conflict with institutional goals and directives.

7.1 *Frustration: Practical Barriers to Effective Teaching*

Frustration was an emotion expressed primarily in relation to thwarted efforts to teach effectively, which some faculty attributed to students’ English language abilities. Monty, for example, related how he feels unable to communicate the

content of his fourth-year seminar with students he perceives, based on his experience teaching EFL, can speak and understand only rudimentary English. Erica and Kate feel frustrated when they recognize students trying to communicate ideas in written assignments, but cannot assess the quality of these ideas because of students' weak written English. Frustration is compounded when time pressures mount as professors reorganize curriculum, increase surveillance of academic misconduct, and, as a result, spend more time on administration.

While students' language abilities and the chain of consequences flowing from them prevented faculty members from feeling they could teach effectively, they did not solely nor even primarily blame students. Instead, frustration was directed at administrative structures and institutional practices that allow unprepared EFL students into their classrooms in the first place. For example, several faculty commented on the adequacy and integrity of IELTS scores used to admit students, and the lack of institutional capacity to provide writing support to struggling students.

7.2 *Anger and Indignation: Breaches of Justice*

We located feelings of frustration in professors' practical concern with thwarted efforts to teach well. Frustration tipped over into anger and indignation when faculty described the consequences of internationalization not as mere inconveniences, but as serious breaches of justice. Professors perceived injustices in numerous areas, with negative consequences both for their work and for students. In all cases, expressions of indignation point to violations of values held by the faculty member; they indicate a belief that some moral transgression has occurred (Haugh, 2016).

For Sherman (cited in Sayer, 2011) "a sense of indignation makes us sensitive to those who suffer unwarranted insult or injury" (p. 37). Indignation accompanied professors' beliefs that the underfunding of higher education was leading to, in Adam's words, the irresponsible admission of "thousands foreign students whose English is iffy....Those students pay much more and then they're dumped on us." Adam's comment reveals two sources of "insult or injury" in an unfair teaching load "dumped on" faculty, and in the higher costs paid by international students who are then less likely to succeed than their domestic counterparts paying standard fees. Hannah described this as a "shameful moral record" of "taking...parents' money when [students] can't speak English and then giving them D's so they pass and they aren't learning anything."

Injustices stemming from recruitment practices are followed by what professors deem to be further moral failings. As discussed above under the rubric of frustration, many teaching faculty feel they are being asked to provide

language learning supports well beyond their scopes of practice, and at the expense of content learning in their classes. For these professors, a moral wrong on the part of the institution in bringing unprepared international students to campus could only be righted by the institution meeting its accompanying obligation to provide the level and array of supports that these students needed to succeed. Other unjust outcomes identified by faculty include compromising the learning experiences of non-EFL students, and passing students up to higher level courses in which academic frustration could only elevate for both instructor and student. Olivia described passing a weak student as a “dis-service” to the student resulting in “frustration” and “a greater sense of failure.” For Olivia, this was morally intolerable: “I would be betraying their trust if I’m passing them on.”

Finally, internationalization raises the indignation of many faculty as their critical theoretical commitments are violated. For example, while internationalization is often justified in terms of its role in “expand[ing] capacity in emerging nations” (Marginson, 2011, p. 28), critical analyses point out that these activities typically flow to the already advantaged. Many teaching faculty are also concerned about the dominance of the English language and of “Western” epistemological frameworks. Under dominant forms of internationalization, however, they find themselves reinforcing these both at home through their classroom practice and abroad as their students return home, privileged bearers of a sanctified knowledge from the “advanced” Western world. Self-described critical faculty see themselves co-opted, through internationalization, into a system that reproduces and extends global social and economic inequality.

7.3 *Enthusiasm and Curiosity: the Promise of ‘Diversity’ (186 words)*

Teaching faculty expressed anger and indignation, but they also discussed deriving pleasure and satisfaction with their work in the internationalized classroom. Most were able to relate some version of an ideal internationalized classroom, one in which the diversity of perspectives offered by international students contributes to high quality, engaged learning. Even Adam, among the most frustrated of our faculty participants, expressed enthusiasm for the presence, under the right circumstances, of international students, describing it as “a wonderful idea [that] can have great benefits for both domestic and international students.” Monty, too, “enjoy[s]... enjoys a class with diversity in it. It’s fantastic getting different cultural perspectives from different parts of the world, different ways of seeing things.”

Such responses, identified in our analysis as “enthusiastic,” “engaged,” or “excited,” belong to a constellation of emotions indicative of the strength of the

role of disciplinary specializations in professors' projects. Where frustration characterized the thwarting of the practical project of teaching well, enthusiasm indicated that professors also see the possibility for internationalization to enrich their own scholarship and that of their students.

7.4 *Empathy and Compassion: Concern for Students*

Faculty varied in the extent to which they expressed emotions related to the specific plights of international students. For some, perceptions of injustice were accompanied less by anger and indignation and more by distress resulting from watching students struggle or suffer. Kat was among instructors who described feeling "really bad for the student because they've been put into an unfortunate position when they haven't been required to have adequate language skills." Kat and others feel helpless and distressed when students fail. In Hannah's case, both indignation and compassion characterized the emotional tone of her interview:

How come this person in fourth year...she sits there and she looks really vague with a big smile on her face. Finally I say, 'I don't think you're understanding what I'm saying. 'No.' 'I don't think you're understanding the readings.' 'No.' Poor dear. I don't know what to do then. But I just think it's a disgrace. And it's just embarrassing, morally speaking. And...it's just not fair." (Hannah, Interview)

Teaching faculty who expressed greater compassion for struggling students place an especially high value on students' overall well-being, which made them distinct from professors like Adam, for whom the "student" is an abstract entity and teaching a contractual duty. Indignation, as we have characterized it above, pertains primarily to the moral obligations of the institution to deliver on the promise of an academic degree of a certain standard, with less accompanying concern for students' subjective experiences. Empathy and compassion, in contrast, are contingent upon recognizing caring about the feelings of struggling students, and thus add relational dimensions to one's conceptualization of morally just internationalization.

7.5 *Defending Professional Identity*

Despite the emphasis placed on explicit faculty development in the literature on effective internationalization (e.g. Green & Shoenberg, 2006; Leask & Carroll, 2011), most interviewees did not see it as something they urgently needed to undertake. Indeed, some resisted the idea that their teaching practices ought to change. In cases of open opposition, respondents resented the inference that inadequate

teaching skills were to blame for international student achievement. As earlier noted, faculty tend to identify weak language skills of international students and institutionalized injustices as the real sources of trouble.

A less obvious explanation for resistance or defensiveness is the challenge that cultural and linguistic diversity in the classroom poses to the security and self-confidence of faculty in their teaching roles. In particular, the reticence of Chinese students is disturbing to faculty because they are deprived of feedback on their teaching that they were accustomed to receiving from culturally similar students. For Kat, who identified herself as friendly and “informal,” the polite deference of her Chinese students challenges the efficacy of the cheerful teaching demeanour that is important to her sense of authenticity in the classroom. Similarly, Carmen reported feeling separated from her identity as a warm, friendly instructor by the need to become sterner and more authoritarian in order to “weed out” students who are unlikely to succeed in her class and suffer further harm in the form of failing grades. For faculty for whom student engagement is important, silent Chinese international students are especially troubling, leaving feelings of confusion and a degree of sadness in their wake as these instructors find it impossible to form the kinds of relationships with students that motivate their enthusiasm for teaching.

Other faculty placed a stronger emphasis on the role of research and scholarship than on teaching in constructing their professional identities. Most respondents at one point identified the importance of the integrity of their disciplines, but this was especially so among those for whom undergraduate teaching was not a strong focus. For these faculty, new demands on time and focus emerging from the presence of international students are a threat to their perceived primary roles as scholars. This was most evident in their rejection of the role of “ESL teacher.” Vera was representative in stating flatly that “no one wants to teach remedial English.”

Citing Ylijoki (2000), Lindblom-Ylanne, Trigwell, Nevgi & Ashwin (2006) point out that “the core of each discipline can be conceptualised as a moral order which defines the basic beliefs, values and norms of the local culture” (p. 287). Thus, when professors who see themselves as guardians of their disciplines are faced with students they perceive as unable to live up to established academic standards, they believe that something core to their scholarly vocations is violated.

8 Discussion: Constellations of Concerns

In our analysis of faculty interviews, we recognized multiple emotions in each participant, which, following Archer (2000) and Sayer (2005), we take to be

commentaries on their concerns. Constellations of concerns (Archer, 2000), sometimes overlapping or contradictory, were irreducible to the ideological positions proposed by Stier. Hannah, for example, expressed both compassion for struggling international students and indignation that university recruitment policies placed students in positions where they were very likely to fail. At the same time, it was clear that she was deeply invested in her role as a guardian of her discipline in that she believed it was her duty to uphold academic standards.

These conflicting goals—to uphold standards and support floundering students—were not at all resolved by Hannah's primary adherence to what Stier would label a liberal "educative" ideology that places primary value on a meritocratic conception of justice. Nor could one even conclude, as a reductive reading of Stier's framework would suggest, that Hannah adhered solely to an "educative" perspective. Her enthusiasm for diversity in her classroom and empathetic responses to international students suggests elements of Stier's idealism, in that she placed high value on diversity and an inclusive classroom environment. Hannah also recognized the instrumental case for the recruitment of undergraduate students from mainland China (PRC). While critical of how the university pursues underprepared international students, she was well aware of the dire financial position of the faculty and its limited options for revenue generation.

Hannah's case was not unusual: we found no reason to classify faculty concerns as "ideological" in the sense proposed by frameworks like Stier's. Three important points may be drawn from this observation. First, internationalization may be regarded not as a matter of contestation among clearly defined ideological positions, but, rather, as a phenomenon emerging from the focussed deliberations of myriad individual actors. The breadth and complexity of faculty emotions pertaining to their "internationalized classrooms," illustrates the unfinished, "projective" nature of internationalization (cf. Knight, 2004).

Second, it is important to closely examine faculty deliberation as *moral* work, even when it is not expressly framed as such by the individuals engaging in it. When faculty concerns are considered in extant literature, it is common for them to be understood, even among faculty themselves, as struggles over positional goods, power, or resources. It is much less often the case that morality is invoked by asking why faculty members find these matters worth struggling over (Sayer, 2005). The responses of faculty "are about something," that is, "they are embodied evaluative judgements of matters influencing people's well-being and that of others" (Sayer, 2005, p. 3). Expressions of emotion indicate faculty's concerns, which in turn tell us something of the visions of the "good life" they wish to advance, for themselves and others, through their professional commitments and practices.

Teaching faculty's perspectives are thus key to recognizing the moral complexity of internationalization. Their adaptations to their "internationalized classrooms," serve as catalysts for fresh moral deliberation as they reconsider scholarly commitments, teaching identities, and the duties owed by universities to their faculty, students, and society in a globalized and inequitable world.

Finally, we wish to highlight that the quotidian nature of many of these deliberations, focused as they are on practical matters like grading student work, adjusting curriculum, or persuading students to attend office hours, make them all too easy to disregard in discussions that tend instead to focus on meso- and macro-level policy analyses at institutional, state, and international levels (Turner & Robson, 2008). The practical problems with which faculty contend, as illustrated, have moral underpinnings. These individual quandaries of practice, often dismissed as "complaints" or "faculty resistance," are in fact indicative of fundamental, unresolved moral tensions in the project of internationalization.

9 Conclusion: Internationalization as a Moral Project

The study on which this article is based was designed to provide an account of faculty attitudes, beliefs and teaching adaptations as they experience rapid internationalization of their classrooms. By moving beyond mere description of these practices to a careful consideration of the emotional content of our data, we demonstrate how teaching faculty engage in an inductive process of reconciling moral tensions inherent in the project of internationalization. Rather than turning to ideological explanations in the manner of Stier (2004), we have proposed that it is more insightful to reframe internationalization as an emergent project of moral discernment that occurs within individuals, and simultaneously at meso-and macro-levels as these individuals negotiate their concerns toward collective goals and strategies.

There are at least three reasons why it is useful to reframe internationalization as a moral project. First, internationalization-as-ideology has surprisingly little to say about morality, given that embedded in ideologies are assumptions of what constitutes "the good life." As we have shown, moral considerations are highly relevant; they are central to the daily work of faculty and students in internationalized classrooms, and have considerable implications for all concerned.

Second, an emphasis on internationalization-as-ideology commits the error of substituting normative claims about how internationalization ought to be enacted for empirical accounts of how it is being enacted. Such empirical

accounts are needed if we are to understand the processes through which normative stances on internationalization are realized and committed to by many actors, that is, if we are to understand internationalization as a collective, unfinished project of reconfiguring the moral landscape of higher education under historically unprecedented conditions.

Third, representing internationalization as an ideological contest among opposing camps offers little in the way of insight into what might inform collaborative process toward discerning a workably “just” model of internationalization. Ideological frameworks like those proposed by Stier show that collaboration is difficult given “divergent or contradictory” perspectives, but offer little insight into how, as such perspectives are shared, they break down into individual processes, informed by both reason and emotion, of justifying moral claims. Further, as we have illustrated, such moral claims are characterized by tensions and contradictions that are downplayed when positions are reduced to ideal types.

The analysis in this article demonstrates the need for strong empirical accounts of moral deliberation. This is especially significant because internationalization schemes often point to the role of institutions as that of merely clarifying the goals of internationalization, as if these goals are self-evidently “good.” “Goodness,” it is assumed, will facilitate faculty “buy in.” When this does not happen, collaboration can quickly break down into discouragement, disengagement, and ineffectual institutional strategies with little hope of advancing the fundamental changes needed for a university to truly “internationalize.” If current efforts are to lead to a defensible version of the future internationalized university, then the perspectives of those who enact its core missions in the classroom must be central to the formulation of policy and practice (deWit, 2014; Turner & Robson, 2008). Lacking an understanding of internationalization as a fundamentally contested and contestable moral project, dialogues and directives for implementation are likely to continue to keep faculty and administration at odds.

References

- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3), 290–305. doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542.
- Archer, M. (2000). *Being human: The problem of agency*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, M. (2003). *Structure, agency, and the internal conversation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Barron, P., Gourlay, L. J., & Gannon-Leary, P. (2010). International students in the higher education classroom: initial findings from staff at two post-92 universities in the UK. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 34(4), 475–489. doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2010.512076.
- Beelen, J. (2016). Global at home. In Jones E., Coelen R., Beelen J., & deWit H. (Eds.), *Global and local internationalization* (pp. 55–65). Rotterdam, Boston & Taipei: Sense.
- Childress, L. K. (2010). *The twenty-first century university: Developing faculty engagement in internationalization*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Choudaha, R. (2017). Three waves of international student mobility (1999–2020). *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(5), 825–832. http://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1293872.
- Croese, B. (2011). Internationalization of the higher education classroom: Strategies to facilitate intercultural learning and academic success. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(3), 388–395.
- Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education*, 58(4), 491–504. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9207-z.
- deWit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- deWit, H. (2014). Misconceptions about (the end of) internationalisation. In Jones E., Coelen R., Beelen J., & deWit H. (Eds.), *Global and local internationalization* (pp. 1–5). Rotterdam, Boston & Taipei: Sense Publishers. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-301-8_3.
- Fischer, E. (2014). *The good life: Aspiration, dignity, and the anthropology of wellbeing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gibney, E. (2013, January). A different world. *Times Higher Education*. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/a-different-world/2001128.article.
- Green, M. F., & Shoenberg, R. (2006). *Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines*. Washington. Retrieved from.
- Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2015). *Introducing critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum*. In W. Green & C. Whitsed (Eds.), *Critical Perspectives on Internationalising the Curriculum in Disciplines* (pp. 3–22). Sense Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-085-7_1
- Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (3rd Edit.) Routledge.
- Hanson, C., & McNeil, B. (2012). Faculty understanding and implementation of internationalization and global citizenship. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching*, 5, 33–38. Retrieved from http://hrgpapers.uwindsor.ca/ojs/leddy/index.php/CELT/article/view/3410.

- Haugh, M. (2016). Complaints and troubles talk about the English language skills of international students in Australian universities. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(4), 727–740. DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2015.1137878.
- Jones, E., Coelen, R., Beelen, J., & deWit, H. (Eds.). (2016). *Global and local internationalization*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Joseph, C. (2012). Internationalizing the curriculum: Pedagogy for social justice. *Current Sociology*, 60(2), 239–257. Retrieved from <http://10.0.4.153/0011392111429225>.
- Khoo, S., Taylor, L. K., & Andreotti, V. (2016). Ethical internationalization, neo-liberal restructuring and “beating the bounds” of higher education. In Schulz, L., & Viczko M. (Eds.), *Assembling and governing the higher education institution: Democracy, social justice and leadership in global higher education* (pp. 85–110). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Killick, D. (2012). Seeing-ourselves-in-the-world: Developing global citizenship through international mobility and campus community. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 16(4), 372–209.
- Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalisation – for better or worse? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 17(3), 1–7. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2012.753957>.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832>
- Leask, B., & Carroll, J. (2011) Moving beyond ‘wishing and hoping’: Internationalisation and student experiences of inclusion and engagement. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(5), 647–659. DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2011.598454.
- Lindblom-Ylanne, S., Trigwell, K., Nevgi, A., & Ashwin, P. (2006). How approaches to teaching are affected by discipline and teaching context. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(3), 285–298. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600680539>.
- Marginson, S. (2011). It’s a long way down: The underlying tensions in the education export industry. *Australian Universities’ Review*, 53(2), 21–33.
- Marginson, S. (2016). High participation systems of higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87(2), 243.
- Nilsson, B. (2003). Internationalisation at home from a Swedish perspective: The case of Malmö. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 27–40. doi: 10.1177/1028315302250178.
- OECD. (2016). *Education at a glance: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.187/eag-2016-en>.
- OECD. (2017). *Education at a glance: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2017-26-en>.

- Rumbley, L. E., Altbach, P. G., & Reisberg, L. (2012). Internationalization within the higher education context. In Deardorff, D. K., deWit, H., Heyl, J. D., & Adams, T., *The Sage handbook of international higher education* (pp. 3–26). Sage Publications.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Washington: Sage Publications.
- Sanderson, G. (2011) Internationalisation and teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(5), 661–676. doi:10.1080/07294360.2011.598455.
- Sawir, E. (2011) Academic staff response to international students and internationalising the curriculum: the impact of disciplinary differences. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 16(1), 45–57. DOI: 10.1080/1360144X.2011.546224.
- Sayer, A. (2004). *Restoring the moral dimension: Acknowledging lay normativity*. Published by the Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YL, UK at <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/sayer-restoring-moral-dimension.pdf>.
- Sayer, A. (2005). *The moral significance of class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sayer, A. (2011). *Why things matter to people: Social science, values and ethical life*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schulz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 53(3), 248–258.
- Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 2(1), 1–28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1476772042000177069>.
- Stier, J., & Börjesson, M. (2010) The internationalised university as discourse: Institutional self-presentations, rhetoric and benchmarking in a global market. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 20(4), 335–353, DOI:10.1080/09620214.2010.530863.
- Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 359–372. DOI:10.1177/1028315307303923.
- Teekens, H. (2003). The requirement to develop specific skills for teaching in an intercultural setting. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 108–19.
- Times Higher Education. (2017). *Institution**. London: Times Higher Education.
- Turner, Y., & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalizing the university*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Vinther, J., & Slethaug, G. (2015). The impact of international students on the university work environment: a comparative study of a Canadian and a Danish university. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 15(1), 92–108. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2014.985308>.
- Vogel, G. M. (2013). Language and cultural challenges facing business faculty in the ever-expanding global classroom. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 11, 1–32.

- Ylijoki, O. H. (2000). Disciplinary cultures and the moral order of studying: A case study of four Finnish university departments. *Higher Education*, 39(3), 339–362.
- Yochim, L. G. (2019). *Navigating the aspirational city: Urban education culture and the revolutionary path to socialism with Chinese characteristics*. Rotterdam: Brill Sense.
- Yochim, L. G., & Servage, L. (2017) “I’m not an ESL teacher and I’m not trained to do it”: Faculty perspectives on “the Chinese Learner” in the “Internationalized Classrooms” of a Canadian university. *International Journal of Chinese Education*, 6(2), 259–287.