Making the Invisible Visible: Current Practices and Perceptions of Internationalization of the Curriculum

Lucie Weisova & Ann Johansson

Globalization and technological development are steadily reshaping the landscape of higher education (HE) and making new demands on higher education institutions (HEIs) to prepare their graduates for the challenge of living and working in a globally connected world. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), social challenges including globalization, migration, and increased social and cultural diversity, will affect the future of education. Global awareness and social and cross-cultural skills were highlighted as 21st-century skills that students need to succeed in their future careers (OECD, 2018). Universities can address these challenges and foster active, responsible, and engaged global citizens by incorporating deliberate interventions within their formal curriculum. According to Leask (2015), an internationalized curriculum has the power to acknowledge the importance of intercultural and international skills and knowledge, as well as cultural awareness and the ability to think in a local, national, and global context. Data from the Global Survey Report of the International Association of Universities (IAU) indicated that 88% of HEIs globally considered Internationalization of the Curriculum (IoC) as important (Marinoni, 2019). Yet, most HEIs find it challenging to pursue an inclusive and systematic approach toward the IoC (Killick & Foster, 2021).

This article explores current Internationalization of the Curriculum practices and perceptions among teaching staff at a middle-sized Swedish University. Further, this article elaborates on enablers and blockers that local teaching staff face in their efforts to internationalize the curriculum. This work will serve as a foundation for stimulating the reflection and discussion amongst teams of teaching staff about the IoC in their disciplines and how to navigate future opportunities to further internationalize curricula.

Background

Leask defined the term curriculum as "the process which we, as educators, select and order content, decide on and describe intended learning outcomes, organize learning activities, and assess learner achievement" (2015, p. 8). She recognized formal (curriculum documented in course syllabi); informal (extra-curricular activities), and hidden curriculum (unspoken social and cultural messages communicated to students). The formal curriculum is influenced by institutional (university priorities); local (social, cultural, political, and economic conditions);

national (economic strength, international status of the predominant language, academic reputation and population size), and global (the dominance of Western educational models) context.

The most widely used definition of IoC describes it as a process of "the incorporation of international, intercultural, and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods, and support services of a program of study" (Leask 2009, p. 209). The IoC concept is related to the concept of 'Internationalization at Home' (IaH). "Internationalization at Home is the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students, within domestic learning environments" (Beelen & Jones, 2015, p. 69). These concepts are often used interchangeably both in the academic literature and in the European educational policy documents (European Commission, 2013). Both IoC and IaH stress the importance of inclusiveness as their aim is to reach all students. The intentionality as well as the fact that learning is also taking place outside the campus walls are other important factors.

During the last decade, IoC/IaH have received increased attention in European, national, and institutional policy documents. The European Commission included the IoC in European educational policies for the first time in 2013. The document 'European Higher Education in the World' underlined the importance of IoC as one of the three key priorities for European HEIs and member states. It says:

"Higher education policies must increasingly focus on the integration of a global dimension in the design and content of all curricula and teaching/learning processes (sometimes called "internationalization at home"), to ensure that the large majority of learners, the 80-90% who are not internationally mobile for either degree or credit mobility, are nonetheless able to acquire the international skills required in a globalized world." (European Commission, 2013, p. 6).

On the global level, the Nelson Mandela Bay Global Dialogue Declaration on the Future of Internationalization of Higher Education declared "increasing focus on the internationalization of the curriculum and of related learning outcomes" as one of the three integrated areas of development (IEASA, 2014, p. 2).

IoC received more attention as some of the limitations of student mobility (students moving to another institution outside their country to study for a limited time) have been highlighted. A predominant limitation is its exclusivity, as only 2.5% of the student population worldwide participate in student mobility (UIS, 2018); in addition, its uncertain effectiveness in developing students' intercultural competencies (Taskoh, 2014) and its negative impact on the

global climate crisis have been discussed in the literature (de Wit & Altbach, 2020). It is also worth noting that the COVID-19 crisis has clearly demonstrated how student mobility is vulnerable to changes caused by global pandemics.

Despite some HEIs' attempts to embark on IoC, research indicates that the ways HEIs understand the IoC are still coated by myths and misconceptions which impede the implementation of IoC (Beelen & de Louw, 2020). For example, many HEIs erroneously believe that the mere presence of international students will automatically lead to the internationalization of the curriculum for all students. In their study, Spencer-Oatey & Dauber (2015) highlighted the critical need for the intentional integration of all students, as having a diverse study body does not automatically mean that education or campus is internationalized. The requirement of teaching in English in order to fulfill IoC efforts is another recorded misconception as IoC is not language-dependent and can be delivered in the local language (Jones & Reiffenrath, 2018). That curriculum taught 'offshore' is internationalized, or that more study abroad opportunities (outbound mobility) are equivalent to a more internationalized curriculum, are additional misconceptions (Leask, 2015). The perception that cross-cultural capability must be pervasive in all courses in order to achieve IoC is one more misconception. As Caruana (2011) indicated, a significant impact can be made by making small changes to the current curriculum. Finally, the belief that a curriculum is already internationalized because of the inclusion of international literature or international guest lectures is also mistaken (Zou et al., 2019).

The first conceptual studies on IoC, its impact, and its meaning were conducted in the late 1990s (Mestenhauser, 1998). Attention has been given to several specific traits of IoC: student graduate attributes (Jones & Killick, 2013), the embedding of intercultural competencies (Deardorff & Jones 2012), global citizenship (Lilley, Barker & Harris, 2015), and intended international learning outcomes (IILOs) with related assessments (Deardorff, 2015).

IoC is a promising approach to developing intercultural and international perspectives and global learning for all students at HEIs, however, Green and Mertova (2016) argued that there is a gap between the theoretical framework and practice, particularly at the faculty level. De Wit & Hunter (2015) argue that there is still much to be done in terms of institutional implementation and engagement of academic staff, as it is not always clear to them what IoC means in practical applications. Once these obstacles are overcome, IoC "can become a driving force for change" (p. 52).

Conceptual framework

The IoC framework and IoC process created by Leask (2015) serve as a conceptual framework for this study. At the core of Leask's framework is interdisciplinary knowledge. The

factors that affect disciplinary knowledge are the dominant and emerging paradigms present in the design and the scope of a curriculum. These paradigms determine whose knowledge is valued. Challenging the central paradigms in the existing curriculum is a necessary part of the IoC, which requires that academics move away from predominant Western models and search for new ways of thinking and teaching. Preparing students for professional practice and citizenship is an essential part of the curriculum and it should nurture students' emergence as "ethical and responsible citizens and human beings" (Leask, 2015, p. 30). The activities in the informal curriculum should also enhance the rigor of the formal curriculum. A core tenet of every curriculum is the assessment of student learning. Students following an IoC should be assessed on how well they achieve international and intercultural learning outcomes. The IoC should be systematically developed to enhance the achievement of desired learning results. This requires cooperation among colleagues across a study program and support from the institutions' student services staff.

The process of IoC (Leask, 2015) is similar to a traditional curriculum review, wherein program and course goals, intended learning outcomes, teaching & learning activities and assessment tasks are designed. Still, the IoC process is more critically reflective and encourages teaching staff to think of new possibilities in their teaching planning process. The first stage, the "review and reflect" stage, embraces initial discussions about IoC. According to Leask (2015), this stage should provide us with the following answers: "To what extent is our curriculum internationalized? What is already happening?" (p. 44-45). At this stage IoC definitions, purposes, and goals should be explained to teaching staff. Then, the existing curriculum is reviewed to lay the foundation for the next phases of the IoC process. In the second stage, "imagine," teaching staff is encouraged to challenge traditional paradigms and think about alternative knowledge traditions. In the third stage, "revise and plan," decisions are taken about what short-term and long-term changes and actions will be made in the curriculum. "Act," stage four, focuses on the implementation of the IoC plans selected and the impact evaluation methodology. The effectiveness of the changes and actions is assessed during the fifth and final stage, "evaluate". As the curriculum development process is cyclical, the results are assessed and participants start again at the "review and reflect" stage (Leask, 2015).

Based on the literature, it is apparent that the IoC as a concept has a range of interpretations, and that the core meaning of IoC may be challenging to grasp (Caruana, 2011). As a result, it is not easy to understand what it means to practice IoC at a HEI. The lack of support for teaching staff to work with IoC compounds these issues (Zou et al., 2019). De Wit and Hunter appeal to HEIs to contextualize and institutionalize the approach to IoC to facilitate

4

its implementation (2015). This article addresses this call and maps to what extent the curriculum is internationalized within different programs at the School of Health and Welfare. Furthermore, the article identifies enablers and blockers that local teaching staff encountered in their efforts to internationalize the curriculum.

Study context

IoC received long-awaited attention in a proposal for a new national internationalization strategy for 2020-2030. It proposed, among other things, that all students who attend the institution should have "developed their international understanding or intercultural competence" by graduation (SOU 2018:3, p.130). Unfortunately, the Swedish government has not yet acted upon this proposal (Myklebust, 2021). Thus, the responsibility remains with individual HEIs, which do not always have the right competencies and infrastructure in place to implement IoC/IaH (SOU 2018:3).

In December 2020, the Swedish Government presented new research propositions for 2021-2024 (Prop. 2020/21:60). One of the outcomes was a modernization of the Higher Education Act on internationalization: "the collected international activities of each higher education institution must enhance the quality of its research and education, and make a national and global contribution to sustainable development" (Prop. 2020/21:60, p. 179). The change entailed a stronger mandate, which is expected to lead to a strategic review of HEIs' internationalization and result in new ways of working and forms of collaboration. This new shared goal should serve as a strategic guide for HEIs in their internationalization work (Prop. 2020/21:60).

This study was undertaken at the School of Health and Welfare (HHJ) at Jönköping University (JU) during May and June 2020. In total, JU has approximately 12,000 registered students (including 2,400 international students) and roughly 800 employees. HHJ has approximately 1,650 full-time students and 140 employees. HHJ offers programs at undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate levels (JU, 2020). "To develop IoC in program and course syllabi according to programs' needs and conditions" is one of the recently implemented long-term goals in HHJ's strategic plan 2021-2024. At the institutional level, internationalization is a part of an overall institutional strategy that emphasizes worldwide engagement and collaboration across borders, but neither IoC nor IaH are embedded in the strategy (JU, 2020).

The Swedish government decides the central (national) intended learning outcomes for each degree. The outcomes for Bachelor of Science degrees are stated in the Qualification Ordinance of the Swedish Higher Education Ordinance from 1993 (SFS 1993:100 with subsequent amendments) and for the Master of Science from 1992 and revised 2006 (SFS

1992:1434 revised 2006:173 1 Ch. 9 §). In addition to the national learning outcomes for each degree, every program of study can create its own 'local' program-specific learning outcomes.

Methods

Design

This study combined quantitative data with qualitative data (Sandelowski, 2000) to capture the participants' experiences of internationalizing the curriculum.

Sample

Eight undergraduate and six graduate programs participated in the study. Table 1 describes them in detail. The program managers and the board members in the HHJ's International Council were identified as appropriate participants for this study, 24 persons from 14 programs in total. All participants are active teachers in their study programs.

Table 1 *Participating programs*

Academic level	Programs
Undergraduate	Biomedical Laboratory Science - focusing Laboratory Medicine
programs (n=8)	Biomedical Laboratory Science - focusing Clinical Physiology
	Dental Hygiene
	Diagnostic Radiology Nursing
	Nursing
	Occupational Therapy
	Prosthetics & Orthotics
Graduate programs	Social Work Gerontology
(n=6)	Nordic master's degree program in Gerontology

Occupational Therapy

Quality Improvement and Leadership in Health and Welfare

The specialist nursing program with a focus on district nursing

The specialist nursing program with a focus on health and care

for children and youth

Data collection

For the purpose of this study, a modified web-based version of the Questionnaire on Internationalization of the Curriculum (QIC) was created to fit the needs of HHJ. It is a combination of three existing QIC versions created by Leask (2015): the original questionnaire with many qualitative open-ended questions (QIC1); the quantitative, five-point scale questionnaire with limited space for written comments (QIC2), and the shortened version of the original questionnaire (QIC1 Abridged). QIC was designed to stimulate the first stage discussion ("review and reflect") about IoC and what actions would best internationalize the curriculum within study disciplines. The modified version with many open-ended questions and space for comments and reflections are more qualitative in nature, but even here respondents are asked to assess different statements on a continuum of 1-4 where one represents a localized curriculum and four an internationalized curriculum.

Additionally, the Enablers and Blockers Questionnaire (Leask, 2015) was included in the modified version. Leask used the terms enablers and blocker to illustrate any factors that can support/inhibit staff in the IoC development. She recommended using this questionnaire later, during the "revision and planning" stage. However, it was in the interest of the studied program managers to know the current situation and challenges the teaching staff faces to be able to adapt effectively for the next steps of IoC work. Overall, the questionnaire contained 27 questions designed to challenge myths and misconceptions related to IoC and let teaching staff reflect upon their curriculum holistically from learning, teaching, and assessment perspective.

The questionnaires' purpose is not gathering data for statistical analysis or measuring the programs' performance. Instead, they should help HEIs gain insight into what is already happening in various study programs; explore the international dimensions of the curriculum's different elements; note the attitudes the teaching staff have toward internationalization of their programs; assess the importance of IoC, and ultimately answer the question "to what extent is the curriculum internationalized?" (Leask, 2015). As the questionnaire was intended to be filled in by the program managers and not all teaching staff at the School of Health and Welfare, the

questions focus only on the program level (and not the course/module level). Despite the omissions, the questionnaire still shed light on the individual elements of the curriculum such as content, teaching and learning arrangements, assessment and the context within which the program is taught.

The survey was created in the esMaker software, version 3.0 (© Entergate AB). Before filling out the survey, participants from each program took part in an introductory meeting where the concept of IoC and the purpose of the study were explained, and the QIC's rationale was clarified. After that, the online link and detailed instructions for the QIC were sent to the participants via email.

Data analysis

The responses from the survey were analyzed with the support of esMaker software and summarized by the first author. Afterwards, both authors worked together on developing themes and selecting quotes. To give a complete picture of how the participants experienced internationalizing the curriculum, quantitative data and qualitative data were combined. The different sections in the survey with similar contents were merged into themes. The results are reported in the following three sections: the preconditions for effective work on the IoC; teaching, learning, and assessment arrangements; and enablers and blockers. Each theme provides quotations from the participants to further illustrate their responses.

Ethical considerations

The participants were informed about the process, possible consequences, and risks of participating in the study; how the data would be managed; and how they could obtain the study results, and gave their consent to participate. The participants remain anonymous to maintain confidentiality, and the results are reviewed and compiled as a group. All 14 programs were described in alphabetical order, Program A – N.

Results

The results are organized into three sections covering the preconditions for effective work with IoC; teaching, learning, and assessment arrangements; and enablers and blockers of IoC.

The preconditions for effective work with IoC

Importance of IoC

All the participating program directors agreed on the importance of IoC in their programs. On a scale of 1 - 4 (1 meaning not important at all, 4 meaning essential), four programs perceived IoC as essential (1), nine programs chose 3, and one program 2. This result was bolstered by open-ended comments from participants which explained why IoC is important for

their programs. The answers reflect the universal responsibility to prepare students to work in a global and local context; improving research and keeping track with new methods; delivering more concrete, hands-on benefits to students such as treating patients with different cultural backgrounds, and providing students with information concerning how their profession varies in other countries. Providing relevant support to international students; supporting internationalization at home through enhancing integration of Swedish and international students in the classroom, and developing courses with clear international perspectives were also mentioned. "Internationalization abroad risks missing 'local' students (e.g., training of local leaders), however, it is also important for local students to become more aware of global issues" (Program C).

Intended international learning outcomes (IILOs) in undergraduate and graduate program syllabi

There were three programs, all on the bachelor level, that defined IILOs in their program curricula. For example, "demonstrate the ability to see welfare interventions in a global and intercultural context" (Program K). In the master-level programs, there were no explicit IILOs. However, international contexts were mentioned in three program curricula, i.e., "discuss and argue for theory and evidence, both orally and in writing, in national as well as international contexts" (Program G).

Rationale for IoC

Ten program directors answered that the rationale for IoC in their programs is frequently discussed and debated by members of the program team. Three programs indicated that IoC is sometimes discussed but never seems to reach a resolution, and thus, no action is taken. One program indicated that IoC is understood and agreed upon by the entire program team. No program director indicated that the rationale for IoC is never discussed. The open-ended comments from the participants revealed that some of the programs discuss how to internationalize at home, but this has not been implemented systematically. Additionally, a participant from "program G" mentioned that not all staff is included. "The staff at the program have a positive attitude in this subject, but not all have internationalization as priority number one".

Teaching staff understanding of the international context of the discipline and related professions

This section discloses the leadership approach toward teaching staff understanding of the international context of their discipline and related professions. The questionnaire asked if this is required from all staff or only from some of them, and if leadership encourages their staff

to have such an understanding.

In seven programs, all teaching staff *are encouraged and required* to continually develop their international understanding of the discipline and related professions. In three programs, some teaching staff *are required* to have a good understanding of the discipline and associated professions internationally. In two programs, some teaching staff *are encouraged* to have a good understanding of the discipline and related professions internationally. Only one program *neither encouraged nor required* their teaching staff to develop these qualities.

Teaching staff confidence in internationalizing the curriculum

For the question "how confident teaching staff currently are about their ability to internationalize the curriculum" (on a scale of 1-4, where four indicates very confident and one little confidence), eight programs assessed themselves as a 3, five programs chose 2, and one program each chose 1 and 4. One reflection from one program director stated, "The question is: Is it necessary to be at 4 [the highest score]? For whom? We are working on demand. Who is asking for this? Maybe it is ok to be on a 3" (Program I).

Teaching, learning, and assessment arrangements

In this section, the importance of the central elements of IoC (teaching, learning, and assessment arrangements) are described.

Encouraging and supporting students to work effectively in cross-cultural groups and teams

On a scale of 1 - 4 (1 meaning not important at all and 4 meaning essential), two programs found themselves at scale 4 to support students working in cross-cultural groups and teams. Eight programs assessed themselves on scale 3, and two programs chose scale 1 and 2. Participant from "program H" stated, "We encourage [this] from day one in the program through group work and appreciation of background" (Program H). Some of the programs expressed the expectation to increase all students' intercultural competence by simple integration with international students. "When the opportunity is given, students from our program work together with students from partner universities. Because it creates an increased cultural awareness and understanding among students" (Program K). At the same time, other programs found it impossible to internationalize a curriculum without international students (in this context: students coming to Sweden for credit or degree mobility). "We do not have students from other countries in our program" (Program D).

Development of students' international and intercultural skills and knowledge

The importance placed on teaching and learning arrangements in assisting all students in developing international and intercultural skills and knowledge varied across the different

programs. On the same continuum (1-4), no program indicated scale 4. Nine programs chose 3; four programs chose 2 and one program 1. One participant expressed: "We have learning outcomes that support these skills, but we have to work more systematically and progressively with the competencies and skills" (Program G). Some participants' comments presuppose that intercultural interaction and international experience must happen when students study abroad. "We give our students the possibilities to study abroad" (Program I).

However, there are also other examples of intercultural interactions and international experiences being encouraged at home through international teachers and international students:

> "We have a lot of teachers from abroad, by web or other possibilities like pods" (Program I). "We encourage building engagement between students, and since our students are international this happens naturally. We try to build groups so that they become as international as possible" (Program F).

Cultural perspectives in assessment

The extent to which the assessment tasks across the program required students to recognize intercultural issues relevant to their discipline and/or professional practice is discussed in this section. Most of the programs placed themselves at a 3 on the scale. However, open-ended comments confirmed that cultural competencies in the various assessments are still in the early stages of development: "[They are] part of assignments in four courses, but the teaching and teacher input needs to be developed to enable a consideration of a larger variety of issues" (Program F). "[A] workshop is planned for June 2020 to lay down concrete plans for how to integrate language and background diversity into both learning exercises and assessment activities" (Program H). There were a few concrete examples of assessment: "It occurs in seminars and reflection assignments. Ethical aspects" (Program B).

Enablers and Blockers

The predefined enablers supporting the development and provision of an internationalized curriculum were chosen as follows: one's own international experience and personal commitment to and understanding of what internationalization of the curriculum means (n=9); teaching staff are encouraged, supported, and rewarded to attend international conferences, including those operating outside of the dominant disciplinary paradigm (n=7); local, school-based experts and enthusiasts who know what internationalization of the curriculum means in my discipline and for my teaching and can assist in practical ways (n=5), and a balanced and comprehensive international strategy in both policy and practice (n=4).

Other enablers identified by respondents include: a balanced and comprehensive

strategy and support from the International Office, International Council, and the group of contact teachers. Some programs disclosed ways they work to strengthen the IoC. Here, student exchange and clinical placements abroad, providing lectures with international guest professors, discussions involving talks about sustainability and sustainable development goals, and teaching staff's interest in working internationally were among the reported practices. One program expressed that they are already aware of the challenges, and all teaching staff were involved in working through them.

The most common blockers that teaching staff faced when internationalizing the curriculum are the following: workload formulae that do not include allocation of time for degree program team meetings and engagement in scholarly activity related to teaching and learning, including curriculum design and internationalization of the curriculum (n=8); lack of support for the practical issues of internationalization of the curriculum at the degree program level (n=6); leaders who are not committed to or informed about the internationalization of the curriculum at institutional, school, and degree program level (n=5), and insufficient funding and support provided to enable teaching staff to attend international conferences, visit international colleagues, or participate in other international experiences related to their work (n=4).

Other blockers respondents identified were: the lack of an institution-wide internationalization strategy; increased workload due to Covid-19; frequent leadership changes; an unstable working situation with a high turnover rate; not all staff perceiving internationalization as a priority; staff questioning why this should be done, and uncertainty in using English as a language of instruction.

What type of support and assistance is needed?

This section investigates how teaching staff can be supported in their work with IoC. The responses indicate that time and competence development are crucial so that teachers can learn concrete methods for internationalizing learning activities and outcomes. Also needed is support on how to engage cultural diversity in the classroom and an ongoing discussion and reflection upon international differences and similarities. First-hand international experience through teacher exchange as well as international contacts with other universities globally were mentioned several times as an effective way to create a greater understanding and insights into IoC. The answers concerning the question of how teaching staff should be rewarded for IoC were not united. Some participants mentioned participation in international conferences as a reward. For others, IoC was a natural part of their work and did not require extra rewards. Additionally, some of the participants disclosed that there is much work to be done in this area. One comment describes that if teachers are supposed to do this work, the decision should be

made on the institutional level.

Discussion

The present study focuses on mapping to what extent the curriculum is internationalized in the School of Health and Welfare (HHJ), as well as staff-identified enablers and blockers to achieving this task. The data collected indicates that most of the programs at HHJ acknowledge the importance of IoC in their programming. There is a clear presence of international spirit, interest, and a desire among teaching staff to work with internationalization; however, the results are lagging. Several IoC activities are taking place in the program curriculum currently, but these are not explicitly specified in IILOs nor strategically developed throughout the program. Similar to Leask & Beelen (2009) and Green & Mertova's (2016) findings, our study finds that without comprehensive IoC planning, there is a risk that these initiatives will remain fragmented and sporadic which will lead to unequal opportunities for students. Making the invisible visible by specifying the IILOs in every program may be a crucial first step in IoC planning. The results show that without specified IILOs, the international, intercultural, and/or global dimensions in content, learning, teaching, and assessment are vague.

It is necessary to dig deeper into this issue and explore why IILOs are not as prevalent in the programs. One explanation might be at the time this study was conducted, there was no direction, regulation, or support from university leadership to internationalize the curriculum. Another explanation is the prevailing student mobility mindset among staff presented by the belief that internationalization equals student mobility only. Health-related curricula are often highly regulated and program managers can feel there is not enough space for IILOs. Furthermore, the central (national) intended learning outcomes for each degree have no specific internationalized dimensions. It is worth noting that the Qualification Ordinance of Swedish Higher Education was created already in 1993. In 1993, internationalization work at Swedish HEIs was not so widespread and was not as high a priority as it is today. Additionally, if study programs have no local program-specific learning outcomes within their study program plan, there are no incentives for creating IILOs in program courses.

The encouragement of student engagement in intercultural interaction and international experiences was high overall. However, assisting students in developing international and intercultural skills and knowledge is an area that still requires further improvement. Likewise, assessments are only vaguely described, so it is difficult to accurately judge what is being assessed in these courses/modules. This is somewhat surprising as Leask's (2015) process of IoC is similar to traditional curriculum development and constructive alignment (Biggs & Tang, 2007).

Personal international experiences and commitment to internationalization are identified as the primary enablers for staff to work with IoC. In this context, it is not surprising that "personal international experience" in the form of teaching mobility (teaching staff spending a limited time teaching at the partner institution in another country) is frequently mentioned as an effective tool for IoC in our findings. The teaching staffs' mobility is a strong card at the HHJ as many teachers spend one-week teaching at the partner universities. Teaching staff mobility can bring new perspectives, inspiration, and teaching practices that can concretely benefit the internationalization of the curriculum. If this international engagement of teaching staff is incorporated into the structure of their study programs, this could allow for thus-far untapped opportunities for advancing IoC. However, even teaching staff mobility, much like student mobility, contributes to negative climate effects. The emerging virtual forms of teaching staff mobility can balance this downside.

Lack of time and support is the main blocker to the IoC process. Surprisingly, the lack (or poor communication) of institutional vision and policy, and the missing link between institutional internationalization strategy and the formal and informal curriculum concern only one third of participants. No participants mentioned inflexible curricula as a blocker in internationalizing the curriculum, even though curricula at the School of Health and Welfare are highly regulated, which typically impedes internationalization activities.

There is a determination to develop IoC among the teaching staff in this study. Still, it is not always clear what IoC means in the reality of each discipline/program, which is a known problem (Zou et al., 2019.) Consistent with previous findings, many common misconceptions are present in this study. Some of the respondents assert that they have accomplished IoC on account of the presence of international students and staff in their program. Consistent with van Gaalen & Gielesen's (2016) findings that some participants assumed that students would automatically increase their intercultural awareness by working in mixed groups with international students (Zou et al., 2019). On the contrary, some programs believed that they could never achieve IoC due to the absence of study abroad possibilities or international staff/students, or because the curriculum was already too packed. This pinpoints the mobility mindset among participating teaching staff.

Methodological considerations

This study has some limitations that need to be considered when interpreting the results. The modified version of the original survey (QIC) might have been too extensive. Even though an introductory meeting took place where the purpose of the study was explained and the QIC's rationale was clarified before the survey was distributed, some of the participants found the

questions hard to understand. This lack of understanding might have affected the validity of our findings. This study was based upon a survey with open-ended answers, and therefore, the results contain quotations reflecting some of the participants' voices. However, as the open-ended responses are not answered by all participants, the qualitative responses submitted may not represent the whole group. The descriptive design was considered more feasible as a starting point but a qualitative design with interviews might have been a potential alternative.

Recommendations and further research

It will require more support and awareness of IoC's individual elements to improve IoC efforts and observe a meaningful shift in teaching staff mindset toward IoC. Recommendations include: local program-specific IILOs be created in the study program plan; IILOs be incorporated into course curriculum; benefits of IoC be explicitly explained to students; teaching approaches be employed to engage students from diverse cultural backgrounds and their prior learning experiences and international, intercultural, and global dimensions be referred to throughout the entire cycle of curriculum development. A top-down strategy at the institutional level would also be helpful in underlining the importance of IoC. A holistic approach and staff engagement at all levels (i.e., academic staff, management, and administrative support) is needed to facilitate this long-term transformative process and shift toward a fully internationalized curriculum. Professional development opportunities, leadership support, and allocation of time for IoC development are necessary - without this, this work will not move forward.

Our data contribute to a clearer understanding of how IoC is perceived in different programs, their strengths and weaknesses, their current standing, and their future trajectory. The results indicate that the participating programs are at different stages in the IoC process; this is most likely because each program has different conditions, requirements, priorities, and levels of available support. Further research on the state of IoC efforts at the course level within individual programs would provide a more comprehensive picture. Identification and dissemination of best practices would also be beneficial. The presented data will serve as a foundation for future actions and steps toward a more internationalized curriculum.

Conclusion

This article explores the current practices and perceptions of Internationalization of the Curriculum (IoC) among teaching staff within The School of Health and Welfare at Jönköping University in Sweden. It provides information about the background and theoretical framework,

explaining the main concepts and the growing importance of IoC in the last decade, touching common myths and misconceptions and introducing Leak's (2015) conceptual framework of IoC. The findings from the Questionnaire on Internationalization of the Curriculum (QIC) identify to what extent the curriculum is internationalized at different programs of the participating department, taking into account the individual elements of the curriculum such as intended learning outcomes, program content, and teaching, learning arrangements, and assessment. The participants' responses, comments, and reflections provided a blueprint for the next steps in this IoC planning. Results show that these programs are situated at various stages of the IoC process. The essential enabler identified is teachers' individual international experiences and personal commitments, while the heavy workload required to implement this practice is the biggest blocker for the IoC work. The authors conclude with a few recommendations: taking a holistic approach to getting academic staff on board with the IoC process; creating intentional local program-specific international learning outcomes; employing teaching strategies that engage students from diverse cultural backgrounds; utilizing global dimensions throughout the entire cycle of the curriculum, and finally, employing a top-down institutional strategy that provides competence development and time for teaching staff to pursue this goal.

References

Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). Redefining Internationalisation at Home. In A. Curaj, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi, & P. Scott (Eds.), *The European Higher Education Area* (pp. 59–72). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_5

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Using Constructive Alignment in Outcomes-Based Teaching and Learning Teaching for Quality Learning at University* (3rd ed., pp. 50-63). Open University Press.

Caruana, V. (2011). *Internationalising the curriculum - Exploding myths and making connections to encourage engagement*. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/internationalising-curriculum-exploding-myths-and-making-connections-encourage

Deardorff, D. (2015). *Demystifying outcomes assessment for international educators; A practical approach*. Stylus.

de Wit, H., & Hunter, F. (2015). Understanding Internationalization of Higher education in the European context. In H. de Wit et al. (Eds.), *Internationalization of higher education* (pp. 41-58). Brussels: European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies. http//10.2861/444393

de Wit, H. (2020). Internationalization of Higher Education: The Need for a More Ethical and Qualitative Approach. *Internationalization of Higher Education. Journal of International Students, 10(1)*, i–iv. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v10i1.1893

de Wit, H., & Altbach, P. G. (2020). Internationalization in higher education: global trends and recommendations for its future. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education, 5*(1), 28–46. https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2020.1820898

Deardorff, D., & Jones, E. (2012). Intercultural Competence: An Emerging Focus in International Higher Education. In *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education* (pp. 283–303).

European Commission. (2013). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European economic and social committee and the committee of the regions: European higher education in the world* (COM (2013) 499 final). https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2013/EN/1-2013-499-EN-F1-1.Pdf

Green, W., & Mertova, P. (2016). Transformalists and transactionists: Towards a more comprehensive understanding of academics' engagement with "internationalization of the curriculum." *Research in Comparative and International Education, 11*(3), 229–246. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499916662372

IEASA. (2014). *Nelson Mandela Bay Global Dialogue Declaration on the Future of Internationalization Higher Education*. https://www.ieaa.org.au/charters/global-dialogue-declaration#:~:text=January%202014,with%20ethical%20considerations%20and%20inclusivity'.

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*(2), 165–182. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312473655
Jones, E. & Reiffenrath, T. (2018, 21 August). *Internationalisation at home in practice*. EAIE.https://www.eaie.org/blog/internationalisation-at-home-practice.html.

Jönköping University. (2020₁). About the University. https://ju.se/en/about-us.html

Jönköping University. (2020₂). Vision. https://ju.se/en/about-us/jonkoping-university/vision.html

Killick, D., & Foster, M. (2021). *Learner relationships in global higher education. A critical pedagogy for a multicultural world*. Routledge.

Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curriculum to improve interactions between home and international students*. Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(2), 205-221. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315308329786

Leask, B., & Beelen, J. (2009). Enhancing the engagement of academic staff in international education. *Proceedings of a Joint IEAA-EAIE Symposium* (pp. 28-40). International Education Association of Australia. https://www.academia.edu/12870810/Leask_B_and_Beelen_J_2010_Enhancing_the_engagement_of_academic_staff_in_international_education

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the Curriculum*. Routledge.

Lilley, B., Barker, M., & Harris, N. (2015). Educating global citizens: a good "idea" or an organizational practice? *Higher Education Research and Development*, *34*(5), 957–971. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1011089

Marinoni, G. (2019). *Internationalisation of Higher Education: An Evolving Landscape, Locally and Globally* (IAU 5th Global survey). IAU.
Mestenhauser, J. (1998). Portraits of an international curriculum: An uncommon multidimensional perspective. In J. Mestenhauser, & B. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus*. American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Myklebust, J. P. (2021, 20 January). *Internationalization goal set to be missed, says*

report. University World News. https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20210120135323211

OECD. (2018). *The future of education and skills. Education 2030.* https://www.oecd.org/education/2030/E2030%20Position%20Paper%20(05.04.2018).pdf

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing and Health, 23*(4), 334–340.

SCB. (2019). *Utrikes födda i Sverige*. [*Foreign-born person in Sweden].* SCB. https://www.scb.se/hitta-statistik/sverige-i-siffror/manniskorna-i-sverige/utrikes-fodda/

SFS 1993:100. *Högskoleförordningen. [Higher Education Ordinance].* https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/hogskoleforordning-1993100_sfs-1993-100

SFS 1992:1434. *Högskolelag. [Higher Education Act].* https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/hogskolelag-19921434_sfs-1992-1434

SOU (2018). *En strategisk agenda för internationalisering*. [*The need to integrate internationalization in the management of and at higher education institutions*]. Statens Offentliga Utredningar, SOU 2018:3. https://www.regeringen.se/490aa7/contentassets/2522e5c3f8424df4aec78d2e48507e4f/en-strategisk-agenda-for-internationalisering.pdf

Spencer-Oatey, S., & Dauber, D. (2015). *How internationalised is your university? From structural indicators to an agenda for integration*. UK Council for International Student Affairs.

Taskoh, A. K. (2014). *A Critical Policy Analysis of Internationalisation in Postsecondary Education: An Ontario Case Study*. Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/1933
UIS, UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2018). National monitoring. http://data.uis.unesco.org/?fbclid=IwAR1OtoGMb_VJODpsMLzIo8n8QsU6TsURCbm65z5YwmFjzIV8q4k2AXJrrTA

van Gaalen, A., & Gielesen, R. (2016). Internationalization at home: Dutch higher education policies. In E. Jones, R. Coelen, J. Beelen & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Global and local internationalisation* (pp. 149-154). Sense Publishers.

Zou, T., Chu, B., Law, L., Lin, V., Ko, T., Yu, M., & Mok, P. (2019). University teachers'

conceptions of internationalization of the curriculum: a phenomenographic study. *Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00461-w