

ARTICLE

Internationalizing University Education: In Pursuit of International Competence

Salem Kim HICKS

Abstract

This paper explores the changing contemporary roles and responsibilities of universities in relation to international student mobility in the global knowledge economy. For the past several decades a growing amount of research has illuminated the experience of international students studying at higher education institutes, much of which points to the lack of interaction between host students and international students. These findings continue across geographic regions despite research showing positive outcomes from interaction. As higher education (HE) comes under more and more scrutiny in the global knowledge economy, this paper advocates cross-cultural interaction as an institutional responsibility in promoting actionable cross-cultural empathy, knowledge, and understanding. This paper suggests engaged pedagogy as an educational and institutional approach for enhancing this interaction and in turn the efficacy of HE in the context of internationalizing higher education institutions (HEIs).

Keywords: cross-cultural interaction, cultural capital, English medium instruction (EMI), engaged pedagogy, higher education institutes (HEI), internationalization, international students (ISs), pastoral care

*This paper is part of a larger project funded in part by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research KAKENHI, Grant/Award Number: 50526051

Introduction

There is a widespread belief in the benefits of the internationalization of education. Governments are eager to build knowledge-based economies, viewing quality higher education systems as a key to economic growth and development. Many universities are

expanding their global reach by setting up branch campuses and offering degree programs in English, often actively and aggressively recruiting international students (ISs). International mobility of students and the demand for higher education (HE) degrees is rising, in large part facilitated by globalization and the hyper-mobility of people through relatively inexpensive global travel and globally networked communication. For some governments that are interested in nation-building through immigration, a tertiary degree received in a local university is believed to signify a highly skilled migrant, especially in terms of positive acculturation. These and other factors contribute to the increasing number of universities joining the international prestige race in desiring international recognition and participation beyond their domestic borders.

One manifestation of the internationalization of education—English medium instruction (EMI)—is recognized as a growing global phenomenon (Dearden, 2015; Macaro et al., 2018), indeed changing the “landscape” for higher education internationalization (Altbach & De Wit, 2018). EMI programs have been emerging in countries where the local language is not English and, in some cases, where English is not widely utilized or understood. International experience and English language ability are becoming more valuable as economies pursue global relations and markets. As such, cultural capital in the form of EMI tertiary degrees is increasingly valued and demanded globally as economic currency to be eligible for employment opportunities.

While the global demand for degrees is increasing, partly due to degree inflation (Fuller et al., 2017), the resultant commodification of higher education through privatization and industry influence at both the local and global level, is of much concern. It has been questioned whether universities have lost their utility as the harbingers of contemplative knowledge that give focus to understanding the world. Rather, it is argued that the focus of new forms of knowledge are on “action and engagement with and *in* the world,” susceptible to “quicker forms of accountability” (Barnett, 2000, p. 410). International university ranking systems help to push institutions in the direction of “excellence”; however, especially on a global scale, the concept tends to be thought a “vacuous...empty concept, susceptible of being filled in any way by any interest” (p. 410).

This paper queries the changing demands on higher education institutes (HEIs) in relation to pressures of internationalization and commodification, with attention to institutional responsibility in facilitating intercultural interaction between host students and international students (ISs). Universities promote the concept of international and diverse learning environments; however, according to numerous studies, universities globally continue to struggle, or neglect to integrate ISs into their wider educational communities. The growing need for international understanding amid pressures of existential crises

including nuclear war and climate change, emphasizes the need for graduates to have not only information literacy and problem-solving skills but also the experience of “testing” those skills in international learning situations. The need for graduates to be trained in skills and strategies in navigating their way intellectually through global issues including the devolution of international political infrastructure, the global rise of populism, and the ubiquitous influence of “fake news,” is arguably more critical than ever.

To this end, the ideas set forth by educational scholar bell hooks (1994) on the concept of engaged pedagogy may be helpful in guiding educators and HEIs through the challenges of achieving the benefits from the multicultural learning environment. For hooks, education encompasses freedom, is a liberatory practice, is shaped by the multicultural world we live in and, most importantly, puts the student at the centre of the experience. An engaged pedagogical approach in the teaching/learning relationship may contribute to a more meaningful experience for not only international but also domestic students and may better facilitate and ensure a more contemporary and valuable “service” to students in the context of increased globalization and nascent internationalization of HE. Engaged pedagogy is not presented as a prescriptive instructional method but as a heuristic (Moen, 2008) to enhance and ultimately foster a critical approach to knowledge-building and intercultural understanding that is so desperately needed globally.

“Shifting” position and pressures on universities

Universities are generally thought to add to the discovery and creation of knowledge, challenging the existing boundaries of knowledge, and disseminating those findings. Indeed, the economic success of a society is thought to be linked to institutions developing research innovations. With the advent of the knowledge economy, the usefulness of universities is being challenged. Universities are challenged as being: outshone by other forms and sources of knowledge; a marginalized institution compared to the rest of society and; slow to respond to change (Barnett, 2000). Indeed signs are starting to show that some leading US companies such as Google, Apple, Netflix, and Starbucks are no longer requiring college degrees and this could become an industry norm (Akhtar, 2019). However, Barnett is optimistic and creative about the future of universities concluding,

In an age of supercomplexity, a new epistemology for the university awaits, one that is open, bold, engaging, accessible, and conscious of its own insecurity. It is an epistemology for living amid uncertainty. (Barnett, 2000, p. 420)

Barnett outlines the four elements of what he calls an “epistemology for uncertainty”:

1. The capacity for revolutionary reframing;
2. The capacity for critical interrogation of all claimants for knowledge and understanding;
3. The capacity for enabling individuals to feel at ease in an uncertain world;
4. The capacity for developing powers of critical action. (p. 420)

Shin and Teichler (2013) propose a conceptual framework for the contemporary university to realign teaching, research, and service functions. They recommend that teaching and service functions should be given more attention and research functions “should be more socially contextualized, so that university research better contributes to society” (p. 218). Put together, these researchers suggest a more “engaged” type of teaching and learning environment, one that not only puts more emphasis on teaching and service functions but that also provides the skills and critical knowledge to deal with an uncertain world.

Shifts in major global issues and political relations in this era of hyper information sharing and dissemination challenge and put pressure on traditional ideas of universities as being unique spaces and guardians of information, reason, and philosophical inquiry. The increasing ease in accessing information for students has, in some ways, flattened the hierarchy in terms of access to information. Although knowledge at the undergraduate level is understood more as a “learning object”, versus as an “object of discovery” at the research or graduate level (Cheol & Teichler, 2013), the advent and increase in misinformation has increased the need for skills in the critical evaluation of information.

Commodification and the internationalization of education

Although the definitions and understandings of internationalization of education are contested and murky at best, there are systems of quality measures that are driving the direction of higher education globally. International ranking systems are becoming more and more utilized in assessing quality and suitability in the global knowledge economy and are being used by policy makers, especially in terms of global market-driven participation.

Improving the standard of education has become a policy focus of many countries as there are believed to be direct causal links between quality higher education and a strong economy. Each of these ranking systems utilizes and gives priority to slightly different criteria, as can be seen in Table 1. The three most currently accessed systems are: Shanghai Ranking, which tends to put more weight on high-quality research and famous researchers;

the QS World University Ranking, which focuses more on inter-industry reputation; and the Times Higher Education World University Ranking, which looks at both research and reputation. The World University ranking is the only system to give substantial weight to teaching and the learning environment. This focus is arguably a direct challenge to the commodification of HE and has the potential to help facilitate substantive internationalization within HEIs.

Table 1: A general comparison of methodological indicators of university ranking systems

QS World University	THE World University	Shanghai (ARWU)
Academic Reputation 40% Employer Reputation 10% Faculty/Student Ratio 20% Citations per faculty 20% International Faculty Ratio 5% International Student Ratio 5%	Teaching (learning environment): 30% Research (volume, income, reputation): 30% Citations (research influence): 30% International outlook (staff, students, research): 7.5% Industry income (knowledge transfer): 2.5%	Quality of education 10% Quality of Faculty 40% Research output 40% Per capital performance 10%

Sources: <https://www.qs.com>; <https://www.timeshighereducation.com>; <http://www.shanghairanking.com>

When criteria do overlap, these measurement systems may use different calculation methods, resulting in different results. For example, all three systems usually have very similar rankings for the top international schools such as MIT, Harvard, and Cambridge. However, after the top tier schools have been ranked the results start to show considerable differences. Students wishing to study internationally but not able to access the globally famous institutions, often rely on these inconsistent rankings. Comparing two of the three currently most popular ranking systems, Ioannidis et al. (2007) found that the criteria used in international ranking, specifically educational and research excellence, did not have reliable construct validity for either. The researchers posit that measurement challenges at the country-level are more “manageable” but still not immune to criticism (see for example, Ghazarian, 2011).

These ranking systems contribute to increasing pressure that universities must contend with as they desire international recognition and participation beyond their domestic borders. In places that typically lack in regulation and infrastructure, such as India, the increasing domestic demand for higher education degrees, as well as the pursuit of international students, is increasing a market-driven trend that is “posing problems with respect to quality” (Bhushan, 2005, p. 4). For example, the Indian government announced in 2018 the

“Study in India” scheme (Nanda, 2018) with a plan to attract 200,000 students, in part hoping to access foreign revenue. However, with this growing demand for tertiary degrees, industry privatization in regions increasing the number of HEIs is often resulting in prohibitive tuition fees and less access for vulnerable groups of domestic students (Usoh et al., 2018). Privileged students have been participating in study abroad programs for decades; however, degree programs specifically tailored to attract international students have launched a different trajectory, not only for students but also for universities. Different types of educational demands, motivations, and desired student services, necessitate new policies and directives that require institutional objectives and administrative staff who can deal with and ideally anticipate these changes and challenges.

Transcultural capital and its global efficacy

Pierre Bourdieu (1986) famously identified and described capital as manifesting in three “fundamental guises”: economic, cultural, and social. Cultural capital in the embodied form of educational qualifications is thought to be one prerequisite to economic capital. Social capital in the form of networks and relationships can be “effectively mobilized” (p. 21), with all three being produced and reproduced over a lifetime. Furthermore, because the “scholastic yield from educational action depends on the cultural capital previously invested by the family” (p. 17), the conversion of economic capital into cultural capital, when considered in the global arena, calls to question the transferability of foreign degrees and exposes the increasing social stratification of global higher education within market forces. The concept of transcultural capital (Meinhof & Triandafyllidou, 2006) blends Bourdieu’s three forms of capital to understand how migrants apply knowledge, skills, and networks acquired abroad.

Growing middle class populations in several countries in Asia are increasing their outflow of students in search of transcultural capital and foreign degrees. In Korea, for example, globalization has played a critical role in increasing the desire for not only tertiary degrees but also for English competency and global skills (Kim, 2011; Koo, 2016). Cosmopolitanism desired as a form of cultural capital is intuitively associated with foreign study. A cosmopolitan is typically viewed as a person who has been exposed to a wide variety of cultures and peoples and thus is more open-minded and intellectual. However, exposure to potentially enlightening situations, experiences, and information has limits to being an influential and transformational vehicle of deeper international understanding. Indeed, research examining changing class demographics suggests a formation of a lifestyle that values conspicuous consumption as a form of identity that signifies a distinction from lower middle classes (Chua, 2000; Pinches, 1999; Koo, 2016). The ability to challenge this developmental trend, given its multitude of destructive consequences globally, can be argued

to be a fundamental purpose and promise of university education.

In a national context, the transmission of cultural capital and the building of social capital by domestic students is thought to help develop local economies. For international students who often carry their skills and qualifications back to their homelands, to what extent the global exchange value of foreign cultural capital is useful outside of the country it was attained in, is less clear. Mathews and Sidhu (2005) note that schools often “privilege narrowly instrumental cultural capital perpetuat[ing] and sustain[ing] normative national, cultural and ethnic identities” (p. 49). Indeed, Bourdieu (1986) recognized that “the best hidden and socially most determinant educational investment” was in “the domestic transmission of cultural capital” (p. 17). However, the usual focus on domestic goals is sometimes in conflict with the wider goals of the internationalization of HE.

In terms of economic currency on the labour market, foreign degrees, especially those from anglophone core countries, continue to be highly valued. However, EMI undergraduate degrees in non-anglophone destinations such as Japan, South Korea, and China are becoming popular among developing nations in Asia, especially as the global rankings of some universities in Asia are gaining increased international reputations (Roughneen, 2018). Japanese universities, however, have been criticized for not performing well on international ranking systems (Sawa, 2019; Yonezawa, 2010). Much of this criticism is directed towards a distinct lack of momentum and pursuit of international research output and outlook throughout Japan. While examining the reasons for this are outside the scope of this paper, moving towards an understanding of how universities can engage with ISs and in a way that validates and legitimizes the “new” roles and responsibilities of universities, is a worthwhile goal in the era of internationalization of education. If Japan still aims to be an “Asian Global Gateway” leader in the regional knowledge economy (Ninomiya et al, 2009), this goal carries with it enormous responsibility to not repeat the same imperialistic mistakes of American exceptionalism by producing and reproducing forms of regional hegemony.

The substantive makings of transcultural cultural capital: Social capital

International study is often associated with the anticipation of interactions with local students. Studies suggest that having significant interactions and forming meaningful friendships with host students is beneficial for ISs. However, studies examining cross cultural interaction between host students and international students in diverse cultural contexts have been found to be generally low, for example, in Australia (Hellsten, 2011), the UK (Montgomery, 2009), and Japan (Hicks, 2013; Nguyen, Le, & Meirmanov, 2018). This reticence to mingle is pervasive and persists should intervention measures be passive or intermittent.

For example, in one longitudinal study involving both ISs and host students, mixed group activities did increase cross-cultural interaction, but only temporarily. The authors concluded that institutions are able to ensure better cross-cultural adjustment through the facilitation of interaction (Rienties & Nolan, 2014). This interaction needs to be purposeful and constant, though, if it is to persist long term.

Studies also show that ISs that make social connections with host students have been found to perform better academically (Neri, & Ville, 2008; Rienties, et al., 2012) and acculturate better. Importantly, these interactions facilitate identification with and commitment to the university (Kashima, 2006). On commenting on their findings that host and ISs do not readily interact, Volet and Ang (1998) go so far as to say that “Australian students’ tendency to prefer low levels of cross-cultural interactions, are of major concern for the future of the internationalization of higher education in Australia” (p. 6). While this study is more than 20 years old, more recent studies are still finding similar disinterest between the two groups. Rientes and Nolan (2014) found that even over time in a BA program, ISs and host students experienced an *increased* degree of segregation.

In order to understand why there is a lack of interaction between international and host students, it is important to examine how particular cultural and political reasons are potentially interfering. For example, in Japan, the relationship between foreign language education and international engagement does not have a clear agenda (Butler & Iino, 2005). Furthermore, government’s EFL reforms continue to elicit disappointing results as they focus on language ability test results rather than education as a “key to understanding and communicating with other people and other cultures—ultimately, for intercultural communication” (Torikai, 2018). This invariably results in a lack of educational will in some universities to value English education as a gateway to internationalization within their educational communities. This leads to a tension whereby ISs are invited to study in EMI programs; however, there is little interest or institutional facilitation of interaction between host and international students. As universities are learning institutes, the responsibility can be placed on the university to foster environments of intercultural exchange.

As EMI degree programs in Japan start to mature, there has been a recent increased output in studies focusing on ISs’ difficulties in adjustment and the general lack of social connection in Japan (see Hennings & Tanabe, 2018; Ye, 2018; Moon & Shin, 2019). Liddicoat argues that interculturality among many Japanese people is not readily conceptualized as developing abilities “to adapt and accommodate to others, nor is it an attempt to explore questions of Japanese identity in intercultural contexts” (Liddicoat, 2007, p. 41). These attitudes do not facilitate acculturation or integration of foreigners. Indeed, studies report that immigrant destination countries with strong integration policies (MPI, 2010; Abu-Laban, 2018)

have traditionally shown higher inflow and more successful retention of skilled migration (Verbik & Lasanowski, 2007). As can be expected, substantive access to equal employment opportunities have been found to positively influence migrant retention. Thus, the link between significant social integration during university study/tenure by international students and interaction with host students may be precursor to successful integration of foreigners in Japanese employment environments.

However, integration and interaction from the ISs perspective is only one part of the equation of internationalization in the multicultural environment. The involvement of host students is critical. The few studies that are available on host students' reactions to ISs tend to find that host students have very little interest in ISs (see Dunne, 2009).

The need for an engaged pedagogy

Teichler (2004) asked whether globalization of higher education has to be viewed as "a manifestation of 'turbo-capitalism' or could it be viewed instead as a move towards 'global understanding'" (p. 5). The question on one hand seems lofty and idealistic given our global penchant for hyper-consumerism and its underpinning of the development model in economics. On the other hand, global understanding is one of the foundational premises and promises that drive HE and its internationalization. Perhaps there has not been enough effort on how to actually make that global understanding happen in a methodological way. It would be difficult to argue against the following ideas: that education does not operate in a vacuum; that education is not related to local and global social and cultural relations; that there are multiple sources of diverse knowledges; that knowledge should be challenged, shared, and negotiated; or that students are not blank slates to be filled with knowledge. The premises that engaged pedagogy is built upon can, indeed, be disruptive to the status quo as it approaches both education and knowledge as being deeply political in essence. Indeed, the internationalization of HE and its transcultural capital complicates its political role and responsibilities. These are basic premises of critical theory, including critical feminist theory.

In trying to overcome student disengagement and disempowerment with learning, scholar bell hooks (1994) articulates a holistic approach to learning. In her formulation, she focuses on (re)uniting formal learning, informal learning, and lived experience. Knowledge is no longer fragmented from lived experiences and compartmentalized in a way that disempowers individual knowledge, experience, and diversity. In describing her vision of engaged pedagogy, hooks writes,

To educate as the practice of freedom is a way of teaching that anyone can learn. That

learning process comes easiest to those of us who teach who also believe that our work is not merely to share information but to share in the intellectual and spiritual growth of our students. (p. 13)

hooks' praxis involves the process of teaching students "in a manner that respects and cares for" (p. 13) them as having agency and participation in the learning process, rather than using "a rote, assembly line approach" (p. 13). This is in contrast to the "safe' place of lecture and invited response" (Berry, 2010, p. 20). In this way learners become "active participants" rather than "passive consumers" (hooks, 1994, p.14). hooks focuses on mutual vulnerability, promoting the idea that students' experiences and stories are integral to "validating" the curriculum. In other words, students are able to synthesize and integrate information along with their lived experiences and prior knowledge by utilizing their "voice".

For hooks, learner voice is achieved in interaction through dialogue. Dialogue, though, should be reflective and empowering in the sense that students are given a voice during all stages of learning. Dialogue, however, involves critical inquiry and self-reflection—skills that are not necessarily intuitive and need to be learned and practiced. Especially students coming from countries with less developed educational systems or learning environments that do not encourage or even permit critical participation from students, dialogic participation, whether in pairs, small groups, and especially plenary sessions, will be challenging. Even students with previous experience in discussion and debate do not necessarily possess the intellectual strategies that are necessary for logical, critical, and creative thinking. This is the concerted praxis that HE can and should be focused on.

Finally, engaged pedagogy is focused on sustainable community building across differences. This is especially pertinent in the multicultural learning environment where intersectional differences are myriad and often come with persistent stereotypes and stigmas. It is important to create safe environments in which students from diverse backgrounds can come together to form discussions and narratives that enable self-reflection and create strategies and ethics to resist prejudice, again assuming the common goal of HEIs is to move understanding towards a more just and equitable world for everyone. This story telling or "counterstory" (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) from all students, is thought to challenge the dominant narrative of hegemonic world views, especially for those politically, socially or geographically marginalized. It places the students at the centre of the learning experience and validates their direct participation in creating a community of knowledge sharing in which they are co-authors and collaborators.

Engaged pedagogy is not fundamentally a radical pedagogical practice considering most university syllabi incorporate the concept of critical thinking skills as a course goal. However,

exposure to knowledge does not necessarily result in the acquisition of higher order thinking skills (Willingham, 2007), nor does it necessarily challenge or discover knowledge or situate the learner in the centre of the learning process. Engaged pedagogy is one methodology that may facilitate the achievement of those goals. The precepts and praxis of engaged pedagogy address some of the issues that cause consternation among researchers in how the internationalization of higher education is manifested: the lack of interaction between host students and ISs as it relates to student care; as well as student agency and power relations within curriculum and pedagogy.

It is important that the value of interaction between students is not seen as outside the responsibilities of the institution. This type of interaction, when done methodically should be seen as a critical and integral part of the purpose of HE. In practice, though, as discussed above, ISs and host students do not readily interact unless they are required to do so formally in classroom activities and curriculum design. Sustained institutional support is found to be necessary (Sias et al., 2008). Creating courses in which both ISs and host students are required to engage in intellectual exchange is challenging yet necessary. Often courses that start out targeting both groups disintegrate into being dominated by one group or the other. Although this phenomenon seems to be consistent across regions, the reasons differ to a certain degree in non-English speaking environments. For example, host students that have limited English language ability will be less likely to brave an EMI learning environment with ISs especially if there is little guidance or support in not only how to negotiate these types of environments, but also in terms of understanding the utility and importance of the learning environment itself. As global migration increases, graduates are going to need the skills that can only be gained in multicultural learning environments and instructors cannot be expected to bear the entire burden.

Engaged pedagogy: Institutional level engagement

Returning to Shin and Teichler's (2013) realignment for contemporary universities that teaching and student services should become central focal points, the precepts of engaged pedagogy can be utilized and should not be limited to the classroom and learning environment. The marginalization of ISs has been found to be a central and challenging aspect of their learning experience. Mitigating this isolation is liberating for all students on international campuses. Proactive support services for all students increases not only symbolic validation of what an international campus is, but has the potential to increase host students' awareness and openness to multiple levels of diversity.

Pastoral support has been found to be necessary for student well-being and success

(Cahill, Bowyer, & Murray, 2014). In its basic understanding, pastoral support involves a holistic approach to student intellectual, emotional, and physical development and well-being. At the university level, institutions, staff, and faculty often see this level of care beyond the necessary services to be provided. Research tells us though that ISs suffer because of lack of integration and host students miss out on the benefits of intercultural exchange often exacerbated by a lack of clarity on staff role, institutions' slowness in recognizing and responding to the mental health needs of students, and the need of professional development for teaching and administrative staff regarding mental health problems (Laws & Fiedler, 2012). Often this type of support is not made available to international students, especially in the unique ways that might be needed. In studies in mental health support in Canada, immigrants, women, and other vulnerable groups are found to need dedicated mental health support in native languages or professional training in specific care giving (Kirmayer et al., 2003), underscoring the import of these matters in dealing with youth.

In the United States context, Yeh and Inose (2010) found English fluency, social support satisfaction, and social connectedness were all strongly associated with acculturative stress, or the characteristic type of stress associated with individuals' cross-cultural experiences. Other studies have shown that ISs with social support had reduced acculturative stress, especially if social support was from host nationals (Sullivan & Kashubeck-West, 2015). In a large study in the US, Duru & Poyrazli (2011) found higher levels of social connectedness, especially with local students, lower levels of perceived discrimination, more years of study in the host country, and higher levels of English language competency, all of which resulted in lower levels of adjustment difficulties being reported.

In studying the occurrence of depression and its correlation with acculturative stress (for example perceived discrimination, homesickness, culture shock, etc.) and social connectedness among domestic and international students at a Japanese university, Nguyen, Le, and Meirmanov (2019) found a strong link between high levels of acculturative stress and the presence of depression, whereas, meaningful social connections lessened manifestations of stress. They conclude that this warrants the implementation of institutional support programs. Providing adequate and nuanced care services presents challenges especially in host countries that do not integrate foreigners well (Hicks, 2013); however, for universities that wish to recruit ISs, the expectations of increasingly discerning ISs as consumers of education, demands for better care services seem inevitable.

As student-led support mechanisms, peer support groups are effective in providing peer-to-peer pastoral care. However, peer support groups for ISs run the risk of becoming marginalized due to lack of participation from host students. Moon and Shin (2019) found that meaningful social connections were made between international students which aided in their

transnational ties, despite being marginalized by host students. However, with institutional intervention and structure (Willis & Sedghi, 2014) host students may be able to sustain participation in the wider university community. In the end, the question is, do schools have the political will and ideological belief that they need to provide pastoral support to ISs. Willis and Sedghi (2014) argue that nuanced responses to specific situations and contexts will become increasingly important for universities recruiting ISs.

Fundamentally, it is the responsibility of HEIs that recruit ISs through promising the benefits of an international learning environment, to provide and foster the services to ensure these ends. In measuring the service quality of Malaysian public universities, Chua and Ramalua (2011) conclude service quality should include not only equipment and facilities but also student welfare. McChlery and Wilkie (2009) advise that despite institutional concerns and constraints around limited resources and assumptions around cost effectiveness, universities should understand that,

both the duty to be responsible for those at-risk, and a student-centered branding for the institution, elevate the value of the system. Irrespective of the difficulty in balancing resources to recognised needs, institutions and the academic community need to identify their baseline of responsibility for those at-risk and administer appropriate support mechanisms. (p. 33)

In the multicultural campus setting ISs and host students can be viewed generally as “at risk” as acculturative stresses are created by the environment and are in need of being alleviated.

Conclusion

Changes in roles and responsibilities of HEIs in a global knowledge economy are requiring more engagement with increasingly diverse students, societal changes, and global issues. Engaged pedagogy can be useful as an institutional approach for enhancing the efficacy of internationalizing higher education institutions. As higher education comes under more and more scrutiny in the global knowledge economy, cross-cultural interaction as an institutional responsibility can foster actionable cross-cultural empathy, knowledge, and understanding. Pastoral support for students, seen as an ethical responsibility that adds value to not only the students' experience but also to the institution, may provide an ideological foundation and policy direction for a way to achieve a level of success and sustainability for the changing position of HEIs. Increasing the utility and efficacy of globally transferable cultural capital

and knowledge may also add to the success of governmental immigration and knowledge economy policy goals.

References

- Abu-Laban, Y. (2018). Recognition, Re-distribution and Solidarity: The case of multicultural Canada. In J.E. Fossum, R. Kastoryano, & B. Siim (Eds.), *Diversity and Contestations over Nationalism in Europe and Canada* (pp. 237-262). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Akhtar, A. (2019, April 10). Apple, Google, and Netflix don't require employees to have 4-year degrees, and this could soon become an industry norm. *Business Insider US*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.sg>
- Altbach, P., & de Wit, H. (2018). Are we facing a fundamental challenge to higher education internationalization? *International Higher Education: The Boston College Center for International Higher Education*, 93, 2-4. Retrieved from <https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe>.
- Barnett, R. (2000). University knowledge in an age of supercomplexity. *Higher Education*, 40(4), 409-422.
- Berry, T. R. (2010). Engaged pedagogy and critical race feminism. *Educational Foundations*, 24, 19-26.
- Bhushan, S. (2005). Foreign Universities in India: Market-driven new directions. *International Higher Education: The Boston College Center for International Higher Education*, 41, 4-5. Retrieved from <https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe>.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson, (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 15-29). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Butler, Y. G., & Iino, M. (2005). Current Japanese reforms in English language education: The 2003 "Action Plan". *Language Policy*, 4(1), 25-45.
- Cahill, J., Bowyer, J., & Murray, S. (2014). An exploration of undergraduate students' views on the effectiveness of academic and pastoral support. *Educational Research*, 56(4), 398-411.
- Cheol, S. J., & Teichler, U. (2013). *The future of the post-massified university at the crossroads: Restructuring systems and functions (Vol. 1)*. Springer International Publishing.
- Chuah, C. W., & Sri Ramalu, S. (2011). Students satisfaction towards the university: Does service quality matters? *International Journal of Education*, 3(2), 1-15.
- Chua, B.-H. (Ed.). (2000). *Consumption in Asia: Lifestyles and identities*. London: Routledge.
- Dearden, J. (2015). *English as a medium of instruction-a growing global phenomenon*. British Council. London: British Council. Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.es/sites/default/files/british_council_english_as_a_medium_of_instruction.pdf.
- Dunne, C. (2009). Host students' perspectives of intercultural contact in an Irish university. *Journal of studies in international education*, 13(2), 222-239.
- Duru, E., & Poyrazli, S. (2011). Perceived discrimination, social connectedness, and other predictors of adjustment difficulties among Turkish international students. *International Journal of Psychology*, 46(6), 446-454.
- Fuller, J., Raman, M., et al. (October 2017). *Dismissed by degrees*. Accenture, Grads of Life, Harvard Business School. Retrieved from <https://www.hbs.edu>
- Ghazarian, P. G. (2011). Higher education global rankings system in East Asia: Issues, implications and Inquiries. In Palmer, J., Roberts, A., Cho, Y., & Ching, G. (Eds.), *The Internationalization of East Asian*

- Higher Education: Globalization's Impact*. Springer.
- Hellstén, M., & Prescott, A. (2004). Learning at university: The international student experience. *International Education Journal*, 5(3), 344-351.
- Hennings, M., & Tanabe, S. (2018). Study Abroad objectives and satisfaction of international students in Japan. *Journal of International Students*, 8(4), 1914-1925.
- Hicks, S. K. (2014). The multicultural campus: Gendered experiences and Othering as factors in stay probability. *Journal and Proceedings of the Gender Awareness in Language Education*, 7, 51-79.
- hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Ioannidis, J. P., Patsopoulos, N. A., Kavvoura, F. K., Tatsioni, A., Evangelou, E., Kouri, I., ... & Liberopoulos, G. (2007). International ranking systems for universities and institutions: A critical appraisal. *BMC Medicine*, 5(1), 30.
- Kashima, E. S., & Loh, E. (2006). International students' acculturation: Effects of international, conational, and local ties and need for closure. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30(4), 471-485.
- Kim, J. (2011). Aspiration for global cultural capital in the stratified realm of global higher education: Why do Korean students go to US graduate schools? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 32(1), 109-126.
- Kirmayer, L. J., Groleau, D., Guzder, J., Blake, C., & Jarvis, E. (2003). Cultural consultation: A model of mental health service for multicultural societies. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 48(3), 145-153.
- Koo, H. (2016). The global middle class: How is it made, what does it represent? *Globalizations*, 13(4), 440-453.
- Laws, T. A., & Fiedler, B. A. (2012). Universities' expectations of pastoral care: Trends, stressors, resource gaps and support needs for teaching staff. *Nurse Education Today*, 32(7), 796-802.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). Internationalising Japan: Nihonjinron and the intercultural in Japanese language-in-education policy. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 2(1), 32-46.
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 36-76.
- Marginson, S. (2014, April 2). Opinion: Why the West's Influence on Global Higher Education Is Waning. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/>
- Matthews, J. & Sidhu, R. (2005) Desperately seeking the global subject: international education, citizenship and cosmopolitanism, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 3(1), 49-66.
- McChlery, S., & Wilkie, J. (2009). Pastoral support to undergraduates in higher education. *International Journal of Management*, 8(1), 23-35.
- Meinhof, U. & Triandafyllidou, A. (2006). Beyond the diaspora: Transnational practices as transcultural capital. In U.H. Meinhof & A. Triandafyllidou (Eds.), *Transcultural Europe: Cultural policy in a changing Europe* (pp. 200-222). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moen, D. (2008). Discussion-based critical/engaged pedagogy: Teaching to question. *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies*, 40(2), 139-146.
- Montgomery, C. (2009). A decade of internationalisation: has it influenced students' views of cross-cultural group work at university? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 256-270.
- Moon, R. J., & Shin, G. W. (2019). International student networks as transnational social capital: Illustrations from Japan. *Comparative Education*, 55(4), 557-574.

- Nanda, P. K. (2018, April 19) Study in India: Govt sets target to attract 200,000 foreign students. *LiveMint*. Retrieved from <https://www.livemint.com>.
- Neri, F., & Ville, S. (2008). Social capital renewal and the academic performance of international students in Australia. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37(4), 1515- 1538.
- Nguyen, M. H., Le, T. T., & Meirmanov, S. (2019). Depression, acculturative stress, and social connectedness among international university students in Japan: A statistical investigation. *Sustainability*, 11(3), 878.
- Ninomiya, A., Knight, J., & Watanabe, A. (2009). The past, present, and future of internationalization in Japan. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 117-124.
- Pinches, M. (Ed.). (1999). Culture and privilege in capitalist Asia. London: Routledge.
- Rienties, B. & Nolan, EM. (2014). Understanding friendship and learning networks of international and host students using longitudinal Social Network Analysis. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 41, pp. 165–180.
- Rienties, B., Beausaert, S., Grohnert, T., Niemantsverdriet, S., & Kommers, P. (2012). Understanding academic performance of international students: The role of ethnicity, academic and social integration. *Higher Education*, 63(6), 685-700.
- Roughneen, S. (2018, May 31). Asia's universities rise in global reputation rankings. *Nikkei Asian Review*. Retrieved from <https://asia.nikkei.com/Life-Arts/Education/Asia-s-universities-rise-in-global-reputation-rankings>
- Sawa, T. (2019). The global decline of Japanese universities. *The Japan Times Online*. Retrieved from <https://www.japantimes.co.jp>
- Shin, J. C., & Teichler, U. (2013). *The future of the post-massified university at the crossroads: Restructuring systems and functions (Vol. 1)*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Sias, P. M., Drzewiecka, J. A., Meares, M., Bent, R., Konomi, Y., Ortega, M., & White, C. (2008). Intercultural friendship development. *Communication Reports*, 21(1), 1-13.
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 23-44.
- Sullivan, C., & Kashubeck-West, S. (2015). The interplay of international students' acculturative stress, social support, and acculturation modes. *Journal of International Students*, 5(1), 1-11.
- Teichler, U. (2004). Temporary study abroad: The life of ERASMUS students. *European Journal of Education*, 39(4), 395-408.
- Torikai, K. (2018, July, 3). *Chronic Reforms and the Crisis in English Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.nippon.com>
- Usoh, E. J., Ohyver, D. A., Som, A. P. M., & Bakar, N. A. (2018). Globalisation and Gender Equality in Education: Government and NGO's Roles in Empowering Women. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7(4.34), 128-131.
- Verbik, L., & Lasanowski, V. (2007). International student mobility: Patterns and trends. *World Education News and Reviews*, 20(10), 1-16.
- Volet, S. E. & Ang, G. (1998). Culturally mixed groups on international campuses: An opportunity for intercultural learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 17(1), 5-23.
- West, J. (n.d.). Growth of International Student Numbers in Higher Education. Retrieved from <https://>

www.qs.com.

- Willis, I., & Sedghi, G. (2014). Perceptions and experiences of home students involved in welcoming and supporting direct entry 2nd year international students. *Practice and Evidence of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 2-17.
- Ye, S. (2018). Trust, Social Support and Adaptation: A Study of International Students in Japan. *International Journal of Culture and History*, 4(2), 13-18.
- Yeh, C. J., & Inose, M. (2003). International students' reported English fluency, social support satisfaction, and social connectedness as predictors of acculturative stress. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 16(1), 15-28.
- Yonezawa, A. (2010) Much ado about ranking: Why can't Japanese universities internationalize? *Japan Forum*, 2(1-2), 121-137.

