Internationalisation of doctoral education

Possibilities for new knowledge and understandings

Janette Ryan

University of Oxford, England

The past decade has seen a rapid increase in the number of international students undertaking doctorates in Anglophone universities such as Australia and the UK. In 2009, 11,500 international students were undertaking postgraduate research in Australia, with a 20 per cent increase in doctoral enrolments over the previous year (AEI, 2011). In the UK, international students comprise 50 per cent of full-time research degree students (UKCISA, 2011). The postgraduate research student cohort in these countries has thus radically changed as these students have brought with them different academic cultures and intellectual traditions.

Although distinct phases can be identified in the responses of Australian and British universities to increases in international students, with the current phase aligned to internationalisation agendas, there still appears to be a lack of recognition of the potential to take advantage of these global flows of people, ideas and perspectives by engaging with the knowledge and academic values that international doctoral students bring. Are we taking advantage of these opportunities for the generation of new knowledge and skills or do we risk being complacent about the superiority of 'Western' academic ways?

Using theories of cross-cultural pedagogy, this paper reports on a qualitative study of views of scholarship and learning in Western and Confucian-heritage higher education, using Australia and the UK, and China and Hong Kong as case studies. Interviews with expert scholars in these contexts demonstrate that although there are differences and similarities towards knowledge and scholarship between these higher education systems, these are changing as contemporary teaching and learning conditions and imperatives become more closely tied to discourses of internationalisation and globalisation. This demonstrates recognition of the changes occurring in higher education and an understanding of the need for genuine intercultural dialogue so that international education is not just based on the legitimisation of Western knowledge but becomes an enterprise of mutual learning.

Introduction

Radical shifts have occurred in doctoral student cohorts in Anglophone universities in the past decade due to significant increases in the number of international students, most notably in Australia and the UK. International students comprise 21 per cent of students in Australia (AEI, 2010a) and 15 per cent in the UK (UKCISA, 2011). They comprise significant proportions of postgraduate programmes in both countries and can be the majority in many courses with Chinese students being the largest single national group in both Australia and the UK. The numbers of Chinese doctoral students in both countries has steadily risen yet the supervision of Chinese doctoral students has received little attention (Chung & Ingleby, 2011; Singh, 2009).

Most Anglophone universities espouse 'internationalisation' as part of their mission as well as the development

of intercultural skills amongst their graduates, yet moves towards the internationalisation of teaching and learning have been modest, particularly at postgraduate level (Singh, 2009). It is therefore timely that not only the vision of internationalisation needs to be articulated, but also how new knowledge and skills can arise from truly internationalised learning. The doctoral relationship provides an ideal vehicle for the exchange of cultural intellectual ideas and the development of new epistemologies. These spaces enable deep conversation and debate and exploration of alternative paradigms to generate new knowledge and fashion new attitudes and perspectives that cross cultural boundaries. The new knowledge that arises can be transformative for all parties in changed and changing higher education contexts.

To date, however, responses to international doctoral students are mainly characterised by 'one-way' learning where the student is expected to conform to Western notions of scholarship and learning. Turner and Robson (2008) describe current pedagogical approaches as 'ethnocentric' rather than 'ethnorelative' (p. 40). Going further, and using Rancière's notion of 'ignorance', Singh (2009) argues that relationships between Western supervisors and Chinese doctoral students are based on 'ignorance' of the students' backgrounds (p. 185). Chung and Ingleby (2011) believe that the lack of attention to the supervision needs of Chinese students is based on 'simple ignorance of the large cultural differences between Chinese and Westerners' (p. 173). Singh (2009) believes, however, that this 'ignorance' can be used as a platform for learning: 'This means bringing this intellectual capital to bear in the production and flow of research-based knowledge as much as the dialogic education of transnational educational researchers' (Singh, 2009, p. 187).

International education 'flows'

The flow of international students from China to Anglophone universities is part of China's 'brain gain' policy to improve the nation's human capital through mobility of its students and scholars (Pan, 2011). The reform of higher education in China has been achieved through both internal means such as massive increases in expenditure to create a number of world-class universities, and external means such as sending students and scholars abroad (Ryan, 2011a). This 'strategic dependence' on foreign higher education resources to develop human capital to drive its education reform and economic progress has 'enabled education abroad to become a source of brain gain' for China (Pan, 2011, p. 106). In contrast, those in

Anglophone universities seem to be content with the quality and appeal of their higher education and have not made similar attempts to learn from other academic cultures, especially those of the fast-developing economic powerhouses of India and China. According to the OECD (2011), for example, 11 international students travel to study in the UK for each British student who travels abroad to study, and for Australia, the ratio is 24:1, the highest of any country.

There is much debate in Australian and British universities about the need to 'internationalise' the curriculum, yet few shared views of what this entails in concrete terms. Further, these initiatives tend to focus on undergraduate programmes and graduate attributes rather than the postgraduate level. These debates occur alongside broader discourses about the internationalisation of university operations, and the proliferation of relationships with overseas partners and transnational education programmes. These discourses usually place the onus on international students to adapt to their new learning environment rather than considering whether and how universities also need to adapt and change (Gu & Schweisfurth, 2006; Ryan & Viete, 2009; Turner & Robson, 2008). Internationalisation debates focus on developing an 'international dimension' (Knight, 2004) into all university operations, generally without articulating what this entails or what domains are involved. At the level of curriculum, they can involve the superficial inclusion of international examples rather than genuine attempts to pluralise the epistemological knowledge base (Webb, 2005).

Analysis of Australian and British universities' responses to increased numbers of international students over the past two decades shows that there are three distinct (but overlapping) phases. These have moved from ethnocentric responses (Ryan, 2011b: Turner & Robson, 2008), where international students are expected to conform to the requirements of Western academe, to more recent approaches where intercultural learning is seen as a desirable attribute for all students in globalised contexts (Gu & Schweisfurth, 2006; Ryan & Viete, 2009). The first two phases involved a shift from a 'skills deficit' (Ballard & Clancy, 1997) located within the international student to a focus on adapting teaching and learning to 'accommodate' international students and both these approaches continue to co-exist. These approaches are based on essentialising 'whole culture' explanations (Clarke & Gieve, 2006) for student differences despite diversity amongst national groups and radical changes within the major source countries of international students such as China. These adjustment/accommodation models position Western academe

and Anglophone countries as dominant and hegemonic. They offer few sustainable or innovative ways to move beyond 'deficit' debates to new approaches to teaching in cross cultural contexts.

Research during the first phase (in the 1990s) focused on differences between 'international' and 'local' students and the skills that international students need remediated (Ryan & Viete, 2009). This saw the proliferation of 'front loading' or 'add on' programmes such as foundation courses, English for Academic Purposes courses and academic skills services. These programmes take responsibility away from supervisors for their international students' academic skills learning, although they do reduce the sometimes heavy burden for academics that this can entail. These programmes have benefits for a whole range of students (not just international ones) but they can be disconnected from the students' discipline area and can focus on narrow academic skills such as drills in paraphrasing and referencing techniques.

Over the recent decade, as international student numbers accelerated, the 'gaze' has shifted to how lecturers should 'accommodate' international students and make their teaching practices more explicit so that international students can adjust their learning behaviours to Western contexts. The need to make explicit the 'rules of the game' for international students (Carroll & Ryan, 2005) - Western modes of expression, norms for interactions between teachers and students, and the rules for referring to the work of others - can be seen in a plethora of information provided to international students. Research on problems experienced by international students tends to result in calls for better induction, increased language skills, or more academic support programmes, that is, for the further 'improvement' of international students.

'Internationalisation' agendas in the current phase include 'internationalisation of the curriculum' for both home and international students. Universities are looking beyond their borders for opportunities for international partnerships to expand their operations and export their education programmes. Although universities are exploring how to respond to more diverse students, policy responses are still typified by the 'augmentation' of students' learning and thus continue the onus on international students alone to adapt (Gu & Schweisfurth, 2006). Internationalisation debates generally ignore the 'cultural dynamics' of teaching and learning (Huisman, 2010) and the potential for taking advantage of the flows of international students in ways that move beyond integration into, or adaptation to, the dominant academic culture.

Moving beyond Western paradigms

The 'universalism' of Western academic paradigms as well as what constitutes 'Western' (or 'Eastern') are contested however. Labelling students (or academics) on the basis of whole systems of cultural practice ignores the considerable diversity *within* cultures as well as *between* them (Ryan & Louie, 2007). Nevertheless, these terms are commonly used, and the term 'Western' education is generally used to refer to the 'Anglo-American model' (Klitgård, 2011a).

The dominance of 'Western' academe and its assumed superiority continues to permeate academic research and literature. According to Connell (2007) not only is Western social science research Eurocentric but it is usually situated within an Anglophone context, in what Klitgård (2011a) calls the 'tyranny of the Anglosphere'. Marginson (2010) argues that 'equal cultural respect is hard to secure in Anglo-American countries in which systems are monocultural; there is usually an innate belief in Western superiority'. 'Internationalisation' needs to be more than inclusion of international examples in courses or the inclusion of an international 'dimension' into university operations (Knight, 2004). It needs to extend to engagement with intellectual traditions around the world so that international knowledge and perspectives are available for debate and learning by both academics and students. This view of internationalisation sees it as a mutual enterprise:

> The internationalisation of education can be expressed in the exchange of culture and values, mutual understanding and a respect for difference…The internationalisation of education does not simply mean the integration of different national cultures or the suppression of one national culture by another culture. (Gu, 2001, p. 105)

This definition of internationalisation views internationalisation not *within* a single system, but rather as an endeavour *between* civilisations. Implicit in Gu's definition is a reaction to internationalisation as a Western academic imperialist endeavour and the 'one way' nature of the traffic. As Singh (2009) argues, there is still much ignorance between Western and Chinese or 'Confucian-heritage culture' (CHC) intellectual paradigms and this is inhibiting two-way or transcultural learning. 'Western' and 'CHC' paradigms of scholarship and learning are generally described as dichotomies and debates on the 'Chinese learner' are inaccurate and unhelpful (Ryan & Louie, 2007). This 'ignorance' about supposed differences between academic cultures and individuals within them inhibits the mutual and respectful *exchange* of ideas

(as Gu advocates) rather than the simple *integration* of knowledge from one culture into another.

While supervision practices often ignore the potential for mutual learning (Rizvi, 2010; Robinson-Pant, 2009; Sillitoe, Webb & Zhang, 2005), something even less positive often happens in international student supervision. Instead of learning being two-way, the behaviours of international doctoral students are often misinterpreted and pathologised (Chung & Ingleby, 2011). Supervisors can misinterpret their lack of English language proficiency as lack of ability; their initial lack of sophisticated language as lack of intellect; their quest to find the 'correct' answer dependent learning rather than an active process to find out what is expected of them; their reluctance to question as lacking criticality rather than modesty or respect for their supervisor; and their relative silence in supervision meetings as lack of connection with ideas rather than internal engagement. Supervisors may view 'acts of textual borrowing' (Schmitt, 2005) as plagiarism rather than a necessary step in their learning development (Klitgård, 2011b). Without attempts by supervisors to understand what is unfamiliar for them, and the impact of their previous learning experiences, international students may be viewed as dependent learners lacking in criticality (Ryan & Louie, 2007). They not only have to learn new approaches and skills but also 'unlearn' their old ones. Recognition of these issues by the supervisor can be a catalyst for engagement in mutual learning which can be more productive for the supervisor and the student. Supervisors can help international doctoral students to not just 'bridge the gap' but to meet on the bridge (Ryan & Viete, 2009). However, international doctoral students sometimes report that they are required to conduct research only within their country of study rather than undertake comparative studies. This can occur because the supervisor may feel they lack knowledge of the overseas context or the subject area. International doctoral students are also generally not permitted to use foreign language sources as supervisors and examiners are unable to check them. This question needs further debate as these students want to ensure that their doctoral study has relevance for their future work.

Lingard (2006) believes that the agency that international students bring to the research encounter should be recognised. Trahar (2011) relates how her views radically changed during the intimate and close discussions with her international doctoral students where she could explore other cultures and values. *Transcultural* knowledge can develop from contact between cultures which results in 'a new, composite culture in which some existing cultural features are combined, while some are lost, and new features are generated' (Murray, 2010).

Socio-cultural theories of learning explain the importance of the cultural milieu of learning but also its potential for redefining learning communities as transcultural spaces. Transcultural approaches recognise that modern societies are no longer monolithic and that 'we are in an era where interculturality, transculturalism and the eventual prospect of identifying a cosmopolitan citizenship can become a reality' (Cuccioletta, 2002, p. 2). According to Sillitoe, Webb and Zhang (2005) working with doctoral students from Confucian cultures can bring new insights: they generate knowledge that is different from Western researchers; can penetrate and interpret Confucian cultures as 'insiders' but are skilled in 'Western' research methods; their more 'holistic' views of the world are useful when investigating issues such as sustainable development; and they help to clarify the 'normative' structures and practices of the Western supervision model for Western supervisors which in turn assists both home and international students.

> ...working with doctoral students from Confucian cultures can bring new insights: they generate knowledge that is different from Western researchers; ...and they help to clarify the 'normative' structures and practices of the Western supervision model for Western supervisors which in turn assists both home and international students

Moving towards cross cultural teaching

The work of theorists such as Lave and Wenger (1999) highlights the social and cultural situatedness of teaching and learning and the 'communities of practice' that exist through the co-construction of knowledge by teachers and learners. The importance of the social context can be seen through the adoption of teaching strategies such as group work and collaborative learning. The cultural 'boundedness' of such approaches, however - the ways they operate, whose voice is heard and whose knowledge is valued - and how these norms came to be is hard for those within that culture to recognise. Being an 'outsider' to a culture brings a 'surplus of seeing' (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 7) that makes academic norms visible; it can "make strange"

the present, in order to begin to provide a vocabulary for questioning the apparent naturalness and givenness of contemporary practices in postgraduate education' (Lee & Green, 1995, p. 3). Morris and Hudson (1995) argue that international education 'helps to problematise inherited notions of ideal pedagogic order' (p. 72).

Negative views of international students and Chinese students in particular are still prevalent (Singh, 2009) as lecturers and supervisors misinterpret the behaviours of their newly-arrived students as passive and lacking critical thinking (Grimshaw, 2007). Those with more intimate knowledge of Chinese learners refute these assumptions (Clark & Gieve, 2006; Grimshaw, 2007; Gu & Schweisfurth, 2006; Jin & Cortazzi, 2006; Louie, 2005; Shi, 2006). According to Grimshaw (2007):

> empirical studies reveal that, contrary to the Western stereotype, Chinese societies do value an exploratory and reflective approach to learning; that Chinese teachers do not rely exclusively upon the transmission mode of delivery; and that Chinese students can be seen to engage in autonomous, problem solving activities. (p. 302).

Academics continue, however, to report the same difficulties and 'pedagogical uncertainties' with teaching international students reported over a decade ago (Singh 2009; Turner & Robson, 2008). If these issues remain unaddressed, there is a risk of continued negative attitudes by lecturers about international students (Deumert, Marginson, Nyland, Ramia & Sawir, 2005; DeVos, 2003; Rizvi, 2010). Many academics remain unwilling or unconvinced of the need to change and adapt and see their role as educating students in 'Western ways' and 'Western values' (Trahar, 2011).

Lack of knowledge about the cultural situatedness of learning and teaching and different academic paradigms is inhibiting the development of cross cultural teaching that draws on an international range of approaches. This 'ignorance' means a lack of understanding of contemporary realities in countries such as China which is undergoing fundamental change as well as the enormous diversity amongst individuals within them (Jin & Cortazzi, 2006; Ryan, 2011a; Ryan, Kang, Mitchell & Erickson, 2009). Rather than focusing on 'differences' between cultures, changing contexts and imperatives call for recognition of the potential for common ground and mutual learning. To date, however, there has been little informed debate about differences between Western and CHC paradigms and even less debate about the diversities within them. Evidence from the study reported below shows that adaptation between academic cultures is currently unidirec-

tional, but that there are sufficient commonalities for the engagement with what are merely different approaches to be both possible and fruitful.

Western and CHC scholarship and learning

In order to understand the contemporary realities of Western and Chinese or CHC approaches to scholarship and learning, the research reported here investigated how these terms are understood and practised within both contexts. Rather than basing judgements about different systems on the behaviours of international students struggling to adapt and thus making assumptions about their previous educational contexts, this research examines understandings and practices by experienced academics within and across those systems. Interviews were conducted amongst a purposive sample of senior academics in a range of disciplines in universities in two Western and two Confucian-heritage countries: Australia and the UK, and China and Hong Kong. Participants had at least 10 years' experience and were at Associate Professor or equivalent level or above.

To date, 24 interviews have been conducted with scholars in the disciplines of Education or the Humanities. This comprises six interviews each in Australia and the UK with equal numbers from both disciplines (only two of the 12 participants had significant experience in China and none were of Chinese descent). Five interviews in each discipline have been conducted in mainland China (all with Chinese scholars, five never having been out of China), and one in each discipline in Hong Kong (one of Chinese descent and one of European descent, both with experience of Western and Chinese higher education). As this is a work in progress, findings are tentative and are discussed here for illustrative purposes. The total final number of interviews will be 54.

The participants were asked (in English or Chinese):

- How do you define characteristics of 'good' scholarship and 'effective' learning?
- What differences and commonalities do you believe exist between Western and CHC paradigms of scholarship and learning?
- Do you believe that these paradigms are changing or should change?

No attempt was made to define these terms; participants were invited to respond in any way they chose. Case study methodology (Stake, 2006) and a constant comparative method of analysis (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994) were used to identify commonalities and differ-

Table 1: Definitions of 'good scholarship and 'effective learning'

	Western	*Chinese*
'Good' scholarship	Original, original ideas	Original, innovative
	Imaginative	Uses imagination
	Creative	Creative, passion for pursuing knowledge
	Adds value, makes a difference	Has some value, beneficial
	Advances knowledge or thinking, application to existing knowledge	Contribution to knowledge, application of knowledge
	Rigorous, questioning, systematic	Systematic inquiry
	Sound theories and methods, innovative methodologies	Includes theory, methodology and subject knowledge, innovative methodologies
'Effective' learning	Understanding and applying knowledge	Deep and broad knowledge framework, applying knowledge
	Think for yourself	Critical thinking
	Work independently	Independent learner
	Challenge and interrogate authorities	Challenge authorities' views
	Think about what they learn and ask new questions	Know why you want to learn and what you should learn
	Build on what's known, develop new schema	[Combines] old and new academic knowledge

ences in participants' responses. Participants were identified via email contact with Deans or equivalent at 18 universities which included larger and smaller institutions, ones with longer and shorter histories, and urban and rural locations.

From the interviews conducted to date, it is clear that there are diverse and competing discourses within universities in both systems and amongst individuals, and scholars in different contexts have both shared and different views on scholarship and learning. The scholars' definitions of scholarship and research are strikingly similar across the two systems. Similar understandings of 'good' scholarship and 'effective' learning can be seen from the vocabulary used to describe these terms (see Table 1). These words and phrases have been taken verbatim from participants' responses to the first question and are representative of overall responses.

The high degree of commonality amongst respondents' responses may be due in part to the influence that Western pedagogy is having in China, although even the Chinese respondents who had never left China used these same terms.

Few Western participants could answer the second question about differences and commonalities between paradigms and freely admitted their ignorance of Chinese or CHC paradigms, often expressing regret about this. The participants who were able to venture an opinion had worked in China or had Chinese colleagues. While acknowledging that differences do occur in academic practices between systems, almost all respondents who answered this question (from both paradigms) emphasised the essential commonalities of ideas and concepts of scholarship and learning. Those with experience in both systems were more likely to report that features were more common than different as can be seen from the quotes below. A Chinese Professor of Humanities at a university in southern China (with experience in both systems) commented:

There are commonalities that good scholarship and effective learning share in both paradigms. An oft-cited belief in China is that the Western paradigm emphasises critical thinking whereas the CHC paradigm emphasises rote learning, memorisation and breadth of knowledge. I believe that differences exist only amongst individual scholars whether they are Eastern or Western.

An American-born Professor of Literature working in Hong Kong who had considerable experience in China noted similar concepts and aspirations in both systems but sometimes different methods of arriving at these:

I don't see any real difference in scholarship in China and in the West insofar as people want to have an understanding and an idea and represent their own understanding of the idea but I think that the way that you begin to arrive at that knowledge, the 'patterns of respect', the ways that you put yourself forward might be different in both places but the final results would likely be the same.

The final question about changes or the desirability of change in these paradigms also elicited similar and differ-

ent responses between and within the two groups. Academics on both sides reported that significant change is occurring within their own paradigm. Respondents from China and those with experience of China often commented on the pace and magnitude of change in China, as seen in the comment from a European Senior Lecturer in Linguistics with experience in China:

> In CHC things are currently changing so fast that it is breathtaking. The CHC scholars and learners are eager to catch up with the West, which has meant eagerness, openness, hard work in such measures that today the Western scholars and learners seem to be meandering along leisurely in comparison.

The American Professor of Literature mentioned above further commented:

> Confucian-heritage cultures are giving way to a certain kind of individuality and this is creating a different kind of learning environment… Oftentimes people will say that within Confucian-heritage cultures you are expected to parrot back what the teachers will say to you but that hasn't been my experience.

CHC academics generally expressed positive views about changes within their system and an enthusiasm for further change, while Western academics tended to comment on negative changes in their systems especially towards more managerialist approaches:

> Paradigms of scholarship and learning are becoming more market-driven in both the West and CHC countries. (History academic at a Russell Group university in London)

The statement below by a European lecturer in English with experience in China shows that there are perhaps more commonalities between systems than is generally thought while at the same time there is potential for beneficial learning between the systems:

> The freedom of research is an ideal that I think both paradigms ascribe to, but for both the real world sets limits. CHC scholarship is less/has been less open to Western scrutiny, perhaps less global…When it comes to learning [in China], I find that there perhaps has been a lack in confidence, a lack of belief in the individual, and also a lack of awareness of individual needs in order to learn best. In the West, on the other hand, there has been a lack of understanding that some learning requires hard work, and that not all learning comes automatically.

Some Western participants noted that while paradigms are changing in China, this is mainly one-way learning, from the West. The statement below from the American Professor of Literature quoted above shows that while China is learning from the West, it is trying to do this in a way that maintains the best of Confucian education traditions, that is, that combines the best features of both systems:

> I don't think that the West is radically changing their views on the educational process but I do think that China is Westernising. It is trying to understand different kinds of skill sets to give their students an opportunity to feel comfortable with Western styles of learning, with Western styles of knowledge and they're incorporating that within the classroom in their own way… they don't lose what is quintessentially Confucian or quintessentially Chinese.

... although there are differences and similarities towards knowledge and scholarship both within and across these contexts these are changing as contemporary conditions and imperatives become more closely tied to discourses of internationalisation and globalisation.

These interviews demonstrate that although there are differences and similarities towards knowledge and scholarship both within and across these contexts these are changing as contemporary conditions and imperatives become more closely tied to discourses of internationalisation and globalisation. The data also demonstrate that negative views about 'Chinese learners' are not based on contemporary expectations and practices of educators within Chinese contexts.

Potential for mutual learning

This research shows not only that each system holds much in common but also points to the potential for mutual learning when assumptions are critically examined and the possibilities for reciprocal learning are identified. Reciprocal learning in the doctoral sphere can occur through broadening the scope and topics for doctoral study, drawing on different cultural epistemologies and intellectual traditions, and considering how to assess unfamiliar modes of expression, argumentation and organisation of the dissertation. It also requires consideration of the inclusion of foreign language sources and on this point, and in general, international colleagues or examiners may be useful sources of expertise.

As China becomes a major player in world affairs, universities and academics need to understand the contexts with which they are engaging and be prepared to adapt and change so that they too can reinvigorate their own

cultures of learning. As international student mobility worldwide accelerates, many non-Anglophone countries are offering programmes in English, often at less cost, so universities enjoying traditional comparative advantages need to ensure that their education continues to be of high quality and relevance in the global education environment. The UK International Unit cautions against complacency in this regard:

> Patterns and flows of international students may start to change… mobile students are increasingly likely to choose destinations within their own regions, and thus we may begin to see less of an 'East-West' movement. (International Unit, 2011)

And equally, emerging countries need to avoid the slavish adoption of foreign ideas and practices and instead examine them for how they can enrich and rejuvenate their own.

The large numbers of international students at Australian and British universities provide opportunities for the development of more globalised paradigms and practices better suited to changing contexts around the world. Universities that limit their interactions with international students to one-way transmission of knowledge risk stagnation and lack of appeal to students, both home and international, who now have more choices available. A transcultural focus can better equip all students to live and work in globalised contexts and in ways that make labels such as 'home' or 'international' obsolete.

Transcultural approaches can provide the vehicle for such changes in pedagogy and curriculum; they move beyond interactions between cultures with one culture positioned as more powerful or 'legitimate', to a stance which arises from mutual dialogue and respect amongst academic cultures and knowledge traditions. Postgraduate supervisors and lecturers need to not just engage in rhetoric about internationalisation but also to listen to others' views of internationalisation; universities need to not just be institutions of learning but learning institutions. Individual supervisors need to develop 'meta awareness' of their students' backgrounds and needs (Louie, 2005) and universities and nations need to recognise the 'necessity for sharing knowledge, building intellectual capacity, and remaining competitive in the global economy' through global academic mobility (UK International Unit, 2011).

Sixteen years ago, Morris and Hudson (1995) noted 'the moment of intense change and complexity' of the times; few could have predicted the pace and acceleration of change and complexity of those trends. Diversity of student cohorts extends beyond national citizenship but also to cultural, linguistic, social and economic diversity, and to

issues of gender, sexuality and disability to name but a few; 'many different cultures appear within single geographical cultures' (Morris & Hudson, 1995, p. 73). It is timely to look back on the issues highlighted in this journal in 1995 and note Morris and Hudson's aspirations for moving beyond 'monocultural chauvinism' towards a 'new international academic ethos'. The editors of the special issue (Lee & Green, 1995) pointed to the connection between postgraduate education and national concerns. Since then, debates have moved to the global level and the relevance of postgraduate education for global knowledge economies. Imperatives for new forms of knowledge and skills have become more urgent. The experience and knowledge that international students bring to encounters between supervisors and students can be tapped to create this 'international academic ethos'. Universities are spaces where intercultural connections occur and can be at the forefront of global knowledge generation. Drawing from both traditions means that new knowledge can be created through more holistic approaches and a more reflective than adversarial orientation to knowledge. Supervisors can recognise the collaborative and respectful learning styles of their students rather than problematise them.

The evidence of the study reported here although limited does indicate that there are sufficient underlying similarities and aspirations to enable mutual adaptation and engagement between academic cultures. This stance can provide access to not only 5,000 years of Chinese intellectual development but also an opportunity to engage with China in its future trajectory as a world superpower.

Janette Ryan is a Research Associate at the China Centre at the University of Oxford, Director of the University of Oxford's International Students Teaching and Support Project and Director of the UK Higher Education Academy's Teaching International Students Project.

References

AEI. (Australian Education International). (2011). International Student Data, YTD April 2011. Available: http://www.austrade.gov.au/Export/Export_Markets/Industries/Education/International-Student-Data Accessed 7 June 2011.

Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays.* Edited by C. Emerson & M. Holquist, trans. Vern W. Gee. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Ballard, B. & Clanchy, J. (1997). *Teaching international students: A brief guide for lecturers and supervisors.* Deakin, ACT: IDP Education Australia.

Carroll, J. & Ryan, J. (2005). (eds), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all.* London: Routledge.

Chung, M. & Ingleby, R. (2011). Overcoming the cultural challenges in supervising Chinese research students in Australia. In J. Ryan (ed.) *China's higher education reform and internationalisation.* London: Routledge.

Clark, R. & Gieve, S. (2006). On the discursive construction of 'The Chinese Learner'. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 19*(1), 54–73.

Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science.* Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.

Cuccioletta, D. (2002). Multiculturalism or transculturalism: Towards a cosmopolitan citizenship. *London Journal of Canadian Studies, 17*, 1-11.

Deumert, A., Marginson, S., Nyland, C. Ramia, G. & Sawir, E. (2005). *The social and economic security of international students in Australia: Study of 200 student cases*. Clayton: Monash Institute for the Study of Global Movements.

Devos, A. (2003). Academic standards, internationalisation, and the discursive construction of 'The international student', *Higher Education Research and Development, 22*:2, 155–166.

Grimshaw, T. (2007), Problematizing the construct of 'the Chinese learner': Insights from ethnographic research. *Educational Studies, 33*(3), 299-311.

Gu, M. Y. (2001). *Education in China and abroad: Perspectives from a lifetime in comparative education.* Hong Kong: Comparative Research Education Centre, University of Hong Kong.

Gu, Q. & Schweisfurth, M. (2006) Who adapts? Beyond cultural models of 'the Chinese learner', *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 19*(1), 54–73.

Huisman, J. (2010). *Internationalisation in higher education: Local responses to global challenges.* Inaugural Seminar, Internationalisation and Globalisation in Higher Education, Society for Research in Higher Education International Research, London, 30 March 2010.

Jin, L. & Cortazzi, M. (2006). Changing practices in Chinese cultures. *Language, Culture & Curriculum, 19*(1), 5-20.

Klitgård, I. (2011a). The internationalisation of academic English writing in higher education: Anglo-American doctrines or transcultural hybridity? Between tradition and change: 'The future of English in the light of globalization, transculturalism, and Internationalization' Conference, University of Southern Denmark, Kolding, Denmark, 11-12 October 2011

Klitgård, I. (2011b). *Plagiarism in the international university: From kidnapping and theft to translation and hybridity.* In B. Preisler, I.Klitgård & H. Fabricius (Eds), Language and learning in the international university. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of International Studies, 8*(5), 5-31.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1999). Learning and pedagogy in communities of practice. In J. Leach & B. Moon (eds), *Learners and pedagogy*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Lee, A. & Green, B. (1995). Introduction: Postgraduate studies/postgraduate pedagogy? *Australian Universities' Review, 2*, 1-4.

Lingard, R. (2006). Globalisation, the research imagination and deparochialising the study of education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 4*(1), 287-302.

Louie, K. (2005). Gathering cultural knowledge: Useful or use with care? In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (eds) *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all.* London: Routledge.

Marginson, S. (2010). *International student security: Globalization, state, university.* Keynote address to the World Universities Forum, Davos, 9-11 January 2010.

Maykut, P. & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide.* London: Falmer.

Morris, S. & Hudson, W. (1995). International education and innovative approaches to university teaching. *Australian Universities' Review, 2*, 70-74.

Murray, D. (2010). *Female North African-French students in France: Narratives of educational experiences.* Doctoral thesis, University of Nevada. Available: http://digitalcommons.library.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/344 (accessed 20 June 2011).

OECD (Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation). (2011). *Education at a glance: Who studies abroad and where.* Available: http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2011/who-studies-abroad-and-where_eag-2011-25-en (accessed 28 October 2011).

Pan, S. Y. (2011). Education abroad, human capital development, and national competitiveness: China's Brain Gain strategies. *Frontiers of Education in China, 6*(1), 106-138.

Rizvi, F. (2010). International students and doctoral studies in transnational spaces. In Walker, M. & Thomson, P. (eds). *Routledge Doctoral Supervisor's companion: Supporting effective research in education and the social sciences.* London: Routledge.

Robinson-Pant, A. (2009). Changing academies: Exploring international PhD students' perspectives on 'host' and 'home' universities. *Higher Education Research and Development, 28*(4), 417-429.

Ryan, J. (2011a). (ed.). *China's higher education reform and internationalisation.* London: Routledge.

Ryan, J. (2011b). Teaching and learning for international students: Towards a transcultural approach. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 17*(6), 631-648.

Ryan, J., Kang, C.Y., Mitchell, I. & Erickson, G. (2009). China's basic education reform: An account of an international collaborative research and development project. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 29*(4), 427-441.

Ryan, J. & Louie, K. (2007). False dichotomy? 'Western' and 'Eastern' concepts of scholarship and learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory (39)*4, 404-417.

Ryan, J. & Viete, R. (2009). Respectful interactions: Learning with international students in the English-speaking academy. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*(3), 303-314.

Schmitt, D. (2005). Writing in the international classroom. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan. (eds), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all.* London: Routledge.

Shi, L. J. (2006). The successors to Confucianism or a new generation? A questionnaire study on Chinese students' culture of learning English. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 19*(1), 122-147.

Sillitoe, J. Webb, J. & Zhang, C. (2005). Postgraduate research: The benefits for institutions, supervisors and students of working across and between cultures. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (eds), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all.* London: Routledge.

Singh, M. (2009). Using Chinese knowledge in internationalising research education: Jacques Rancière, an ignorant supervisor and doctoral students from China. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 7*(2) 185-201.

Stake, R. (1996). *Multiple case study analysis.* New York: Guilford Press.

Trahar, S. (ed.) (2011). *The Doctorate: International stories of the UK experience.* Bristol: ESCalate Subject Centre. Available: http://escalate.ac.uk/8137 Accessed 5 July 2011.

Turner, Y. & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalizing the university.* London: Continuum.

UKCISA. (United Kingdom Council for International Student Affairs). (2011). *Higher Education Statistics*. Available at: http://www.ukcisa.org.uk/about/statistics_he.php#table2 (accessed 16 July 2011).

Universities UK International Unit. (2010). *International Focus*, 15 September 2010. Available at: http://www.international.ac.uk/resources/International%20Focus%2061.15.09.10.pdf (accessed 14 December 2010)

UK International Unit (2011). *International Focus*, 26 May 2011.

Webb, G. (2005). Internationalisation of the curriculum: An institutional approach. In:J. Carroll & J. Ryan (eds), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all.* London: Routledge.

Internationalisation of doctoral education, Janette Ryan   **63**