



TOWARDS A FRAMEWORK FOR VIRTUAL INTERNATIONALIZATION

Elisa Bruhn, Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg, Germany

Summary

Digitalization, internationalization, and an expansion of flexible distance provision are among the trends which the higher education landscape is experiencing in many countries today. At the intersection of these trends, the traditional boundaries between distance and conventional education are becoming blurred (Guri-Rosenblit, 2014; p.114; Naidu, 2003; p.350), with distance and on-campus education both embracing online learning that can be accessed easily from anywhere on the planet. Virtual transnational education (TNE) and massive open online courses (MOOCs) are prominent examples of higher education crossing borders (Knight, 2016; p.328). Furthermore, the aim to internationalize the curriculum is playing an increasing role in traditional and distance education today. Institutions, instructional designers and instructors have stepped up efforts to internationalize the on-campus classroom as well as distance education with the help of information and communications technology (ICT). These efforts find their expression, for example, in attempts to introduce intercultural awareness into online course development (e.g. Gunawardena, 2014), as well as in virtual mobility and collaborative online international learning (COIL) projects in on-campus higher education (e.g. Guth, 2013). In an endeavour to conceptualize the abundance of approaches aiming at internationalizing higher education via virtual media, this paper proposes an approach to formulating a comprehensive framework for *virtual internationalization* by focusing on its global, intercultural, and international dimensions.

Conceptualizing virtual internationalization

The internationalization of higher education has changed its nature in recent years. Gone are the days when the idea was practically synonymous with the physical mobility of students. The emergence of concepts focusing on the possibilities of internationalization *at home* (IaH) or *of the curriculum* (IoC) (Beelen & Jones, 2015) points to an increasing awareness that internationalization is not necessarily limited to university members crossing physical borders. Instead, certain curricular activities on campus or online have been developed to complement or substitute physical mobility (de Wit & Hunter, 2016). In the course of such development, with the research fields of digitalization and distance education playing their part, virtual forms of internationalization have gained importance in on-campus and distance education alike.

Scholars have recently conceived concepts such as virtual mobility, globally networked learning (GNL), virtual exchange, telecollaboration, and collaborative online international learning (COIL), to name a few (Guth, 2013; UNICollaboration, 2014). These concepts are commonly used to label facets of internationalizing on-campus education at the classroom or program (micro) level, and have proven useful in advancing the idea of virtual forms of internationalization. However, they generally do not provide a comprehensive model of virtual internationalization that could be applied on the macro-, meso-, and micro levels of both online and on-campus higher education, and from the classroom to the national or sector level. Yet, virtual internationalization expands the possibilities of internationalizing higher education in many ways – being more than virtual mobility only, just as internationalization is more than mobility only.

The term *virtual* has been defined, for the computer context, as “not physically present as such but made by software to appear to be so from the point of view of a program or user” and as “established or conducted using computer technology” (OED Online, 2013). Hence, reformulating Knight’s widely accepted definition of internationalization, the term *virtual internationalization* can be understood as follows:

Virtual internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of introducing an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the delivery, purpose or functions of higher education with the help of information and communications technology (ICT). (own definition, based on Knight (2003; p.2) (modifications emphasized))

Thus, by simply including mention of information and communications technology (ICT) into Knight’s broad definition, the resulting definition of *virtual internationalization* is comprehensive enough to cover all kinds of ICT supported measures and processes at different organizational levels, as well as the delivery, purpose and functions of higher education. The foundations for this endeavour are laid in this article, by approaching the required framework from the three dimensions mentioned in the definition: global, intercultural, and international.

The global dimension

The global dimension of internationalization is described by Knight (2004) as referring to “worldwide in scope and substance ... [while] not highlight[ing] the concept of nation” (p.8). The discussion of this aspect includes activities of higher education institutions that have a worldwide or part-world (Marginson, 2011; p.12) reach, as well as those that aim at introducing a global dimension into the *at-home* curriculum. The part-world aspect may, for example, refer to developing countries in which HEIs of the “developed world” pursue some kind of “global engagement” (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007; p.20).

The phenomenon of *worldwide reach* is the first to be addressed in this paper. Marginson (2011) suggests speaking of the *glonacal* era of higher education, distinguishing three levels that influence and affect each other: *global*, *national*, and *local* (p.13). The virtual delivery of

programs, in his view, can contribute to the global dimension of higher education, especially because of the potential to take “higher education straight from the local to the global dimension” (p.22), bypassing the national level. Of course, the adoption of necessary national and international frameworks and agreements (such as the General Agreement of Trade and Services – GATS) is a prerequisite for such worldwide reach to rise to its full potential (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007).

Higher education institutions and consortia, as well as private providers have discovered globally available higher education as a growth market, and have started offering online degrees and certificates worldwide. MOOCs and MOOC providers such as Coursera, Udacity, and Iversity are further examples working at the global scale. In fact, having been unknown to most only a few years ago, MOOCs are now being considered and applied by many institutions around the world as a valid internationalization instrument (Knight, 2014; p.49). These examples demonstrate that distance education providers have the potential to transcend national borders, enrolling massive numbers of students from almost any location worldwide (Gunawardena, 2014; p.75; Guri-Rosenblit, 2014; p.119). However, Amirault and Visser (2010; pp.23-24) show that virtual program offerings do not *automatically* cross borders, nor result in the same effects everywhere. Virtual universities have not always been successful – the most important reasons are presumed to lie in the incapacity to appeal to the global target groups, in quality and intercultural issues, and in political factors (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007; p.10, p.42).

What is more, in spite of their theoretical potential of worldwide reach, many online distance programs are targeted at a domestic market (Sadykova, 2012; p.2), and the ratio of students enrolled in these courses while living abroad is low in many countries. In the United States in 2014, for example, just over 1.3% of students taking exclusively distance education courses offered from the United States resided abroad (Snyder, de Brey, & Dillow, 2016). Of course, there are students from everywhere in the world who live *within* a certain country that need to be taken into consideration. One distinctive example is Kiron based in Germany, which, in collaboration with traditional higher education institutions and their on-campus programs, offers online higher education for refugees, thus opening up German education to a global clientele who live within the country.

In any case, be it in- or out-of-country provision, be it online distance or on-campus education, the next step is to follow Amirault and Visser (2010) in asking: “The question ... is not just *Do we have international participants?*, but rather, *Do we have internationalized learning environments?*” (p.28, emphasis in original). This leads to the second aspect in this section, namely introducing a *global* component to the *at-home* curriculum. Rephrasing the quote by Amirault and Visser, one could ask: In what ways can ICT help to introduce a global dimension into all kinds of programs in higher education? Is it not so that many institutional mission statements and national higher education internationalization strategies aim to prepare students to live in a *globalized world* in which they are being challenged to become *global citizens* and foster *global understanding*, thereby contributing to the *global knowledge*

society as inhabitants of the *global village* (cf. Teichler, 2004; p.23)? Indeed, scholars have identified a shift towards an “approach to internationalisation that sees the principal outcome of international education as educating graduates able to live and work in a global society” (de Wit & Hunter, 2015; p.51). Internationalization, in this sense, does not mean only the enrolment of students from anywhere in the world (either domestically or via forms of globally available education); it includes the aspect of introducing a *global* component into the *at-home* curriculum in on-campus and online distance education alike.

The intercultural dimension

Regarding the intercultural dimension of virtual internationalization, two aspects will again be addressed in this paper: The first is the attempt to provide an interculturally adequate classroom to facilitate the same quality of learning for all students, however interculturally diverse they may be (Edmundson, 2009). The second aspect is the effort to foster increased intercultural competence of participants.

Investigating questions that revolve around interculturally sensitive online classrooms, scholars have examined culture and intercultural learning in virtual environments in different ways. One approach is to ask about learners’ and instructors’ diversity and *cultural differences*, which are generally perceived as essential to their nationality, ethnicity, or other significant cultural characteristic. Often influenced by the works of authors such as Geert Hofstede or Edward Hall, insightful results on learners from different cultural backgrounds have been obtained by, for example, M. Wang (2007) and Mishra (2011). Another approach is to focus on *cultural resemblances*, perceiving an increasing portion of learners in the online classroom as *digital natives*, members of a global *cyberculture*, etc. Palfrey, in an e-mail to his colleague Gasser, envisions an emerging global culture with the information network of the Internet at the source of an intensification of cross-cultural exchanges, the benefits of which by far exceed those of student exchange programs (Palfrey & Gasser, 2008; pp.274-275). A third approach is to understand culture in the online classroom as being constructed (or negotiated) (Gunawardena, 2014; p.83), in other words, as a *third culture* (Raybourn, Kings, & Davies, 2003; p.106). This perspective follows the assumption that learners and instructors bring their experiences, their types of socialization, and their culturally formed learning and teaching styles into the online classroom, parts of which the others may share, and part of which they do not. In the virtual space, then, there is the potential – not the automatism! – that a *new cultural amalgam* (Ess, 2009; p.18) can be created among participants.

It has been argued that instead of an equalizing cyberculture emerging naturally in online education, it is necessary to provide a culturally sensitive classroom (Gunawardena, 2014; O’Mahony, 2014). Yet, the solution cannot reside in “duplicat[ing] the learning environment from the learners’ home culture. Rather, the purpose is to build mutual accommodation and respect for the culture of others in order to reach academic success” (Wang & Reeves, 2007; p.10). This may prove necessary, especially because differences encountered in the online classroom may be less obvious than in face-to-face classrooms, and because they are not limited to evident ones such as language. They can also be hidden in culturally influenced

learning styles, values, or even religious influences (Edmundson, 2009). As this is obviously no easy task, it has been suggested that development programs for faculty and support personnel should be provided (Boubsil & Carabajal, 2011; p.12).

The second aspect of the intercultural dimension to be discussed in this section is the fostering of learners' *intercultural competence*. This term can be understood to be:

... the appropriate and effective management of interaction between people who, to some degree or another, represent different or divergent affective, cognitive, and behavioral orientations to the world. ... The extent to which individuals manifest aspects of, or are influenced by, their group or cultural affiliations and characteristics is what makes an interaction an intercultural process. (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009; p.7, emphasis in original)

Intercultural competence, in this sense, is required of people interacting with others who manifest features of a culture that differs from their own. It has been argued that any intergroup interaction has this affordance, since intercultural differences are related not only to nationality, but also to characteristics such as ethnicity, religion, or region (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009; p.7). In the virtual space, there is reason to believe that establishing this kind of competence requires approaches that are different from those that can be applied in physical encounters. This is particularly true when communicating via asynchronous textual tools, because visual cues and immediate feedback are lacking (Sadykova, 2012; p.41). On the other hand, scholars have also valued the potential of bringing intercultural learning into online education because of the possibility to draw benefit from the multicultural composition of many (if not all) online classes (Ess, 2009; p.25). As Knight (2004) puts it: "We know that internationalization is also about relating to the diversity that exists within countries, communities, and institutions" (p.11).

The international dimension

Again, two aspects of the topic under discussion are presented in this section. The first deals with the international reach of higher education, and the second with international curricula. In contrast to the *global* dimension, which describes phenomena and processes transgressing the national level without highlighting the concept of nation, the *international* dimension is characterized by a limited number of countries that may be involved.

The aspect I will discuss in the context of international reach is transnational education (TNE) and specifically, *virtual TNE*. TNE has been defined as "[a]ward- or credit-bearing learning undertaken by students who are based in a different country from that of the awarding institution" (O'Mahony, 2014; p. 8). In this sense, virtual TNE refers to those cross-border programs that are delivered via distance provision. In practice, many TNE programs today offer a mixed delivery mode of blending distance learning with on-campus elements – for example, through support structures or twinning models (Ziguras, 2008; p.644). Virtual TNE is a growing market: "Rapid advances in the Internet, multimedia, and e-learning technologies provide increasing support for the adoption or expansion of distance learning technologies as

a delivery method for transnational education” (Boubsil & Carabajal, 2011; p.6). It is therefore estimated that the demand for international higher education will continue to grow, and that the online, distance delivery of TNE will play an increasing role in the future (de Wit & Hunter, 2015; p.49; Knight, 2016; p.334).

Coming to the second aspect of this section – international curricula – I will focus on the concept of *virtual mobility*. Of course, there are other facets that this aspect may encompass, including (but not limited to) virtually assisted foreign language or area studies (de Wit & Hunter, 2015; p.42; cf. also Leask, 2015). Exemplarily, this section concentrates on the “buzzword” virtual mobility, which requires special attention in order not to be confused with virtual internationalization as a whole. The term can be understood as a physical international experience being complemented or substituted by a virtual component (Leask, 2015; p.19). While with virtual TNE, a whole program moves abroad, virtual mobility can be applied to essentially any curriculum, be it online distance education or on-campus delivery. Collaborative online international learning (COIL), established at the State University of New York, is an example of an especially successful model of virtual mobility. Bringing classes from two (sometimes more) countries together online, the COIL method “promotes interactive shared coursework, emphasizing experiential learning and gives collaborating students a chance to get to know each other while developing meaningful projects together” (Guth, 2013; p.2). While some argue that COIL is the more accurate term than virtual mobility (de Wit, 2013), it may be advisable to retain the former. The term *virtual mobility* opens up the possibility to include international virtual experiences that are not necessarily grounded in collaboration, but provide other forms of virtual travel, including *virtual field trips* (cf. e.g. <http://www.georama.com/berkeley-college/>), and *virtual internships* (Vriens & van Petegem, 2011). For a more profound discussion of different forms of virtual mobilities, cf. Urry (2007). In fact, many scholars see virtual mobility as “one of the most flexible, versatile and inclusive approaches in the provision of international experience opportunities” (Villar-Onrubia & Rajpal, 2016; p.75; cf. also MOVINTER, 2010). And the founder of the German MOOC provider Iversity envisions virtual student exchanges modelled on the European program ERASMUS – an “online ERASMUS for all” (Klöpfer, 2014).

Conclusion: Towards a framework for virtual internationalization

In this paper, I have investigated three potential dimensions of virtual internationalization. Each time, two perspectives have been taken: The first concerns the involvement of a global, intercultural, or international *clientele* or *reach*. The second considers a global, intercultural, or international *curriculum*.

The considerations of this paper have shown that the concept of *virtual internationalization* has potential in all three dimensions, going far beyond the ‘buzzword’ of *virtual mobility*. In order to conceptualize a comprehensive model of virtual internationalization, it will be necessary to further investigate its manifestations and potentials at the micro, meso, and macro levels. This paper has provided a stepping stone for this endeavour.

References

1. Amirault, R. J., & Visser, Y. L. (2010). *The impact of e-learning programs on the internationalization of the university*. New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
2. Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). Redefining Internationalization at Home. In A. Curaj, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi, & P. Scott (Eds.), *The European Higher Education Area: Between Critical Reflections and Future Policies* (Vol. 1, pp. 59-72). doi:10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_5
3. Boubsil, O., & Carabajal, K. (2011). Implications of globalization for distance education in the United States. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 25(1), 5-20.
4. Edmundson, A. (2009, April 5). Culturally accessible e-learning: An overdue global business imperative [Blog post]. Association for Talent Development. Retrieved from <https://www.td.org/Publications/Magazines/TD/TD-Archive/2009/04/Culturally-Accessible-E-Learning-An-Overdue-Global-Business-Imperative>
5. Ess, C. (2009). When the solution becomes the problem: Cultures and individuals as obstacles to online learning. In R. Goodfellow & M.-N. Lamy (Eds.), *Learning cultures in online education* (pp. 15-29). London, England: Continuum.
6. Gunawardena, C. (2014). Globalization and cross-cultural aspects. In O. Zawacki-Richter & T. Anderson (Eds.), *Online distance education: Towards a research agenda* (pp. 75-108). Edmonton, Canada: AU Press.
7. Guri-Rosenblit, S. (2014). Distance education systems and institutions. In O. Zawacki-Richter & T. Anderson (Eds.), *Online distance education: Towards a research agenda* (pp. 109-130). Edmonton, Canada: AU Press.
8. Guth, S. (2013). *The COIL Institute for Globally Networked Learning in the Humanities. Final report*. Retrieved from http://coil.suny.edu/sites/default/files/case_study_report.pdf
9. Klöpfer, H. (2014, July 9). Online-Erasmus für alle [Blog post]. The European.eu. Retrieved from <http://de.theeuropean.eu/hannes-kloepper--2/8719-digitale-innovation-an-europas-hochschulen>
10. Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33(Fall 2003), 2-3.
11. Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
12. Knight, J. (2014). Three generations of crossborder higher education: New developments, issues and challenges. In B. Streitwieser (Ed.), *Internationalisation of higher education and global mobility* (pp. 43-58). Oxford, England: Symposium Books.
13. Knight, J. (2016). Meaning, rationales and tensions in the internationalisation of higher education. In S. McGrath & Q. Gu (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of international education and development* (pp. 325-339). Abingdon, England: Routledge.
14. Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the curriculum*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.

15. Marginson, S. (2011). Imagining the global. In R. King, S. Marginson, & R. Naidoo (Eds.), *Handbook on globalization and higher education* (pp. 10-39). Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar Publishing.
16. Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2007). *Globalisation and higher education* OECD Directorate for Education (Ed.) *Education working paper* No. 8. doi:10.1787/173831738240
17. Mishra, T. P. (2011). *International student curricular preferences in U.S. institutions of higher learning*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. UMI No. 482202.
18. MOVINTER. (2010). *In praise of virtual mobility: How ICT can support institutional cooperation and internationalisation of curricula in higher education. White Paper proposed by initiative of the MOVINTER Project*. Retrieved from http://www.epics-ve.eu/images/stories/Documents/EMundus_MOVINTER_WHITE_PAPER.pdf
19. Naidu, S. (2003). Designing instruction for e-learning environments. In M. G. Moore & W. G. Anderson (Eds.), *Handbook of distance education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
20. OED Online (2013). Virtual (3rd ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/223829>
21. O'Mahony, J. (2014). *Enhancing student learning and teacher development in transnational education*. The Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/enhancingtne_final_080414.pdf
22. Palfrey, J. G., & Gasser, U. (2008). *Born digital. Understanding the first generation of digital natives*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
23. Raybourn, E. M., Kings, N., & Davies, J. (2003). Adding cultural signposts in adaptive community-based virtual environments. *Interacting with Computers*, 15, 91-107.
24. Sadykova, G. V. (2012). *Learning experiences of international students in online courses: Mixed methods study*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. UMI No. 3549575.
25. Snyder, T. D., de Brey, C., & Dillow, S. A. (2016). *Digest of education statistics 2014 (NCES 2016-006)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education / National Center for Education Statistics.
26. Spitzberg, B. H., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 2-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
27. Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education*, 48, 5-26.
28. UNICollaboration (2014). *Position paper: Virtual exchange in the European Higher Education Area*. Retrieved from http://unicollaboration.eu/sites/default/files/Position%20paper_1.pdf

29. Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
30. Villar-Onrubia, D., & Rajpal, B. (2016). Online international learning: Internationalising the curriculum through virtual mobility at Coventry University. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 20(2-3), 75-82. doi:10.1080/13603108.2015.1067652
31. Vriens, M., & van Petegem, W. (2011). *Make it work! Integrating virtual mobility in international work placements*. Retrieved from http://www.euvip.eu/resources/Manual_ONLINE.pdf
32. Wang, C.-M., & Reeves, T. C. (2007). The meaning of culture in online education: Implications for teaching, learning, and design. In A. Edmundson (Ed.), *Globalized e-learning cultural challenges* (pp. 1-18). Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.
33. Wang, M. (2007). Designing online courses that effectively engage learners from diverse cultural backgrounds. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(2), 294-311. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00626.x
34. de Wit, H. (2013, June 1). COIL – Virtual mobility without commercialisation [Blog post]. University World News, (274). Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130528175741647>
35. de Wit, H., & Hunter, F. (2015). Understanding internationalisation of higher education in the European context. In H. de Wit, E. Egron-Polak, L. Howard, & F. Hunter (Eds.), *Internationalisation of higher education* (pp. 41-58). doi:10.2861/444393
36. de Wit, H., & Hunter, F. (2016). Trends, issues and challenges in internationalisation of higher education: Where have we come from and where are we going? In S. McGrath & Q. Gu (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of international education and development* (pp. 340-358). Abingdon, England: Routledge.
37. Ziguras, C. (2008). Cultural and contextual issues in the evaluation of transnational distance education. In T. Evans, M. Haughey, & D. Murphy (Eds.), *International handbook of distance education* (pp. 639-653). Bingley, England: Emerald.