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Abstract

Work on academic mobility has primarily explored the movement of people and the production and circulation of ideas, concepts, and innovations in scientific research. The movement of knowledge for the purpose of HE teaching and learning, however, remains under-researched. Aiming to respond to this lack of attention, this thesis investigates how international academic staff transfer ideas and academic perspectives acquired in non-UK pedagogic environments to students at UK universities. The thesis examines the opportunities and challenges migrant academic staff face in engaging in such knowledge transfer while adapting to UK HE, exploring three research objectives: (1) to analyse the experiences of migrant academic staff in the UK with regard to the transfer and adaptation of international ideas and concepts in their teaching and learning practice; (2) to examine the impact of “foreignness as a teaching resource” (Alberts 2008: 198) on UK students taught by international academics; and (3) to assess to what extent UK universities recognise and support non-UK academics as a valuable resource in teaching and learning. To address these objectives, I utilised a multi-method approach comprising 41 semi-structured interviews with international faculty, senior management and professional development staff, and a questionnaire survey with 185 undergraduate students. The fieldwork was conducted at three research-intensive case-study universities in England, from December 2014 to January 2016.

The thesis significantly advances knowledge on geographies of education and migration studies in several ways. First, it highlights the uneven geographies of knowledge transfer in HE teaching and learning. Second, student encounters with migrant academic staff may drive change in certain UK undergraduate learners through developing intercultural respect, stimulating open-mindedness, expanding horizons, and promoting tolerance of otherness. Third, the case-study universities only cursorily capitalised on migrant academics’ insights about other knowledge environments in relation to pedagogic approaches and knowledge claims, and therefore the thesis points to the need for further progressive debates about how best to mobilise and support international best practice. In doing the above, the thesis advances a new conceptualisation – double-being, double-thinking – that emphasises the disparate knowledge environments that migrant academics straddle. Thus, the thesis opens up a new research agenda in emerging scholarship about the internationalisation of higher education through migrant academic staff.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Internationalising HE [higher education] is a transformative and continual process of sector-wide concern. Learning, teaching and research, and the interconnections between them are centrally important.

Promoting a high quality, equitable and global learning experience can help prepare graduates to live in and contribute responsibly to a globally interconnected society. Everyone within HE can make a valuable contribution to the process of internationalisation, working in collaboration as an international academic community. Individuals bring a plurality of identities, cultures, languages and experiences that can enrich and enhance learning, teaching and research. Thus, responsibility for internationalising HE is shared among organisations, individuals and curriculum (Advance HE 2018: no pagination).

1.1 Introduction

In August 2010, The Indian Express, an English-language Indian newspaper published an article entitled ‘UK to send students to India for better skills’. It began with the following opening paragraph to its readers:

British students could soon sit and study alongside Indians in lecture halls at universities in India as part of plans to make UK students more employable by giving them international experience of living in other countries (The Indian Express 2010: no pagination).

The agenda for this article was set by David Willetts, former Minister of State for Universities and Science under David Cameron’s Conservative-Liberal Democrats coalition government, who led a delegation of business leaders and University Vice-Chancellors to India, as part of a ministerial visit to establish joint-degree programmes between the two countries (Labi 2010). In an interview with the UK’s The Telegraph, Willetts laid out this transformative vision for UK higher education policy and practice, saying “one of my aims is to try and encourage our undergraduates and postgraduates to study abroad. [...] It would enrich the outlook of British students and make them more employable” (Paton 2010: no pagination). This latitude for action came after the Confederation of British Industry (CBI) reported that 71% of employers were “not satisfied with the foreign language skills of young people” and that 55% “perceive shortfalls in their international cultural awareness” (Confederation of British Industry 2010: 23). Latest figures portray a story of little
notable shift, with 66% and 56% in 2017 respectively (Confederation of British Industry 2017). For those students who do not gain international experience through study, work or volunteering overseas, campus-based internationalisation strategies aim to integrate an intercultural and international dimension into the student experience (Knight 2012). Through an examination of British higher education, this thesis analyses the internationalisation of UK students through migrant\(^1\) academic staff, highlighting the transformative potential international academics can have on 'immobile' undergraduate students in terms of fostering global outlook, intercultural respect, and career aspirations.

The dissertation responds, in part, to a recent call by Kim (2009: 398) for a detailed “investigation on the mobility and recruitment of international academics and their impact on the internationalization of British HE”. It addresses the question of how international academic staff transfer ideas and academic perspectives acquired in non-UK pedagogic environments to students at UK universities. The thesis will examine the opportunities and challenges migrant academics face in engaging in such knowledge transfer while adapting to UK higher education. The project builds upon wider debates in geography and other social sciences about the benefits and challenges of internationalising higher education. Emphasising the importance of international mobility of students and staff in the 1990s (Blumenthal et al., 1996), policymakers also identified a need for providing the majority of non-mobile students with international perspectives to prepare them for an increasingly globalising job market (Wächter 2003). For example, through the internationalisation of the curriculum, the opening of branch campuses, and the expansion of distance and e-learning opportunities (Knight 2003). With this proliferation of institutional strategies, interdisciplinary research on internationalisation in higher education has grown substantially in the last two decades. However, the majority of this work has analysed the context, patterns and socio-cultural and economic implications of international academic mobility rather than knowledge transfer in learning and teaching through international academic staff (Kim 2009).

In the UK higher education system, the recent rise in the number of migrant academic staff is predicted to continue (in 2015-16, 29% of academic staff were non-UK nationals compared to 19% in 2005-06; Universities UK International 2017a)

---

\(^1\) In this thesis, the term migrant academic is used interchangeably with international academic, non-British academic and non-UK academic.
which has led key commentators to talk of a potential “de-nationalization of the profession” (Kim 2009: 398). This international academic mobility has mainly been research-driven (Bauder 2015), but there are significant implications for learning and teaching at universities. Migrant academic staff – those who received their education outside of the UK prior to taking up an academic position in the country – contribute to the internationalisation of students at UK universities in a number of ways. For instance, they may provide different conceptual, methodological and empirical content in their teaching materials, apply different pedagogic approaches, and utilise their international networks to enhance the student experience (Alberts 2008).

However, the presence of migrant staff in UK universities also poses significant challenges for the individuals themselves, their students and the employing universities. The migrant academics need to adapt to new institutional practices in a different cultural and learning environment, the students need to adjust to non-native English speakers as well as to unfamiliar approaches to the subject, and the institutions need to assure high quality of student learning (Lewis 2005; Foote et al., 2008; Green and Myatt 2011). Given the potential contribution of migrant academic staff to the internationalisation of the curriculum and to promoting intercultural understanding, the lack of research on this topic, particularly in the UK context, is surprising (see, for example, the absence of this theme in the comprehensive review by Caruana and Spurling 2007). Existing recent studies have focused on the challenges faced by non-UK academic staff in a new pedagogic environment (Luxon and Peelo 2009; Hsieh 2012; Pherali 2012) but only cursorily point to the rich experience they can bring to UK higher education. This lacuna is productive, in that it represents an opportunity to shape emergent debates around internationalising UK students through migrant academic staff.

1.2 Research context

In a review article in Progress in Human Geography, Holloway et al., (2010: 583) begin their paper entitled ‘Geographies of education and the significance of children, youth and families’ with the statement “education warrants further attention by geographers”. Over the past decade, a focus upon higher education has come to the fore within the discipline, with wide-ranging research agendas spanning academic mobility, knowledge production and circulation (e.g., Ackers 2005, 2008; Jöns 2007, 2009, 2011a, 2015, 2018a; Hoffman 2009; Leung 2013; Trippl 2013; Bilecen and Van
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Mol 2017); student mobility (e.g., Weichbrodt 2014; Sondhi and King 2017); studentification (Smith and Holt 2007; Hubbard 2009); transregional university alliances (Harrison et al., 2016); university rankings (Jöns and Hoyler 2013); internationalisation (e.g., Knight 1994, 2004; Altbach and Knight 2007; Robson 2011); globalisation (e.g., Scott 1998); and philanthropy (Warren et al., 2014, 2016). Within these different themes, this thesis draws on two main bodies of scholarly work: academic mobility and internationalisation ‘at home’ (IaH) (e.g., Caruana and Spurling 2007; Leask 2015). These diverse but interconnected lines of inquiry usefully inform emerging debates about internationalising immobile UK undergraduate students through migrant academic staff.

One of the central tenets of mobilities and education is that the global flows of academics and students are fundamental to internationalising universities (Jöns 2015). Work on academic mobility is increasingly prolific. The key finding is that “transnational movements of academics shape the production and dissemination of knowledge and thus the geographies of contemporary knowledge economies” (Jöns 2007: 97). Similarly, this significance of global academic flows and knowledge networks is integral to the rise of knowledge centres and their shifting geographical formations (Jöns 2015; Scott 2015). Most studies on transnational academic mobility have examined the production and circulation of people, ideas, concepts and innovations in scientific research. In all these instances, however, the movement of knowledge for the purpose of higher education teaching and learning remains conceptually and empirically underexplored. Aiming to respond to this lack of attention, this thesis provides the first UK study to investigate the role of migrant academic staff for internationalisation strategies ‘at home’.

Extending the focus to student mobility, there is vibrant literature on transnational education (TNE) (e.g., Waters and Leung 2012) and capital accumulation (e.g., Findlay et al., 2017). Study abroad is touted as transformational travel; a ‘rite of passage’ where young adults have the opportunity to live in another country, experience different cultural traditions (music, religion, food) and embrace new friendships and social encounters (e.g., Brooks and Waters 2011; Grabowski et al., 2017; King and Sondhi 2018). Linked to this, King and Ruiz-Gelices (2003: 246) point out that UK students who spend time abroad, under a European mobility programme, tend to have a greater “propensity to acquire a more ‘European’ identity”, are “more favourably inclined towards European integration” and “see
themselves as ‘belonging to a European cultural space’”. Similarly, Tsoukalas (2008: 147) suggests that exchange students “function as bridges that connect disparate social circles with each other” – it is these bridges, Tsoukalas argues, that facilitate intercultural learning (see Chapter 5 for a discussion about knowledge brokerage). On the other hand, King et al., (2011: 165, emphasis in original) underline the significance of “social class reproduction and elite formation”, where international education favours the highly educated, wealthy and privileged. On a European scale, this diagnosis is consistent with the Euro Student report, which concluded that “students from low-income families make substantially less use of the opportunities for studying abroad than do those from families with higher incomes” (Schnitzer and Zempel-Gino 2002: 115).

In the UK, a focus on educational mobility has recently come to prominence. This is evident through changes in government policy regarding the value of overseas credentials (documented in the media articles mentioned above). Such observations are inextricably linked to global trends in the internationalisation of higher education. The British Council, for instance, estimate that 3.85 million higher education students will be globally mobile by 2024 (British Council 2013). This impressive figure reveals significant growth in student migration and mobility, up 27% from 2011. Focusing specifically on the United Kingdom reveals a major beneficiary host country of inbound learners (alongside the United States and Australia), 442,000 students in 2011 – a figure predicted to increase to 568,000 by 2024, which is a growth of 29% (British Council 2013; note the pre-Brexit date of the British Council document). Since the Brexit referendum, concerns have grown within the higher education sector about international student mobility to the UK (Busby 2018) and uncertainty surrounding research collaborations with European Union (EU) institutions (Henley 2017). Despite these fears, figures published by UCAS report that EU and international non-EU applications rose in 2018 (3.4% and 11% respectively; UCAS 2018). The increase of EU students can be attributed to the government’s reassurance that EU nationals will “remain eligible for undergraduate, master’s, postgraduate and advanced learner financial support in [the] academic year 2018 to 2019” (Department for Education 2017: no pagination). A weaker exchange rate can also explain the buoyed applications (Busby 2018). In the wake of the country’s decision to leave the European Union, Orr-Ewing (2017: no pagination)
poses the interesting question “How will UK universities keep their students thinking globally post-Brexit?”

Outbound mobility, in contrast, is relatively low (Sweeney 2012). During an interview with one migrant academic, the lecturer exclusively linked student immobility to the ‘geopolitics of emotion’ (Moïsi 2009), for example, fear of travelling and mixing with other cultures, while another interviewee depicted British undergraduate students as provincially-minded (see Chapter 6 for a detailed discussion). For the academic year 2015-16, the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) reported that 27,405 UK domiciled students studied or worked overseas as part of their university degree, representing 2% of total UK learners in that year (Universities UK International 2017b). By contrast, in Germany, 6% of university graduates in 2014 had experienced study or training abroad for three or more months at least once (DAAD and DZHW 2015). Beyond this, there is a dimension of UK higher education in which scholarship remains relatively nascent: the immobile learner, currently 98% of all UK students (Universities UK International 2017b). There have been some key papers outlining immobile students’ relationship with migrant academics, although these are mostly framed within a North American (Alberts 2008; Foote et al., 2008; Hutchison 2016), Australian (Green and Myatt 2011) and New Zealand (Lewis 2005) context (for exceptions, see; Luxon and Peelo 2009; Hsieh 2012; Minocha et al., 2018). This inadequate attention is surprising, given the tendency in recent articles and policy reports to valorise internationalisation ‘at home’ (e.g., European Commission 2013a; Higher Education Academy 2014; Nuffic 2014).

In this dissertation then, I focus specifically on the impact of “foreignness as a teaching resource” (Alberts 2008: 198) on UK students taught by migrant academic staff. By doing so, it opens up a new research pathway around the mobility of pedagogy and ideas (Williams 2006, 2007a) in higher education teaching and learning. Given the low student numbers who do not engage in overseas activities, IaH is timely and relevant (Teekens 2013). Attesting to this, Beelen and Jones propose the following definition:²

Internationalization at Home is the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all

² The original concept of IaH was presented at a European Association for International Education (EAIE) conference in 1999. It was defined as “any internationally related activity with the exception of outbound student and staff mobility” (Crowther et al., 2000: 6).
students within domestic learning environments (Beelen and Jones 2015: 69).

This clear focus on the curriculum brings into dialogue the 1996 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI) symposium and report entitled *Internationalisation of higher education*, which brought academic mobility and internationalisation of the curriculum into the policy agenda (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 1996; also see van der Wende 1996a). In addition to this, Leask refers to internationalising the curriculum as follows, which is the definition this study adheres to:

Internationalization of the curriculum is the incorporation of international, intercultural, and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods, and support services of a program of study (Leask 2015: 9).

Here, the significance of migrant academic staff to internationalising the university and promoting intercultural understanding can be stressed. Indeed, the Erasmus Impact Study (European Commission 2014: 153) highlighted that staff mobility through the programme was considered “to be a very effective tool for enhancing the internationalisation of teaching”, as well as providing “international experience to students who did not wish or were not able to participate directly in international mobility actions”. Yet, as Brewer and Leask (2012) point out, the success of curriculum internationalisation is dependent on universities mobilising and supporting international best practice (see Chapter 7 and Chapter 8). The *Erasmus Impact Study* focused on short-term visiting scholars rather than migrant academics, and therefore such individuals provide an ideal case-study to contribute to an emerging area of enquiry within geography.

Such an evaluation of the contribution of migrant staff to the internationalisation of the curriculum has significant policy implications for higher education institutions engaged in IaH. Indeed, this research makes three central contributions to geographical and pedagogical literature more broadly. First, it contributes to knowledge and understanding of different internationalisation strategies in higher education (Olds 2007). Second, it adds the role of migrant academic staff to internationalisation processes ‘at home’ (Trahar and Hyland 2011).
Third, it creates new insights into transnational knowledge transfer through migrant academic staff, a topic that has been largely neglected by geographers and education scholars alike (notable exceptions are recent studies by Pherali 2012 and Minocha et al., 2018).

1.3 Research aim and objectives
Like any large project, it is not uncommon for research questions to have changed in priority or mutated in meaning. Thus, it is important to emphasise that there has been some fluidity in the questions posed during the undertaking of this thesis – outlined below. Nevertheless, the project’s aim has remained constant throughout. That is:

To investigate the potential contributions to internationalisation processes ‘at home’ through migrant academic staff, examining existing practices of knowledge transfer in higher education teaching and learning from the perspective of non-UK academics, UK undergraduate students, and senior management and professional development staff.

To address this aim, three objectives were undertaken. For each objective, a series of specific research questions were posed.

1. To analyse the experiences of migrant academic staff in the UK with regard to the transfer and adaptation of international ideas and concepts in their teaching and learning practice.
   a) What are the benefits and challenges of bringing different pedagogical approaches to a UK context of teaching and learning?
   b) What are the strategies employed by academic staff to transfer previously acquired subject-specific knowledge to UK students in their teaching and learning?
   c) How do non-UK academic staff perceive their opportunities to shape pedagogical discourses at their university?

2. To examine the impact of “foreignness as a teaching resource” (Alberts 2008: 198) on UK students taught by international academic staff.
a) What are the perceived benefits and challenges of being taught by international academic staff from a UK undergraduate student perspective?  
b) How has teaching by non-UK academic staff shaped the international outlook and intercultural understanding of UK students?  

3. To assess to what extent UK universities, recognise and support non-UK academic staff as a valuable resource in teaching and learning.  
a) To what extent do UK universities actively seek to utilise the international teaching approaches of international academic staff?  
b) What strategies do senior management and professional development staff employ to mobilise and support international best practices of non-UK academic staff?  

To address these objectives, I utilised a multi-method approach comprising 41 semi-structured interviews with international faculty, senior management and professional development staff, and a questionnaire survey with 185 undergraduate students. The fieldwork was conducted at three research-intensive case-study universities in England, from December 2014 to January 2016.  

Research questions posed that were not answered are as follows:  
- How has the experience of being taught by international academic staff impacted on the students’ career plans and aspirations?  
- What specific examples of transferable best practice can be identified?  

While these questions were desirable, they were not achievable due to issues relating to data availability as an outcome of shifting research methods (outlined fully in Chapter 3) and difficulties in untangling different motivating factors underlying students’ career plans.  

1.4 Defining some key terms  
Before proceeding further, it is necessary to clarify what is meant by the term ‘teaching’ and, by extension, to sketch out the criteria used to categorise UK ‘immobile’ students and ‘migrant’ academic staff.
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Of Germanic origin, the etymology of the verb *teach* from Old English *tǣcan* means to “show, present, point out” (Oxford Dictionaries 2019: no pagination).

Leading on from this, Collins’s lexicon of the noun *teaching* refers to “the work that a teacher does in helping students to learn” (Collins Dictionary 2019: no pagination).

To these articulations, we can add Bruner’s (1996) insights around education, learning, and problem-solving:

To instruct someone […] is not a matter of getting him to commit results to mind. Rather, it is to teach him to participate in the process that makes possible the establishment of knowledge. We teach a subject not to produce little living libraries on that subject, but rather to get a student to think mathematically for himself, to consider matters as an historian does, to take part in the process of knowledge-getting. Knowledge is a process not a product. (p. 72)

Building upon these observations, by teaching, in this thesis, I mean pedagogies, practices, and teaching identities. To elaborate, this implies: how migrant academic staff integrate personal and professional dimensions into the content of curriculum; as well as thinking about classroom interactions and instructions; teaching methods; educator-student relationships; educational philosophy; time management and organisation; ordering and sequencing of content; and assessment tasks in a range of learning spaces – lecture, seminar, laboratory, and staff office – and across different academic roles – instructional, leadership, pastoral, and social. While staff and senior management recognise the various components of teaching, the perception of students is the end product, for example, the lecture or tutorial itself. Together, these elements are likely to have an influence on students’ educational experience and knowledge acquisition. For instance, an educator’s textbook selection can “send a “hidden” message concerning whose knowledge counts […] and by implication, whose does not” (Leask 2015: 8). In a very different context, Fernando and Cohen (2016) in their study of UK higher education have shown how Indian academics affiliated to science and engineering effectively leveraged their compatriot networks to advance their careers and attract high-profile British collaborators. This work links to the scholarship of Alberts (2008), whose analysis of foreign-born professors in the American academy suggest such individuals can mobilise their overseas networks to enhance the student the experience, as well as being able to “insert examples from their home countries or provide different perspectives on issues” (p. 202).
Against this backdrop, I bring into dialogue the criteria used to categorise ‘immobile’ UK students. My concern for the non-mobile learner in the university setting comes in three parts. First, in a recent policy report Universities UK International (2017b) highlighted disjunctures in learner mobility, with students from white and higher-economic groups dominating outward mobility in 2015-16. The same report found that participation rates were lowest among black and minority ethnic (BME), disabled and care leaver students. This finding complements the broader argument proffered in this thesis on the trope of internationalising UK students through migrant academic staff, whereby those who are unable to participate in mobility can benefit from diverse intercultural experiences and approaches in their teaching and learning. In valuing otherness, non-UK academics can be utilised as a key resource for improving students’ internationalisation experience. Second, in the wake of the EU referendum, and specifically a no-deal scenario, the Department for Education (DfE) issued a stark warning that participation in Erasmus+ and the European Solidarity Corps (ESC) will cease after 2020 (Department for Education 2019). Inspired by this technical notice, Universities UK (2019) launched #SupportStudyAbroad an online national “campaign asking the UK government to commit to continue funding study abroad opportunities for UK students” (no pagination). Third, 31% of academic staff at UK higher education institutions in 2017-18 were from overseas; 18% had EU nationality, and 13% had non-EU nationality (HESA 2019a). Strikingly, while the absolute number of non-British nationals continues to grow, since Brexit there has been a reduction in the number of younger academics (aged 34 and under) and therefore suggests the waning attractiveness of the British academy (Marini 2018). In initiating this reflection, my foray into the immobile geographies of British undergraduates may raise a set of concerns about the dissertation’s empirical content and the constraints the classification had on project outcomes. To clarify, the immobile framing of UK students – those who do not participate directly in overseas activities throughout their degree programme – is not a straightforward undertaking. For this ‘marker’ creates tensions, not least because these students may have international experience, just not through their university degree.

Vital here is consideration of students’ mobility history prior to attending university – for instance, familial arrangements, high school exchange programmes, and gap year excursions, as well as thinking about informal international experiences
undertaken whilst enrolled in higher education that are not part of formal institutional learning structures, for example, volunteering and volunteer-tourism. As Waters and Brooks (2011) point out, there is a pressing “need to appreciate the plurality of spaces […] in which contemporary education and learning take place” (p. 155, emphasis in original). This is an acknowledgement that education and learning are explicitly linked to internationalisation strategies designed to boost students’ market potential. Weichbrodt (2014) hence argues that long-term high school exchange visits (lasting from 6 to 12 months) play an important role in reproducing future mobility experiences, such as participating in other educational programmes, internships or career opportunities abroad. In a very different context, Wakeford and Orams’s (2019) study illustrates the potential of international high school field-trips in developing a sense of social responsibility and global civic activism. In this case, school students (aged 16 and 17) from New Zealand travelled to Cambodia to work in an orphanage and assist a charitable organisation in the construction of domestic dwellings, with the intended outcome of “engaging in meaningful experiential development education” (p. 39). However, this rendering of mobility brings to the fore concerns regarding “the value of contact and the inevitability of learning by experience” (Simpson 2005: 466). Even more problematic, the commodification of host communicates in humanitarian activities (Guiney and Mostafanezhad 2015) and the unequal power relations between the student learner and the different other (Tallon 2011). Beyond formal education, the gap year experience typically associated with youth travel places great emphasis on acquiring global knowledge (Simpson 2005). King (2011) notes that a pre-university year out can develop a young person’s confidence and mature self-identity, wherein those fortunate to undertake such travel are distinguishable from their peers, able to “convert the cultural capital they acquire during their Gap Year into future economic advantages” (King 2009: 206). For those young people lacking the resources to participate, such mobility can widen the inequality gap and entrench social (dis)advantages (Heath 2007).

When I write about the ‘immobile’ student – someone with no international experience prior to tertiary education and is internationally immobile throughout their degree programme – there are various assemblages of virtual mobility in learning contexts that need to be considered. For example, “telecollaborative or online intercultural exchange projects with partner students in distant locations around the globe” (O’Dowd 2013). Urry’s (2007) ‘new mobilities paradigm’ represented a
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profound advancement in understanding relationships that transcend “geographical and social distance” in real time (p. 47). There is a growing body of literature exploring how information and communications technologies (ICT) can facilitate the development of young people’s global citizenship. Truong-White and McLean’s (2015: 21) study, for example, which explores digital storytelling as a “transformative approach to global citizenship education” illustrates the potential of digital technologies in engaging students to think globally. By contrast, Rye (2013) is more critical, arguing that students’ internet use, for instance, is not a measure for developing citizenship on a global scale. For clarity, in this thesis, I do not address virtual mobility; instead, I focus on how direct physical exposure to migrant academics can result in developing respect for other perspectives. However, by pointing to Urry’s (2007) mobilities paradigm, if only cursorily, it brings into dialogue the multiple connections that may form the contours of a student’s internationalisation experience, but which are not explored in this thesis. In sum, while a student may have acquired international experience through high-school activities or familial set-up, I look specifically at one aspect of internationalisation as part of formal university structures – the link between migrant academics, the immobile learner, and internationalisation outcomes.

Geographical research on the role of migrant academic staff to internationalisation processes ‘at home’ is a developing field of inquiry within UK higher education and beyond (e.g., Minocha et al., 2018). The focus on international faculty – those who received their education outside of the UK prior to taking up an academic position in the country – provides a critical lens through which to analyse transnational knowledge transfer in higher education teaching and learning. A broader concern for British academics with international experience demands attention too, not least for the ways in which they may integrate new modes of thinking acquired in another knowledge environment. However, pre-selecting non-UK academics as the unit of analysis gives rise to a new tranche of investigative research. It explores how migrant academic staff socialised in a different linguistic, social, cultural and educational context can offer new possibilities to internationalising higher education. In so doing, the study analytically narrows down a much wider range of experiences to investigate, for example, non-British faculty as opposed to all academic staff with international experience. A critique of the classification used to
identify participants and the constraints this may have had on project outcomes is discussed in the conclusion chapter (Chapter 8).

1.5 Structure of the thesis

I conclude this introduction with a guide to the chapters that follow. Chapter 2 situates this thesis within contemporary debates that inform geographies of higher education. In doing so, I critically engage with existing geographical and social science literature about academic mobility, knowledge transfer and higher education teaching and learning.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodological and epistemological approaches used in this research and discusses how these further a geographical analysis of internationalising higher education. It begins with a discussion of employing epistemological pluralism (King 2012), drawing upon Bruno Latour’s (1987) centres of calculation, and Edward Said’s (1983) travelling theory. The chapter then proceeds with consideration for utilising multi-method research, justifying the use of semi-structured interviews, feedback surveys and secondary data analysis. Qualitative research methods, in particular, were most suitable for this project as they provided in-depth perspectives to identifying contextualised examples of knowledge transfer in a UK context of higher education teaching and learning. The chapter then details how the case-study universities were selected and how the research participants were recruited. Finally, particular attention focuses on the emotionality experienced by migrant academics in adjusting to and working in a different knowledge environment (also Chapter 4 and Chapter 5), as well as the emotional effects I felt in undertaking this research.

In Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7, the study’s empirical findings are presented. These chapters are organised by research objective, with Objective One split between Chapters 4 and 5. In Chapter 4, I consider the motivations for academic mobility to the UK. These global flows, as the chapter will illustrate, are framed within a romanticised yearning for British higher education. However, Chapter 4 also introduces a tension between migrant academics and the imaginative geographies of the case-study universities, highlighting disparate realities. Through exploring the migratory context of non-UK academics, this study provides new insights into the “distinct, yet interlocking, dynamics” (Rumbley and de Wit 2017: 7) around transnational academic mobility within a UK context of higher education. Moreover,
the chapter’s empirics contribute to emerging theoretical debates on the links between mobility, emotions and immigration policy.

Chapter 5, which is the second part of Objective One, examines how migrant academic staff use their differentiated experiences to transfer and adapt international ideas and concepts in their teaching and learning practice. Through semi-structured interviews, migrant academics (from across the humanities and the natural, technical and social sciences) outline how they incorporate “international, intercultural, and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum” (Leask 2015: 9). Through these entertaining narratives, the chapter fleshes out the contours of knowledge transfer from a Commonwealth, European and rest of world geographical imagination. By reflecting on these different journeys, I propose a new conceptualisation – double-being, double-thinking (developed after Thomson 2014: no pagination) – that productively links to the different academic contexts and geographical locations that non-UK academics astride.

Chapter 6 explores the impact of “foreignness as a teaching resource” (Alberts 2008: 198) from the perspective of UK undergraduate students. Particular attention focuses on the different ways in which students consume an international education; I also consider how previous encounters with non-UK teachers at school can shape their engagement with migrant academic members of staff at university. I suggest that these encounters with “strange others” (Ahmed 2000: 24) can be a precondition to producing the ‘ideal global graduate’ (Lilley et al., 2015: 226) in terms of fostering intercultural respect and understanding. In addition, the chapter demonstrates that students with an ethnically diverse, non-white background are more positively inclined towards non-UK academics than white UK students. The key argument is that diversity accepts diversity (Ahmed 2012) more than the homogeneous white population.

In Chapter 7, I shift attention to senior management and professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching. This penultimate chapter shines a light on institutional policy, examining to what extent UK universities recognise and support migrant academic staff as a valuable resource in teaching and learning. I argue that the case-study universities only cursory (at the time of interview) capitalise on migrant academics’ insights into other knowledge environments.

Chapter 8 returns to the aim of the thesis, by bringing together the analytical chapters to consider migrant academic staff as a conduit for internationalising
immobile UK undergraduate students. The chapter outlines the explicit contributions to geographies of higher education and migration studies. Specifically, it illustrates the role of migrant academic staff to internationalisation processes ‘at home’ (Trahar and Hyland 2011). In doing so, the dissertation contributes in important ways to the geographies of higher education literature and opens up a new research agenda on the burgeoning field of inquiry about the internationalisation of higher education through migrant academic members of staff. Chapter 8 then proposes eight policy recommendations, followed by two proposals for future research enquiry.
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Literature review: Theorising knowledge and international migration in higher education

Those migrants who can think and act with deep reflexivity are potential boundary spanners who can transfer knowledge across space and between economic systems. Migration is also more than just a source of substitute human capital, for it can be a source of diversity and creativity (Williams and Baláž 2008a: x).

2.1 Introduction

As the previous chapter illustrated, the thesis explores the intersection of transnational academic mobility and cross-border knowledge transfer in teaching and learning; a highly significant yet largely overlooked theme in academic debates on the internationalisation of higher education (Kim 2009). In this chapter I review the existing literature on knowledge mobilities, education, and migrant learning, locating my work within the conceptual frameworks developed by human geographers (e.g., Williams 2006, 2007a, 2007b; Raghuram 2013; Madge et al., 2015), and scholars affiliated with anthropology, education, and sociology (e.g., Bilecen and Faist 2015; Coey 2018).

Leveraging knowledge via corporeal mobility is key to competitive performance and innovative advancement within and beyond the academy (Marginson 2010). In the context of higher education, this is most evident in the circular movements of researchers and academics. These academic mobilities are also part of the wider processes connected to internationalisation and globalisation, and crucial to the formation of global knowledge hubs and transnational knowledge networks (Jöns 2015). From this perspective, a critical question is posed about intercultural encounters and the harnessing of pedagogic approaches and academic perspectives anchored in other higher learning environments. Against this backdrop, I draw on Williams and Baláž’s quotation with which I opened this chapter. Indeed, this reflection illustrates a particular argument I am endeavouring to make, that is; migrant academics contribute to the internationalisation of the curriculum and to promoting intercultural understanding. However, the narratives that punctuate this dissertation often defy this statement. Rather than being a “resource of internationally-informed academic and pedagogic practice” (Minocha et al., 2018: 2), the study’s empirics witness profound imperialist assumptions about whose
knowledge counts (also see Esson et al., 2017; Noxolo 2017; Esson 2018). While positive experiences of knowledge transfer and learning are offered throughout this thesis, research findings also reinforce the “lopsided’ geographies of knowledge production” (Walker and Frimpong Boamah 2017: 1). We see then a tension between migrant academics attempting to question or subtly change prevailing institutional logics and organisational structures impeding the diffusion of diverse pieces of knowledge and viewpoints. There was also a tendency for migrant academics to disguise their authentic self (also Jiang et al., 2010; Green and Myatt 2011) in order to be successful in the epistemic community in which they are employed (see also Beaverstock 2017; Jöns 2018a).

These interactions lay the foundations for conceptualising the role of migrant academic staff to internationalisation processes ‘at home’. To interrogate debates about knowledge transfer in higher education teaching and learning, it is apposite to engage in a discussion of what knowledge is. This is a conversation which will allow us to tease out conceptual definitions, to explore the different typologies of knowledge and their role in studying knowledge transfer via academic mobility. I then outline the culture-specific background of knowledge and pedagogic approaches. The chapter then looks at the impact of internationalisation and globalisation on higher education. Finally, I review the literature on academic mobility and discuss how migrant academic staff’s overseas experiences can potentially be harnessed as a teaching resource in a UK context of higher education.

2.2 Deconstructing knowledge: understanding the concept

Recent work on knowledge management, production, and dissemination point to the differentiated ways in which knowledge is constituted (e.g., Baker 2002; Baláž and Williams 2004; Williams 2006, 2007b; Williams and Baláž 2008a, 2012; Waters and Leung 2017). An important impetus for this work stems from Polanyi’s (1958, 1966) seminal publications, in which he distinguishes between tacit and codified knowledge. Explicit knowledge is systematic and formal, easy to communicate, codify and transfer. It may be visual or taped, stored in databases, books, graphs and manuals. Tacit knowledge, in contrast, denotes subjective, difficult to capture, represent and articulate intellectual capabilities. Developed from personal experiences, interactions, and observations, tacit knowledge also refers to beliefs, values, feelings, and intuitions. An example of tacit knowledge in relation to migrant
academics can be found in the work of educationalist Pherali (2012), whose research on academics from non-English speaking backgrounds found local cultural knowledge a barrier to integration and to maintaining collegiality in the workplace. More than forty years later, Dalkir (2005) points to the stickiness of tacit knowledge. For Dalkir argues that tacit knowledge is relative, noting “the same content may be explicit for one person and tacit for another” (2005: 8).

While Polanyi’s concept of knowledge is a useful starting point, Blackler’s (1995) five-pronged approach is most appropriate for studying knowledge transfer via human mobility, as argued by Williams and Baláž (2008a). Blackler’s (1995) review of organisation studies literature identified four different types of tacit knowledge – embrained, embodied, encultured, and embedded – and one explicit form – encoded. Within the tacit categorisations, the aptly defined embrained and embodied have corporeal mobility, fully transferable cognitive skills (embrained knowledge) or sensory information (embodied knowledge) that can move across transnational borders. In contrast, encultured and embedded knowledge is relatively immobile, in that they “represent relational knowledge, grounded in the institutionally specific relationships between individuals” (Williams 2006: 591). This is not to deny migrant individuals the capacity for partly transferrable encultured and embedded knowledge, for all mobile workers can reflect on institutional differences (Williams and Baláž 2008a). In the case of higher education, migrant academics are potential boundary spanners individuals who “engage in ‘boundary spanning’ activities that cross, weave and permeate many traditional boundary types, including organisational, sectoral, professional and policy” (Williams 2012: 1). However, one caveat needs to be noted. Key to valorising culturally, organisationally and nationally different knowledge claims requires the acceptance and actions of people in the new knowledge environments, who “believe it, buy it and disseminate it” (Latour 1987: 121; also see Edward Said’s (1983) travelling theory for a discussion on accepting or resisting new theories, concepts, and practices).

From a geographical perspective this raises an important question for this study, that is, what types of knowledge do migrant academics transfer in their teaching materials and pedagogic approaches? This is significant since research findings will create new insights into what typologies of knowledge are imparted, but also the capital students may acquire through encountering other perspectives and viewpoints. In theory, knowledge claims contained within textbooks and academic
journals – encoded knowledge – should be easily mobile. In practice, however, Jöns (2018a), reflecting on her experience working in British higher education, observed that in order to contribute to geographical debates in the dominant *lingua franca*, she had to “adopt a different style of thought and argumentation” and “focus on ideas and debates familiar to Anglophone reviewers and readers” (p. 33). This resonates with a number of recent scholarly interventions that speak to the continued reticence towards “difference and diversity in […] knowledge production processes” (Noxolo 2017: 317; see also Desai 2017; Esson *et al.*, 2017; Radcliffe 2017).

When it comes to defining knowledge, this study adheres to Nico Stehr’s (1994) sociological definition “as a *capacity for social action*” (p. 95, emphasis in original). This chimes with the notion of internationalising the curriculum, expressed by Leask (2015: 23) in terms of individual transformation from parochially minded students to individuals with the capacity to be global citizens, “committed to actions that benefit others as well as themselves”. Such a perspective is particularly suited to this research, linking to debates on encounter concerning the reinforcement or changing of values (e.g., Valentine 2008; Wilson 2017; see Chapter 6).

### 2.3 Knowledge transfer via human mobility

Writing in a special country report for the journal *Social and Cultural Geography* (SCG), Jöns and Freytag (2016) provide the most evocative links between knowledge transfer and transnationally mobile academics. Focusing on German-language geography, Jöns and Freytag trace the work of Alfred Hettner (1859-1941) and Walter Christaller (1893-1969), 20th century social and cultural geographers whose sophisticated theorisations about chorology and central place theory have “considerably shaped Anglophone geographical debates” (Jöns and Freytag 2016: 4; also see Jöns 2018a). These examples provide a snapshot of knowledge transfer between different academic paradigms and language contexts. Yet despite these boundary-spanning activities, the mobility of knowledge can be fraught with substantial barriers. For example, at the level of the organisation, its “willingness to embrace external reference standards and methods” (Earl 1990: 741) is crucial to knowledge transfer. To leverage migrant knowledge, Williams and Baláž (2008b) opine, “organizations need to maximize connectivity and openness amongst workers” (p. 1926). Within geography, a growing body of literature has outlined the importance of spatial relations, epistemic communities, and institutional structures as being
integral to the diffusion and legitimisation of knowledge claims (e.g., Livingstone 1995). Scholars socialised in a different language, and knowledge environment may provide new scientific practices, research interests or teaching materials (Alberts 2008). While others will question the institutional codes and customs (Meusburger 2015), and some will even exercise power to subtly change prevailing organisational structures (Dacin et al., 2002; see also Chapter 5). Whether an academic performs the role of a knowledge broker also depends on language contexts (e.g., Minca 2000; Garcia-Ramon 2003; Rodríguez-Pose 2004, 2006; Jöns 2018a), academic hegemonies (Berg and Kearns 1998; Garcia-Ramon et al., 2006), and the geographies of interactions (Derudder and Liu 2016).

Critical interventions by geographers in relation to language barriers have been scrutinised. This is illustrated, for example, by Garcia-Roman (2003: 1) who reminds us that English-language “privileges the geographical discourse of the Anglophone world” by ignoring the research and writings of scholars operating in languages other than the dominant lingua franca. More recently, Minca’s (2018) semi-biographical commentary highlights the dilemma of cosmopolitan geographers, bi- and multi-lingual scholars who co-exist in national and international publication cultures, language contexts, and academic communities. Even amongst native speakers of English, striking tensions concerning the "spatial politics of geographic knowledge production" (Berg and Kearns 1998: 128) are palpable. For example, reflecting on a rejection letter from an American geographical journal, Berg and Kearns criticise the editor’s comments for valorising “American geographies as ‘unlimited’, and marginalis[ing] other geographies – [...] as ‘limited’” (p. 128). In many ways, this debate can extend to the epistemic communities practised at international academic conferences. Using the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Geographers as a case study, Derudder and Liu (2016) observe the meeting’s increasingly parochial and inward-looking activities. Despite its international rhetoric, they argue that intra-national interactions are twice as likely to materialise than international engagements. At the core of these linkages lies power differentials and linguistic hierarchies (Derudder and Liu 2016). Indeed, the existing literature on knowledge transfer in higher education and research has emphasised that “inter-linguistic knowledge transfer remains an exception rather than the rule” (Jöns 2018a: 35).

For non-Anglophone academics, novel ideas anchored in national geographical traditions may be brutally criticised or ignored (Meusburger 2017). This affects multi-
directional knowledge transfer, in which knowledge claims produced in other language contexts and academic systems can be subject to hegemonic power relations, different publication cultures, and research evaluations (Jöns 2018a). Yet, as Jöns and Freytag (2016) argue, engaging with German-language social and cultural geographies, for example, may provide new insights into multi-method approaches for those working in another language context. In the following section, the discussion elaborates on the epistemology of knowledge. The purpose here is to offer an account of the cultural dynamics in education practice, framing the dialogue to explore the relationship between power and knowledge in educational settings and pedagogic approaches.

2.4 Pedagogies for social transformation

According to Giroux:

Pedagogy is not simply about the social construction of knowledge, values, and experiences; it is also a performative practice embodied in the lived interactions among educators, audiences, texts, and institutional formations. Pedagogy, at its best, implies that learning takes place across a spectrum of social practices and settings. (2004: p. 61)

The origins of Giroux’s proposition lie in the work of Brazilian educational philosopher Paulo Freire (Giroux 2003). A key figure in education research, Freire’s politicised reading of education and pedagogy linked learning to political and social transformation, an emancipatory educational experience that seeks “to change the structures of society” (Shaull 2000 [1970]: 33, cited in Freire 2000 [1970]). The significance of Freire’s work has been enhanced by the publication in English of his seminal work *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, published originally in the Portuguese-language. In so doing, the international transfer of educational knowledge can be traced across national, linguistic, and disciplinary boundaries. Freire thus epitomises a boundary-spanning academic. With much appreciation, Freire’s influence can be seen in the work of educationalist Henry Giroux, whose scholarship demonstrates his interests in viewing education as a “site of contestation, resistance, and possibility” (Giroux 2003: 6).
Against this backdrop, these perspectives bring into dialogue texts that evaluate the geographies of citizenship education (e.g., Mills 2013, 2015; Couldry et al., 2014; Sullivan 2018) and cosmopolitan learning (e.g., Rizvi 2009; Reid and Sriprakash 2012; Rizvi and Beech 2017), and foregrounds the rationale for internationalising the curriculum (Leask 2015) as a way of constructing globally-ready graduates (Hunter et al., 2006) who can act as “agents of social good” (Bowden et al., 2000, cited in Hughes and Barrie 2010: 325). Studies on global citizenship have often emphasised its transformative force (Lilley et al., 2014), for example developing an ethical, social, and professional understanding (Barrie 2012), and exploring the construction of altruism and empathy, self-awareness, and civic engagement (Morais and Ogden 2011). More recently, interest amongst scholars in the study of youth citizenship has shifted attention from school place-based sites of learning to alternative spaces of education. Mills and Waite’s (2017) analysis of a state-funded youth programme is insightful in this respect. They use an online survey with National Citizen Service graduates to tease out the geographical complexities of learning to be a citizen, while local citizenship engagement was promoted, the global was curiously absent. Other research has explored the relationship between youth mobility and global citizenship. Rye’s (2013) study, for example, which examines students’ internet use as a potential conduit in the development of global citizens, illustrates that virtual mobility is a weak substitute for direct physical engagement. For some, in contrast, the notion of global citizenship draws attention to the falsehood of globalisation, not least because colonial structures of power continue to exacerbate educational inequalities and tensions (Rizvi 2007). Instead, Rizvi (2009) argues for cosmopolitan learning “a mode of learning about, and ethically engaging with, new social formations” (p. 254).

What Rizvi’s writings emphasise is the need to move beyond colonial approaches to knowledge, the curriculum, and pedagogy. Indeed, a more inclusive understanding of knowledge production and dissemination has been challenged by activist and postcolonial scholars, most recently in response to Radcliffe’s (2017) RGS-IBG chair’s theme Decolonising geographical knowledge: opening geography out to the world, and Bruce Gilley’s (2017) controversial essay entitled The case for colonialism (e.g., Esson et al., 2017; Noxolo 2017; Rodriguez 2018). Such critical interventions are necessary, not least in UK higher education where Desai (2017) speaks of viscerally-present institutional racism. To this agenda, Esson (2018) calls for curriculum reform, but notes decolonising teaching and learning activities “must
take place as part of substantive efforts to change our institutional arrangements and practices" (p. 3). In this context, some important studies have sought to critically engage with, and challenge, dominate pedagogical practices. For example, Daigle and Sundberg (2017) reflect on efforts to decolonise geographical knowledges in their teaching of an introductory human geography course. Unsurprisingly, they posit, their decolonial praxis was unsettling for the white reluctant student. Nevertheless, Daigle and Sundberg’s study offer important insights about engaging with decolonial pedagogies and content materials.

Thus, in the vein of Freire’s (1985) work, embedding pedagogies and curricula for social transformation requires a framework of unlearning and a commitment to change; a rejuvenation of teaching practices “so that we can think and rethink, so that we can create new visions […] against and beyond boundaries” (hooks 1994: 12). For example, in Chapter 5 we see how a migrant academic was compelled to confront institutional codes and customs, motivated by a desire to push fresh approaches to exam practices.

2.5 Internationalisation of higher education

Internationalisation has become a crucially important research agenda within contemporary HE (Teichler 2005). Brandenburg and de Wit (2015) have stated that in the last twenty years institutional interest in the internationalisation of HE has become a core concept within academic debates. Many universities, however, have become increasingly pressurised to internationalise their syllabus as a consequence of shifting governmental strategies and changing economic and social landscapes within which HEIs operate (Leask 2001).

The thematic landscape of academic discourses on the internationalisation of HE can be categorised into seven broad research themes, as stated by Kehm and Teichler (2007). Research has tended to focus on: (i) academic staff and student mobility; (ii) the internationalisation of curricula, accreditation issues and quality assurance of cross-border programmes and learning, teaching and research substance; (iii) globalisation and the neo-liberalisation of academic services that influence HE systems in other countries; (iv) marketisation of academic programmes and the recruitment of international students; (v) institutional and national HE strategies with regard to competition and cooperation; (vi) HE policies contextualised within a national and supranational framework; and (vii) knowledge transfer. More
recently, internationalisation discourses have debated how social differences such as sexuality, gender, and religion, are important in the analysis of academic cultural capital (Holloway et al., 2012). In addition, Hayhoe (1996) has argued that a westernised interpretation of internationalisation creates conflict in non-western countries where ideological, cultural and moral dimensions of knowledge differ. Here, it is worth re-visiting knowledge transfer as one of the major research themes identified by Kehm and Teichler (2007), which highlights the timeliness of this research by exploring knowledge transfer in higher education teaching and learning.

There are many widely held beliefs about why the internationalisation of higher education is important. For many, internationalisation is a moral principle helping learners to develop a sense of global citizenship and ethical responsibility (Bourn et al., 2006; Kahane 2009). Other perceived benefits include opportunities for brain gain, strengthened knowledge and research production, improved academic quality, and the potential to develop an academic community that has internationally-oriented staff and students (OECD 2004; Knight 2008; Green and Myatt 2011). Similarly, Qiang (2003) identified internationalisation as a tool to prepare students for the demands of a globalised labour market. Despite positive connotations associated with internationalisation, Knight (2015) has argued that a university’s international marker does not automatically translate to high standards, better quality or improved institutional reputation, whereas Altbach and Knight (2007) state that there are many institutional and regional motivations for internationalisation. Within the EU, academic internationalisation is actively funded and promoted through initiatives such as the Bologna process and the Erasmus programme (Altbach and Knight 2007). The EU is eager to promote the development of a competitive and vibrant “European knowledge society” based on the unrestricted mobility of knowledge and academic researchers between institutions and across European borders (Commission of the European Communities 2007: 2). Institutional motivations of internationalisation, in contrast, may be financial (motivated by the need to enhance growth and revenue), political (to improve the political reputation of the university’s home nation), or religious (driven by an eagerness to disseminate the spiritual belief of a specific religious faith; Hawawini 2011).
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3 For example, missionaries founded the American University of Beirut in 1866 (Hawawini 2011).
Internationalisation has long been part of the university landscape (Taylor et al., 2008), though its popularity grew post-1980s (Scott 1998). Today, internationalisation has gained prominence in the education sector as a seductive and policy-laden buzzword carrying the promises of fostering intercultural understanding, equity and national and international citizenship (Reid et al., 2010). Described by Taylor (2004) as one of the most formidable forces for change in the transformation of HE in the twenty-first century, internationalisation has also become a popular catchword (Yang 2002). The past thirty years have seen “the international activities of universities dramatically expanded in volume, scope, and complexity” (Altbach and Knight 2007: 290). While Knight (2004: 5) describes the popularity of internationalisation as “encouraging” she is quick to add a cautionary note stating the concept has become complex, confusing and misunderstood. The confusion and complexity that Knight (2004; 2008; 2015) describes refers to the increasingly multidimensional character of internationalisation characterised by unclear conceptual frameworks (Kehm and Teichler 2007), myriad divergent perspectives, approaches (Knight and de Wit 1995) and strategic aspects (de Wit 2002). Van der Wende et al., (1999) write that this can be attributed to a broadened research focus that has shifted from a uni-dimensional interest on student exchange to a divergent focus on strategic development, curricular reform and quality improvement in research and education. Callan (1998) argues that research into internationalisation presents a conundrum. How should the term be depicted: as a process, a policy or as a challenge or irresistible trend in which researchers are unable to resist? (Callan, 1998; Teichler 1999). What about as a practice?

Early attempts of conceptualising internationalisation referred to a set of activities operating at the level of the institution (Knight 2004). Arum and van de Water (1992: 202 cited in Knight 2004: 9) proposed a definition describing the term as “the multiple activities, programs and services that fall within international studies, international educational exchange and technical cooperation”. However, this definition fails to recognise the intercultural aspect of internationalisation and its multidimensional character. By the 1990s, Knight (1994) had introduced a concept that captured the term as a process to illustrate that the internationalisation of HE needed to be both sustainable and integrative. Typically, the internationalisation of HE refers to “a range of activities, policies and services that integrate an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the
institution" (Knight 1994: 1). According to the OECD (1999) and Qiang (2003), this definition captures three important features in understanding internationalisation as a concept. Internationalisation can be seen as a vibrant process and integrated activity. It emphasises multiple cultural and ethnic dimensions within a specific country and integrates education networks that will contribute to the conservation of the intercultural and international dimension of HEIs (OECD 1999; Qiang 2003). Knight’s (1994) institution-based definition has become one of the most popular interpretations of the internationalisation of HE. Other scholars and international organisations have attempted to introduce alternative definitions, notably Marijk van der Wende (1997).

As a counter-argument to Knight’s (1994) institutionally situated concept, van der Wende (1997) stated that Knight’s concept was, in fact, an aim rather than a process. Van der Wende (1997) went on to argue that many universities would view internationalisation as a process; as a means to accomplish broader objectives, such as upgrading and restructuring academic services, systems and improving quality. An alternative definition was introduced as any “systematic, sustained effort aimed at making higher education (more) responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalisation of societies, economy and labour markets” (van der Wende 1996b: 23). This definition places emphasis on the globalisation of HE, but according to Knight (2004) fails to contextualise internationalisation within the education sector. Despite many scholars’ efforts to formulate a robust definition, the term remains conceptually ‘fuzzy’ (Callan 1998). I would argue that instead of it being fuzzy, internationalisation is multi-dimensional and context and content-specific.

In its purest meaning, the internationalisation of HE could be viewed as having a humanistic function. It is passionately defended by the education sector with a belief that it encourages intercultural understandings, motivations that are behind scholarship programmes such as those run by the American Fulbright Commission (Brandenburg and de Wit 2015), the German Humboldt Foundation (e.g., Jöns 2007), and the European Union Lisbon Strategy (Altbach et al., 2009). Yang (2002) presents a thoughtful and impassioned argument stating that the primary function of HE, as a space of intellectual creativity, is to encourage an understanding that our lives are intimately connected to the wider world. Similarly, Brandenburg and de Wit (2015) have asserted that higher education institutions (HEIs) must prepare students and academic professionals as global citizens whose professional and personal lives
exist within a global community. According to Chen (1996 cited in Yang 2002), this can only be achieved when intercultural communication is founded on principles of equity and mutual privileges in order to avoid cultural conflict and misinterpretation. Such dialogue can be linked to human geographer Ron Martin (2001: 190) who has argued that human geographers have a moral obligation to apply their knowledge, ideas and critical thinking “in the pursuit of the betterment of society”. This is a rather provocative statement but emphasises the role of geography as a discipline in deepening our understanding and knowledge to help improve environmental, social and economic conditions. Research into the geographies of higher education is thus an increasingly important research agenda interested in the contemporary study of economic, social, cultural and political systems, and the mobility of knowledge(s), people and material resources (Holloway and Jöns 2012).

2.6 Globalisation of higher education

Discursive struggles in defining globalisation have meant that multiple interpretations antagonistically coevolve and coexist (Fiss and Hirsch 2005). Authors are divided on its impact and conceptual framing. Opponents of globalisation portray it as a destructive force that leads to political and economic volatility (Rapley 2004), social inequality (Khor 2001) and environmental degradation (Shiva 2000). Other accounts are more optimistic. For instance, globalisation can be harnessed to create economic and cultural freedom (Steger 2009), enhance social capital and generate greater opportunities for inclusivity (Mittelman 2004). The discursive framing of globalisation also illustrates contradictory epistemological positions. The sceptical perspective asserts that the scope and intensity of globalisation is an exaggeration; it is a historical process rather than a modern phenomenon (Hay 2002; Furlong and Marsh 2010). The hyperglobalists believe that borderless states with porous national boundaries have escalated cross-border movements of financial capital and international investments. Kenichi Ohmae (1995), for example, writes that globalisation has destroyed the nation-state, rendering it obsolete. The third perspective, the transformationalist rhetoric, rejects both the sceptics “nothing much has changed” ideological belief and the hyperglobalist neo-liberal redundant nation-state tendency (Held et al., 1999: 9).

Despite a vast literature, attempts to conceptualise globalisation have failed to deliver a mutually agreeable definition, but thematic overlaps can be detected. For
example, Giddens (1990: 64) writes that globalisation is the “intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa”.

Similarly, Held et al., (1999: 2) identify globalisation as “the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life”. With regards to higher education, globalisation can be defined as “the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (Altbach and Knight 2007: 290). The impact of globalisation on HEIs has been described by Scott (2000: 3) as “perhaps the most fundamental challenge faced by the University in its long history”.

The need to differentiate globalisation from internationalisation, according to Yang (2002), requires immediate action. Internationalisation has been identified as the “White Knight” carrying the hopes and promises of intercultural understanding and equity (Brandenburg and de Wit 2015). In contrast, Scott (2000) writes that internationalisation has a tendency to reproduce or even legitimise hegemony and hierarchy, whereas globalisation can address issues such as global inequality because it has no historical ties. While internationalisation and globalisation are discursively framed as two opposing concepts they are related as the international activities of HEIs operate as a corollary of globalising forces (Knight 2004). The education sector has been shaped by globalising processes including technological innovations, massification, knowledge production, English-language hegemony (Kishun 1998; Paasi 2005) and the flow of academic perspectives, people, knowledge and material resources across national boundaries (Holloway and Jöns, 2012; Jöns et al., 2010). These processes are transforming global HEIs and contributing significantly to the reproduction of social, economic, cultural, gendered and classed advantages and disadvantages (e.g., Paasi 2005; Holloway et al., 2010; Holloway and Pimlott-Wilson 2012; Waters 2012).

The use of English-language as the lingua franca in geography and other scientific disciplines has become a key debate (Paasi 2005), which according to Altbach et al., (2009) lies beyond the control of HEIs. Paasi (2005) draws attention to the hegemonic nature of the Anglo-American dominated geography discipline and social science journal practices. Critical debates analysing the spatial patterns of knowledge production have highlighted academic exclusiveness in which intellectual property produced in the United Kingdom and the United States is favoured (Paasi
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2005; Kong and Qian 2019). A prime example of such global North elitism and non-west ‘othering’ was highlighted by Rigg (2007), who identified that only ⅛ of 362 articles published in three prestigious Anglo-American journals, quoted in the text, referenced Global South practices (for a similar comparison examining non-English geographical publication contexts, see Jöns and Freytag 2016). Many scholars, for example, Garcia-Ramon (2003) and Shepherd et al., (2000) have reported that research operating beyond the Anglo-American core may be deemed irrelevant. Garcia-Ramon (2003) passionately spoke of the unease among non-English speaking researchers asserting geographical discourse produced in the English language privileges the Anglophone world, while non-English research is neglected and non-native English speakers are discouraged from communicating and debating their research. While the growth of English provides a substantial international job market for academics proficient in English (Welch 2008), linguistic hegemony has the capacity to empower some while simultaneously disempowering and marginalising others (Short et al., 2001; Marginson 2008; see Chapters 4 and 5).

Contrary to arguments critical of English-language dominance *lingua franca* has been defended. Rodríguez-Pose (2004) proposed three advantages of the use of English in scientific research. First, it generates economies of scale by utilising global networks and globally dispersed English-speaking academics. Second, communication difficulties are eased; and third, diverse geographical traditions have survived because of their exposure to the Anglophone world. Rodríguez-Pose, however, points to the anxieties, feelings of disempowerment and loss of personal agency that non-native English-speaking academics experience, impacting their communication, style of pedagogy and teaching proficiency (e.g., Leask 2004; Collins 2008; Luxon and Peelo 2009; Hsieh 2012; see Chapters 4 and 5). Human geographers such as Ifan Shepherd *et al.*, (2000: 288-289) have expressed concern regarding the potential dangers of “information imperialism” and the dissemination of geographical knowledge through predominantly “white, western, Anglo-centric” academic networks. To avoid educational and/or intellectual colonialism, Shepherd *et al.*, (2000) propose a HE geography network based on pluralism, equity and equality, and equality of access. However, Paasi (2005) has stated that the standardisation of
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scientific quality, measured by the UK Research Assessment Exercise \(^5\) and scientific practice is a consequence of globalisation. With ever-increasing demands for HEIs to be viewed as international institutions, globalisation strengthens the dominance of English as it is seen as a marker for “boosting the prestige of academic journals published in English and the dominance of Anglo-American academic communities” (Canagarajah 2002: 40).

Inequality and the uneven global development of HEIs have been discussed by several authors, including Altbach et al., (2009), Bennion and Locke (2010) and Marginson (2006, 2008). Universities that belong to lobby groups such as the Russell Group, in the United Kingdom, and Ivy League, in the United States, seek to exploit their status as elite HEIs (Marginson 2006). Institutions led by Yale, Berkeley, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Harvard, and Princeton, in the United States, and Oxford and Cambridge, in the United Kingdom, gain global power through their hierarchical position on global university league tables and national higher education systems (Marginson 2008). Their magnetic force, or “draw of excellence” (Ackers 2008: 411), as desirable HEIs attract, and compete for, the world’s leading global researchers, teaching staff and students (Bennion and Locke 2010). The Economist newspaper labelled such universities as the “global super league” in which the world is considered their academic arena (Wooldridge 2005: no pagination). While much emphasis has been placed on university reputation and ranking HEIs on a global scale (Hoyler and Jöns 2008a; Jöns and Hoyler 2013), Ackers (2008), Altbach (2015) and Knight (2015) have argued that a university’s international marker (in terms of curriculum, global networks, faculty, research and students) does not automatically translate to high standards, better quality or improved institutional reputation. University rankings are viewed as an inevitable outcome of commercialisation, massification, and competition in global postsecondary education (Altbach 2015). Yet, problematically, world university rankings are compiled using different methodological approaches, thus capturing very different measures of institutional performance and reputation (Jöns and Hoyler 2013). Despite problems with methodological validity, administrative inconsistencies and bias toward STEM subjects, university rankings have become an indicator for
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\(^5\) Since the publication of Paasi’s (2005) paper, the Research Assessment Exercise has been replaced by the Research Excellence Framework (REF).
commercial enterprise, which according to Altbach (2015) has implications for worldwide academe.

In the current era, the education sector has become a metaphor for the ‘knowledge economy’ in which “new globalizing knowledge spaces...are brought together within one space” (Olds and Robertson 2008: no pagination). HEIs are regarded as important agents in the ‘knowledge economy’ (Olssen and Peters 2005). The transformation of HE has observed the emergence of pro-market policies such as deregulation, privatisation (Kishun 1998) and the increasing commodification of knowledge (Orr 1997). In the quest for universities to become global competitors, HEIs are enhancing their ties with industry, while HE policies are increasingly emphasising institutional entrepreneurialism (Goedegebuure et al., 1994 cited in Orr 1997). Students, too, have become identified as a commodity. Full-fee paying international students enrolled on undergraduate and postgraduate courses abroad are increasingly viewed as saviours of struggling university programmes in Anglo-American universities (Gibbons 1997 cited in Kishun 1998). Likewise, Altbach (2015) acknowledges that students and their families have become HE customers who purchase educational services.

There are a number of positive technological, economic and socio-political reasons underpinning education sector policies to globalise higher education (Yang 2003). The proportion of female researchers in scientific research continues to grow faster than that of men, although currently not enough to indicate a self-correcting gender imbalance (European Commission 2013b). Access to higher education, however, continues to affect individuals from ethnic and religious minorities and lower social classes (Altbach et al., 2009; Chapter 6). The impact of technological innovations on teaching and learning in HE is considered a major benefit in today’s globally connected world, equipping learners to compete in the knowledge economy (Arambewela 2010). Moreover, national boundaries are becoming more permeable for those wishing to take advantage of the research and study opportunities offered in another country (Altbach et al., 2009). Immigration challenges, however, still exist. While government policies continue to promote initiatives to reduce non-EU immigration, the UK government also acknowledge that the British economy is positively impacted by highly skilled migrants (Mavroudi and Warren 2013).
2.7 Academic mobility, knowledge transfer and internationalisation

British higher education transformed in 1963 as a corollary of the Robbins Report. The report recommended a democratised higher education system, expansion of existing universities, the creation of new institutions, the introduction of an ambitious ideology that sought “equality of opportunity” (Committee on Higher Education 1963: 7) and a revolutionised university policy (Yokoyama 2010). Participation in higher education has subsequently expanded, creating a heterogeneous student population (Hyland 2009). Some 1,776,540 undergraduate and 566,555 postgraduate UK domiciled students enrolled in 2017-18, according to figures by HESA (2019b). Even so, widening and sustaining participation amongst under-represented segments of the population remain a policy challenge (e.g., Chowdry et al., 2013; Moore et al., 2013; Desai 2017). These changes in the student demography have been accompanied by increasing numbers of academic staff (Figure 2.1), particularly highly qualified and internationally mobile foreign-born lecturers (Universities UK 2007; Hoyler and Jön 2008b).

Figure 2.1 Non-UK academic staff with EU and non-EU nationality, 2003-2013

*Data source: HESA staff record 2003-04 to 2012-2013 (HESA 2014).*

Reasons for the growth in non-UK academics are manifold, including the creation of a European Higher Education Area (EHEA), recruitment challenges, and institutional strategies to internationalise teaching, learning and research functions (Universities...
UK 2007). First, EHEA aspires to regional and cross-border cooperative networking and the promotion of European higher education as attractive, highly competitive with strong academic excellence (Altbach et al., 2009). Key objectives of the Bologna Process (1999) are to achieve a “European knowledge society” a concept that combines the unrestricted mobility of education, knowledge, research, and innovation between academic disciplines, institutions, and employment sectors on a European scale (Commission of the European Communities 2007: 2). Transnational or cross-border education has long characterised higher education on an international scale, but as competition and commercialisation within the higher education sector increases (Rumbley et al., 2012) the EHEA initiative aims to promote European higher education excellence in technological innovation, research and economic strength and achieve greater competitive advantage (Ackers 2008), as well as circumvent scientific provinciality (Kyvik et al., 1999). Second, research conducted by the Universities and Colleges Employers Association (UCEA) (2009: 1) reported that recruiting and retaining qualified domestic academic staff was “sometimes” an issue for institutions, encouraging HEIs to recruit internationally. The influx of international teaching and research staff may also reflect the UK impact agenda measured by the REF (UCEA 2009), as universities seek to attract potentially mobile world-leading academic talent (Williams and Baláž 2008a; Bennion and Locke 2010) as a strategy to generate greater academic funding, increase research output and improve institutional ranking (Rumbley et al., 2012; Thomson 2014). International faculty may also be drawn to UK higher education for its academic reputation, career prospects, “favourable working environment” (Hoyler and Jöns 2008a: 143) and its highly competitive academic community (Mertens 2007).

The third reason has been institutional, governmental and sector-wide initiatives, strategies and policies to develop the international dimension of higher education (Knight 2012). Internationalisation benefits higher education. Learners are equipped with employable skills and international awareness to flourish in a globally connected world (OECD 2004; Kahane 2009), while new pedagogical practices enrich higher education communities (Green and Myatt 2011). Knowledge is globally situated; students should, therefore, expect their academic scholarship to be influenced by ideas, practices, techniques, and perspectives sourced from international staff (Hoare 1994). Within geography – although not exclusively geography discipline-specific – the instructor’s international research and training can
be leveraged as a valuable teaching resource (Alberts 2008). Migrant academics have been described as a major strategy to internationalising the curriculum (Hsieh 2012; Thomson 2014), yet critical evidence supporting this statement remain insufficient.

International faculty have become increasingly recognised as a source of classroom diversity and cultural capital (e.g., Green and Myatt 2011; Trahar 2011; Brewer and Leask 2012) but existing studies only cursorily point to this, especially in the UK (e.g., Luxon and Peelo 2009; Hsieh 2012; Pherali 2012). Most studies have tended to report on the emotional and cultural challenges encountered by the migrant academic and the perceived negative outcomes of the student learner (Alberts 2008). Fewer studies have examined the resilience, self-determination and coping strategies of non-British academic staff in a new pedagogic environment (Zhou et al., 2008), as well as knowledge transfer through transnational academic mobility and its impact on the internationalisation of students (Kim 2009). Thus, it is important to re-state the study’s timely focus on knowledge transfer in teaching and learning and the link to internationalising higher education. The research proposes to analyse existing practices of knowledge transfer in teaching and learning among non-UK educated and socialised academic staff and the perception of otherness by UK undergraduate students. The next section will discuss the international academic staff’s experiences working in an unfamiliar academic environment.

2.7.1 Migrant academic staff in a new knowledge environment

Storme et al., (2013, 2017) have argued that the need and expectation for twenty-first century academics to be internationally mobile appear to be greater than ever; the role of highly skilled workers in the creation and transfer of knowledge in knowledge based-economies has intensified (Williams and Baláž 2008a) exacerbated by the increasing commodification of knowledge (Orr 1997). Before proceeding further to discussions examining non-UK staff as valuable resources to UK higher education teaching and learning, it is pertinent to draw attention to foreign instructors’ experience of working in an unfamiliar pedagogic, cultural and potentially different linguistic academic environment, and how this can impact their pedagogic practice and opportunities for knowledge transfer. The mobility of students and their overseas learning experience have dominated academic discourse (see, for example, Brooks and Waters 2011). More recently, academics – especially geographers (e.g., Alberts
2008; Jöns 2009) – have examined the motivations, experiences, and outcomes related to international career moves of academic staff, yet little is known about their adaptability into new academic communities and their concerns, needs, and frustrations. Given the lacuna of existing studies examining transnational academic staff experience within a UK higher education context, international examples will be drawn from Australia, the United States and New Zealand in the Global North and Sudan in the Global South.

It has been reported that international academic staff may experience similar challenges to those of international students (Luxon and Peelo 2009). Indeed, existing studies have tended to explore migrant academic staff's experience within a framework of pain; for instance, financial hardship (Collins 2008), citizenship and residency uncertainty (Foote et al., 2008), isolation, cultural and religious challenges (Alberts 2008), as well as connected outcomes such as unfamiliarity with assessment practices (Herrmann 2014), curriculum design and academic background of learners (Luxon and Peelo 2009). All of these factors may pose genuine difficulties for non-national academic staff (Pherali 2012) that may negatively impact pedagogic style (Collins 2008), research quality and student learning (Green and Myatt 2011) and lead to emotional distress such as confusion, frustration, disorientation (Leask 2004) and feelings of disempowerment (Hsieh 2012). Further, the constant negotiation and re-negotiation of new cultural landscapes can have painful emotional and psychological consequences for the hybridised and cosmopolitan academic (Grimshaw and Sears 2008). Even so, this apparent framing of academic staff’s experiences as painful can become a source of strength, resilience, and optimism. For example, an American educated lecturer working in the UK HE system drew on her academic experience and self-confidence to effectively integrate her 'Otherness' into new and unfamiliar academic communities (Luxon and Peelo 2009).

Interestingly, this use of ‘Othering’ seems to be an exception. Existing studies reveal a concerted effort by international academic staff to disguise (Green and Myatt 2011), “camouflage” (Clifford and Henderson 2011: 115) and “overlook” (Jiang et al., 2010: 166) the ‘otherness’ or perceived differences in their cultural and academic background. Phillips et al., (2009) generously read such behaviour as high-achieving and confident educators who seek unfamiliar academic environments, moving from “comfortable spaces of knowledge to uncomfortable places of becoming” (p. 1455). There is evidence however that institutions are failing to recognise and embrace the
diversity international academic staff can bring to higher education communities (Green and Myatt 2011; Chapter 7). Clifford and Henderson (2011) also argued that non-national academic staff tend not to understand the university system or educational culture in which they are employed because pedagogic practices are rooted in academic cultures (Zhou et al., 2008). For instance, non-UK staff made false assumptions in regards to active classroom discussions, were unfamiliar with the idea of second-marking (Herrmann 2014) and unprepared for “obscure” and “puzzling” terminology used to describe curriculum design and course administration (Luxon and Peelo 2009: 653). Numa Markee (1997: 12), a language teacher working in Sudan, found he was “linguistically, culturally, and professionally ill-equipped” to successfully plan and integrate exogenous pedagogical approaches into his teaching and learning practice. In New Zealand, international academic staff cited widespread confusion with regards to expected teaching style, frustration with the perceived “casualness” of the learning environment and ill-fitting pedagogic practices and goals developed within academic communities exterior to New Zealand (Yourn and Kirkness 2003: 624). While in Australia, existing research found international academic staff to be irritated by misleading institutional informality and a perceived lack of punctuality (Guerin and Green 2016).

English-language proficiency and the ability to effectively communicate with students, colleagues, and senior management is repeatedly presented in the literature on academic mobility (Alberts 2008; Luxon and Peelo 2009; Saltmarsh and Swirski 2010; Green and Myatt 2011; Hsieh 2012; Pherali 2012; Śliwa and Johansson 2015; Guerin and Green 2016; Chapter 6). Language incompetency or perceived English-language inability of international academic staff has also triggered media outbursts in the United States concerned that higher education quality is suffering (Alberts 2008). Consequently, English-speaking proficiency tests have been implemented in many American universities (Clayton 2000; Finder 2005). An accent is also a source of concern for some students (Alberts 2008) and some international faculty (Luxon and Peelo 2009; Hsieh 2012; Pherali 2012). However, there appears an inconsistency in how much a staff member’s accent affects learning, with most students reporting only short-term challenges (Alberts 2008). Interestingly, Hsieh (2012) and Śliwa and Johansson (2015) reported that some academic staff believed a student’s intellectual inability and poor module performances contributed to complaints about accent and language difficulties, particularly in scientific subjects.
where the use of universal language is widespread. From the perspective of academic staff, English-language competency does not supplement a limited understanding of local cultural references and knowledge (Pherali 2012). Interpreting cultural expressions and maintaining informal conversations with colleagues and students represented a greater challenge than language use (Hsieh 2012), especially when required to provide advice on personal and academic matters as personal tutor (Pherali 2012). However, there is agreement that language anxiety can impact teacher-student interaction, resulting in increased dependency on PowerPoint presentations as a tactic to reduce potentially threatening student interaction (Luxon and Peelo 2009; Pherali 2012). Teaching, researching and publishing in English nevertheless is frequently considered a source of personal and professional growth (Leung 2013; Chapters 4 and 5).

From the perspective of non-UK academics, there appears a notable absence of appropriate workplace inductions, development courses, and support services and networks. Irrespective of academic, cultural and linguistic background, induction events and development courses were delivered with an assumption that international academic staff possessed tacit knowledge of their new educational setting (Saltmarsh and Swirski 2010). Moreover, development and support courses seldom met the needs of heterogeneous non-national academics (Collins 2008; Luxon and Peelo 2009; Green and Myatt 2011; Hsieh 2012), with many staff also feeling abandoned and alienated following departmental inductions (Thomas and Malau-Aduli 2013). Surprisingly, some support mechanisms were perceived as a threat to professional development and competence; institutional support may, therefore, be rejected if “viewed as ‘patronizing’” or discriminatory (Pherali 2012: 328). Despite the professional difficulties, feelings of frustration and bewilderment outlined above, studies emphasise that foreign academic staff felt largely welcomed by colleagues and students (Pherali 2012) and positively viewed their new HEI environment (Saltmarsh and Swirski 2010). These experiences, however, are not representative of the entire international academic workforce. Perceived attitudes of colleagues and students toward migrant academic members of staff will shape daily experiences and day-to-day survival (Foote et al., 2008; Luxon and Peelo 2009).
2.7.2 Foreignness as a teaching resource

Previous research has emphasised that the professional, academic and lived experiences of international faculty enrich the student experience (Alberts 2008; Luxon and Peelo 2009; Pherali 2012). However, empirical evidence supporting these claims remains scant. One explanation for this lacuna of information points to “incoherent and incomplete” data based on weak methodological techniques (Teichler et al., 2011: 111). Despite this dearth of literature, a small number of case studies have discussed the rich resources that international academic staff can bring to higher education communities. Therefore, much of the following discussion on transnational knowledge transfer and pedagogic practices in teaching and learning is based on this limited literature, reinforcing the timeliness of this research.

The key question of how do international academic staff engaged in both research and teaching transfer ideas and academic perspectives acquired in non-UK pedagogic environments to UK students has important implications for the student experience, teaching quality (Pherali 2012) and HE policies (Jöns 2007). This increasing trend of recruiting highly skilled academic talent from an international market has become widely recognised as a prerequisite for growth in the knowledge economy (Tremblay 2005), contributing to the globalisation of HE institutions (Marginson and van der Wende 2007). The influx of global academic talent also brings with it the need for quality assurance that international educators can deliver and sustain quality student learning (Foote et al., 2008; Green et al., 2012). But within this quality assurance framework lurks uncertainty: what constitutes quality learning? This is compounded further by universities placing varying degrees of importance on high-quality teaching and learning (Gribble and Ziguras 2003) as well as a lack of clarity in its definition (Chalkley et al., 2000).

The internationalisation of higher education teaching and learning approaches challenges existing pedagogic practice. Non-British academic staff are expected to make distinctive contributions to the curriculum, while at the same time being required to integrate into their new epistemic community (Pherali 2012). That said, practical considerations need to be addressed. Leung (2013) suggests that it should not be assumed that the transfer and translation of explicit and tacit knowledge are automatic, for it has to be engineered. Additionally, students are accustomed to specific learning paradigms; therefore, international faculty need to understand and be prepared for the specificities of distinctive academic cultures (Gribble and Ziguras
2003). For example, Norwegian education and research tend to pursue hermeneutic pedagogies, while Swedish educational policies are proponents of positivistic learning paradigms (Eide 1993). Similarly, Chinese lecturers teaching methods tend to be dogmatic and direct (Hsieh 2012) compared to the traditionally deductive style of Western learning (Felder and Silverman 1988). Despite these teaching and learning differences and challenges, non-native academic staff’s previous professional experiences have been highly praised. Moreover, cultural and pedagogical differences may be viewed by foreign academic staff as a valuable resource for knowledge dissemination, rather than an obstacle. For example, a native speaker of English teaching in the UK used cultural differences in order to extrapolate theory, by “trading on anecdotes” from which subject-specific content could then be illustrated (Luxon and Peelo 2009: 656).

2.8 Conclusion
In this chapter, I have examined the transformative processes that have affected higher education over the last twenty years. In doing so, this review of the literature provides a conceptual framework through which to situate this thesis. Throughout the chapter, reference has been made to literature about migrant academic staff as a source of classroom diversity and cultural capital (Green and Myatt 2011; Trahar 2011; Brewer and Leask 2012). Existing studies, however, only cursorily point to this, especially in the UK (Luxon and Peelo 2009; Hsieh 2012; Pherali 2012). In the next chapter, I introduce the research methodology, which will present the findings of the study and how they can contribute to the broad debates discussed in this chapter.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Thanks for doing this study. I think it’s good, it’s really important.
Lecturer, Female, PhD from Canada

3.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses the research approach and methods employed to examine
the experiences and perceived contributions of migrant academic members of staff to
the internationalisation of the curriculum. It is organised into three different research
phases, reflecting the study’s tripartite research population. Phase one draws on
interviews conducted with migrant academics, phase two focuses on interviews
undertaken with senior management and professional development staff, and phase
three discusses the student feedback survey. The remainder of the chapter is
organised into five sections. First, sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 discuss epistemological
pluralism, grounded theory, and multi-method research. In section 3.5, the rationale
for selecting the case-study universities is considered, and each research method
(semi-structured interviews and online feedback surveys) is discussed in detail.
Section 3.6 provides a brief conclusion. There are no self-contained sections
detailing research ethics, reflexivity, and positionality. Instead, a reflexive narrative
weaves throughout the chapter and, indeed, the entire dissertation. This is from an
understanding that reflexivity is a constant activity rather than a linear process (e.g.,
Hoggart et al., 2002; Byrne 2004; Alexander 2008; Silver 2008). The fieldwork was
conducted at three anonymous case-study universities located in England, from
December 2014 to January 2016.

3.2 Epistemological pluralism
Interdisciplinary research on internationalisation in higher education has grown
substantially in the last two decades (see, for example, Brooks and Waters 2011;
Wihlborg and Robson 2018). This synthesis of influences across different disciplinary
areas, linking geography with cognate disciplines such as business studies,
education, and sociology, connects a diverse range of philosophical perspectives.
Thus, inspired by King’s (2012) compelling argument for interdisciplinarity in human
geography, the epistemological framework for this research is pluralistic. In
examining the mobility of academics (Jöns 2007, 2015), pedagogy and ideas
(Williams 2006, 2007a) in the internationalisation of higher education, this study responds more specifically to King’s (2002) call for “interdisciplinary […] synthesis which brings together and integrates a range of perspectives, frameworks, theoretical stances and methodologies in order to study migration (or the various forms of migration) in a manner which is holistic […] and which recognises its multifaceted diversity” (p. 90-91, emphasis in original). In making the argument for epistemological pluralism, I draw on two diverse but connected bodies of work that can be usefully employed to conceptualise transnational academic mobility and the mobilisation of knowledge(s), practices, and concepts: Bruno Latour’s (1987) centres of calculation and Edward Said’s (1983) travelling theory.

Writing in 1983, Said introduced ‘travelling theory’, suggesting “ideas and theories travel–from person to person, from situation to situation, from one period to another” (p. 226). En route, journeying through time and space, Said argues that theories change in response to new situations, historical dynamics and the places through which they travel. However, the journey is never unimpeded and not all theories survive; “some are abandoned, replaced and forgotten along the way” (Frank 2009: 62). For example, Said writes:

One should go on to specify the kinds of movement that are possible, in order to ask whether by virtue of having moved from one place and time to another an idea or a theory gains or loses in strength, and whether a theory in one historical period and national culture becomes altogether different for another period or situation (Said 1983: 226).

This quote is particularly important to this study and offers an understanding of how migrant academic members of staff transfer ideas and academic perspectives acquired in non-UK pedagogic environments to students at UK universities. Indeed, as the following chapters will illustrate, some ideas and pedagogy are resisted and overlooked. Thus, travelling theory brings into dialogue important questions about hierarchies, networks, English-language dominance and the place of the knowledge environment in which knowledge is produced (Gregory 2009). Travelling theory, however, does not attend to human movement (Donald 1987), I, therefore, draw on Latour’s (1987) centres of calculation as a complementary body of work to conceptualise the mobilisation of individuals and material resources.
Centres of calculation (Latour 1987), a concept which has been successfully used in migration studies (e.g., Jöns 2015), illustrates the circular movements of people and non-human research objects (e.g., books, maps, artefacts) and the cumulative stockpiling of expertise, knowledges, and resources in a few venues or ‘centres of calculation’, such as universities, museums and laboratories. As Jöns (2011b) points out, it is a concept that has “contributed significantly to the construction and dissemination of scientific, geographical and other forms of knowledge in different times and spaces” (p. 158). According to Latour (1987), there are three constituent elements to the concept and, therefore, the production of new knowledge: (1) mobilisation (the movement of resources); (2) stabilisation (accumulated research objects are assembled, transformed and re-represented to create a new narrative); (3) extension (the acceptance of new knowledge). The concept is particularly suited for this study for two reasons. First, it conceptualises the transnational movements of migrant academics and the accumulation processes of ideas and pedagogy. As non-UK academics move from one knowledge environment to another, it is argued that their transnational links may provide a basis for knowledge transfer in higher education teaching and learning. Second, the different geographical scales travelled by non-UK academics can be studied, providing an intriguing insight into the varying knowledge landscapes encountered by interviewed migrant academics and their exposure to different practices, knowledge(s), and ideas. Indeed, as Meusburger (2015: 268) points out, academic mobility “can trigger new ways of thinking and learning” through “gathering experience in different knowledge environments, tackling new challenges in different departments and scientific domains, exposing one’s research ideas to new criticism, and familiarising oneself with issues and methods one has not yet encountered at previous places of work”.

Building on these considerations, Pherali (2012: 318) has argued that migrant academics moving into British higher education are required to “integrate while making some distinctive contributions to the programs drawing on their international cultural capital”. Further, and paradoxically, Thomson (2014: no pagination) states “international academics share the need to make connections between what happens here and what happens elsewhere”, incorporating into their teaching “homegrown literatures, scholars, histories and ways of life”. This does not take into account, however, international faculty who choose to disguise, overlook and/or
camouflage their cultural identity and academic background (Jiang et al., 2010; Clifford and Henderson 2011; Green and Myatt 2011). Nonetheless, knowledge transfer in a UK context of higher education teaching and learning is confirmed in this study, but the emerging picture is a complex interplay between institutional differences in practices, norms, and cultures (Chapters 4, 5 and 7) and staff-student interactions (Chapter 6). Not all interviewed migrant academics reported negative experiences of integrating different approaches into the curriculum, for some it was an opportunity for creativity and diversity. However, as Said (1983: 227) makes clear, institutional processes and intolerances to “alien” ideas and theories can impede their movement from one environment to another.

Bringing together these theories, this dissertation reveals how and why knowledge transfer in teaching and learning takes place, while also highlighting divisions within the case-study universities. The study is also informed by feminist philosophy and post-colonial theory underpinning arguments about power differentials (Ley and Mountz 2001), situated knowledges (Haraway 1988), positionality (Parr 2001), and colonial influences in shaping pedagogic spaces (Madge et al., 2015; Noxolo 2017). An analysis of the social conditions underlying knowledge transfer is also undertaken because according to Bilecen and Faist (2015) reciprocity, trust and solidarity were identified as three social conditions of knowledge transfer. For King (2002), epistemological pluralism is a research strength. For example, economic geographers have recognised the value of engaging with pluralism “to create new knowledge” (Barnes and Sheppard 2010: 208). However, the interdisciplinary character of migration research has been critiqued, with Collins and Huang (2012: 270) expressing concern about the “absence of explicit methodological debates” in contemporary migration scholarship, raising questions about the relative benefit of mixed methodologies and the conceptual implications of employing different methodological approaches.

3.3 Grounded theory
Grounded theory, a well-established methodology in qualitative inquiry (Patton 2002), strives to generate theory from collected data through the systematic coding, categorising and constant comparing of empirics (Glaser and Strauss 1967). Both the semi-structured interviews and qualitative questionnaire responses were analysed using a grounded theory approach. By coding the material, themes and relationships
could be identified across interviews that shed light on the differences and similarities experienced by international academic staff (Objective 1). In the analysis, I was also interested in exploring staff-student relationships (Objective 2) and comparing institutional contexts and policies (Objective 3). In applying grounded theory, it allowed for the identification of different types of knowledge transfer, the strategies non-UK academics employed in negotiating such transfer, and the institutional support processes in mobilising international best practices of migrant academics.

The importance grounded theory places on “achieving validity and reliability in the data analysis” (Babbie 2016: 301) is critical to this study, to be able to understand multiple actors’ experiences of internationalising the case-study universities. There are also limitations to the approach, including, as Glaser (2003: 128) himself has argued, “the researcher’s self”. In this instance, the “researcher simply follows the grounded theory procedures/canons without imagination or insight into what the data are reflecting – because he or she fails to see what they are really saying except in terms of trivial or well-known phenomena” (Strauss and Corbin 1990: 256). To mitigate the above, mind maps were created to tease out themes, categories, and occurrences of a pattern. Overall, the greatest strength of grounded theory is that it allows for more explorative analysis of survey data, thus providing an analytical justification for a multi-method approach combining qualitative and quantitative research methods.

3.4 Multi-method approach
In the last decade, a substantial literature on the global geographies of academic mobility has produced rich data enhancing our understanding of mobilisation processes, transnational knowledge networks, knowledge production and circulation, and the internationalisation of tertiary education. Much of this contribution to scholarship is based on qualitative research, with relatively few papers contributing to quantitative evidence. Exemplary here is a study by Jöns (2009), who surveyed 1,893 former Humboldt Research Fellows from different countries in Germany. Taken together, qualitative and quantitative research can provide balanced insights into studies focusing on the geographies of education (Holloway et al., 2010). In order to address the research objectives (Chapter 1), the study subscribes to a multi-method
approach combining qualitative interviews, online feedback surveys, and secondary data analysis.

For McKendrick (1999: 40), “the possibilities for multi-method research are […] considerable”. Explicit here is the dynamism and capability of weaving together quantitative and qualitative techniques (Clifford and Valentine 2003). For example, secondary datasets of non-UK academics working in British higher education provided expansive information about academic staff, highlighting temporal migration patterns to the UK, the variable nationalities of international faculty and gender inequalities. This statistical information acquired from HESA provided a contextual framework in which to situate an inherently qualitative study. In contrast, the use of qualitative interviews revealed the complex nuances of human behaviour and knowledge transfer processes, while the student feedback surveys were an appropriate vehicle to gather initial insights into student experiences, interactions, and attitudes of being taught by migrant academic members of staff in a UK context of higher education teaching and learning, a largely neglected aspect in academic debates.

Integrating quantitative and qualitative data has great potential for revealing “different aspects of empirical reality” (Denzin 1978: 28), therefore maximising our understanding of the phenomenon under inquiry (Valentine 2005). Similarly, different methods are “differentially received and a mixture can allow us to get our message across to varied audiences” (Holloway 2014: 382). The study’s research findings from multiple sources (study participants, different case-study universities, and research methods) have provided an emergent platform to deconstruct and contextualise migrant academic staff’s role and sense of belonging in UK higher education. The following section engages with the methods employed in this research.

3.5 Research methods
In this section, I discuss research encounters and the methods which facilitated these encounters. Divided into three distinctive yet overlapping sections, section 3.5.1 pays particular attention to the analysis of secondary data, and the selection, access, and co-operation of the case-study universities. The remaining two sections address semi-structured interviews with non-UK academics, senior management and
professional development staff (section 3.5.2), and online feedback surveys with British undergraduate students (section 3.5.3), respectively.

3.5.1 The case-study universities
This study has selected three case-study higher education institutions within England for an in-depth analysis of the experiences of migrant academic members of staff and their perceptions of knowledge transfer in their teaching and learning practice. The selected participant universities are not named in this thesis to safeguard the anonymity of research partners and individuals. The selected universities offer a breadth of academic subjects from across the humanities and the natural, technical and social sciences, as a variable to examine the strategies employed by different institutions and migrant academics in mobilising international best practice.

Secondary data obtained from HESA in combination with qualitative techniques were used in selecting the case-study universities for this research. Staff data was requested at the individual institutional level and included: age, nationality, gender, academic employment function, mode and terms of employment, and academic discipline. Where an academics previous employment was outside of the UK this information was not recorded and therefore coded ‘Unknown/Question not answered’. The omission of this datum creates a partial representation of migrant academics new to British higher education, wherein “selected phenomena” is recorded and undocumented information is silenced (St. Martin and Pavlovskaya 2010: 182). These absences illustrate the limitations of the HESA dataset, overlooking the geographical and higher education diversity of migrant academics as well as British staff returning from working overseas. In another way, too, this issue highlights the primacy of certain data over others. Crucially, the content of collected HESA data “is determined by government and HE funding bodies, in consultation with HE providers and other key data users” (HESA 2016a: no pagination). However,

---

6 Contract of employment (e.g., teaching only, teaching and research, research only, neither teaching nor research).
7 Contract of employment status (e.g., full-time, part-time).
8 Type of contract (e.g., open-ended/permanent, fixed-term, atypical).
9 Applicable to 2012-13 onwards this refers to the “subject or subjects in which the member of staff is currently working”. For 2011-12 and earlier, it designates the “subject or subjects appropriate to that staff member’s academic qualification, not necessarily the academic subject in which that staff member may currently be teaching or researching” (HESA 2016b: no pagination).
10 The previous institution worked refers to UK higher education institutions only (email correspondence, HESA 2013).
I argue information pertaining to previous employment is important in understanding the uneven geographies of transnational mobility and the production and circulation of knowledge (e.g., Jôns 2007, 2015; Ackers and Gill 2008; Bauder 2015). This information would build upon wider debates in geography about the benefits and challenges of internationalising higher education, as universities seek to attract potentially mobile world-leading academic talent (Williams and Baláž 2008a; Bennion and Locke 2010) as a strategy to generate academic funding, increase research output and improve institutional ranking (Rumbley et al., 2012; Thomson 2014).

To examine the relationship between migrant academics and the internationalisation of UK higher education research was undertaken at three different types of higher education institutions to (i) help with the recruitment of non-UK academics and (ii) to allow for a comparison of institutional contexts and strategies. Although there are multiple combinations to group and compare British universities (Beloff 1968; see also Coey 2013) in this study, the case-study institutions are differentiated by the award of their royal charter, or the year an institution acquired university status. Empirically, the differentiation of higher education institutions by generation encourages the exploration of participant universities’ historical, political, educational, and organisational principles. On a conceptual level, the relationship between the university and internationalising the curriculum is complex, layered with distinct interrelated dimensions that on the one hand concern migrant academic staff’s “agency in transforming the institutions and environments in which they are placed” (Madge et al., 2015: 687, emphasis in original) and, on the other, a place-embedded knowledge hub with “traditional university values: ‘the discovery of new knowledge, the testing of received knowledge and the creative, responsible and effective application of knowledge’” (Watson 2002: no pagination) and the bringing together of “national and international flows of knowledge and people” (Goddard and Vallance 2013: 2). The latter seems at odds with the experiences of some non-UK academics from across the sample, who spoke of the ambivalences and challenges of bringing different pedagogic practices to a UK context of higher education teaching and learning (Chapters 4 and 5).

In Britain, university generations have been a long-standing informal point of reference that continues to be used (Beloff 1968), while university mission groups are subject to frequent change. For example, at the time of analysing the HESA data, the 1994 Group disbanded (Morgan 2013) leaving just four mission groups now
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representing the different types of higher education institutions: GuildHE; the University Alliance; Million+; and the Russell Group. The generational groupings employed for this study allowed for a detailed differentiation between new and established universities, in terms of higher education provision and institutional strategies for internationalising the curriculum, reflecting the close link between university charter and research reputation (Goddard and Vallance 2013; see also Moodie 1991). To determine the case-study universities, all UK higher education institutions were grouped chronologically by university status as defined by the Pearce Review (More Partnership 2012): for example, Oxbridge; pre-1960s; 1960s; 1990s; 2000s; and specialist. By analysing the 2012-13 HESA staff records (HESA 2014), the percentage of non-UK academic staff (by nationality) employed at all higher education providers in the UK was calculated (158 institutions in total). This measure was used to determine the diversity of academic staff on a national scale but also to ensure a representative sample of British universities. For instance, the selected case-study universities are all within 4% of the generational average for their type of institution (Table 3.1). They are all provincial universities located outside of the ‘golden triangle’ (Cambridge, London, and Oxford) and all are highly ranked institutions in terms of league table positioning, research quality, student satisfaction, and entry requirements. In national terms, the average nationality measure (21%)\(^{11}\) indicates that the selected universities are relatively diverse and above average in terms of non-UK academics employed on a teaching and research contract. Most remarkably, the average share of non-British academics in the older universities is higher than those of the younger universities, indicating that a more diverse teaching body is a feature of the more established and highly ranked institutions. The university generations represented in this study are pre-1960s and 1960s.

\(^{11}\) Based on the calculation of non-UK academics employed on a teaching and research contract only.
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Table 3.1 Academic staff whose nationality is non-British by university generation and contract of employment, 2012-13 (average %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University type (In chronological order)</th>
<th>Teaching &amp; Research</th>
<th>Teaching only</th>
<th>Research only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxbridge</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1960s</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Based on the calculation of full and part-time academic staff.
b Excludes individuals who identified their nationality as 'Stateless', 'Europe not otherwise specified', and 'not known'.
c Specialist institutions are “characterised by their relatively tight focus on particular subjects” such as music, art, and pharmacy (More Partnership 2012: 101).
d Data source: HESA staff record 2003-04 to 2012-2013 (HESA 2014).

Access to, and the analysis of, staff data provided an analytical basis for the study; however, the reliability of secondary data must be considered. For instance, a HESA representative recommended that I use data from 2003-04 onwards, as figures prior to this are of poorer quality and not compatible due to the use of different population sets (email correspondence, HESA 2013). The use of secondary data, therefore, raises important methodological issues, such as data quality, documentation, and administration (Kitchin and Tate 2000). Despite the problematic nature of the HESA dataset, its analysis provided the justification for selecting the case-study universities. The statistical information also provided a historical dimension creating a ten-year time-series index between 2003-04 and 2012-13, which enabled the identification and analysis of fluctuating population trends (Clark 2005) in terms of non-British academics employed in UK higher education (see Figure 2.1 Chapter 2).

For this study, contact was made in the first instance with the Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for Teaching, senior managers who have a significant strategic and academic influence on teaching and learning. Contact was made in writing, either via email or post. This included a letter of request and project brief detailing the overview of the study. To facilitate access, there was explicit reference to the Higher Education Academy\textsuperscript{12} (HEA) as funders of the doctoral project. An

\textsuperscript{12} In March 2018 the Higher Education Academy merged with the Equality Challenge Unit and the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education to form Advance HE (Advance HE 2018).
existing contact within higher education suggested citing the HEA in all communication as a strategy to gain institutional permission and access. The contact suggested that the study’s connection to the HEA would encourage participation, because of the organisation’s “globally recognised” commitment to enhancing learning and teaching in higher education (Higher Education Academy 2016: no pagination). While the HEA has not imposed any restrictions, guidelines, or influenced the project design, its use as a research strategy needs to be acknowledged. Finally, the written overview of the study was deliberately constructed to convey the project as a collaborative venture, mutually beneficial for both the researcher and research partner. In return for institutional permission, each university will receive a detailed summary of the research findings. The Pro Vice-Chancellors responsible for Teaching were assured that research partners and participants would not be identified in academic output, or discussed with individuals outside of the supervisory team.

Despite the research being conducted in similar education settings, a single strategic approach for gaining access could not be applied. At each of the case-study universities, several gatekeepers were approached. While “official access” (Wanat 2008: 192) was granted by the Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for Teaching, this was not a “one-off activity” (Burgess 1991: 43). Rather, access was continually negotiated and renegotiated with gatekeepers situated at different hierarchies within the university structure (Table 3.2). This complicated access to and the recruitment of participants, it also highlighted the challenges involved in securing access to participating universities. For example, given that project findings will have significant benefits to best-management practices for teaching and learning, I had expected the Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for Teaching to assess the validity of the project and either grant or deny the request. Indeed, this process did take place at two of the participating universities. Where this did not happen, a complicated two-month “chain of negotiation” began (Valentine 1999: 145). Thus, I had to re-strategise my approach (Peticca-Harris et al., 2016) to accommodate different institutional policies, in terms of negotiating access, co-operation, and ethical requirements.
Table 3.2 Chain of negotiation by the case-study universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University A</th>
<th>University B</th>
<th>University C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for Teaching</td>
<td>i. Existing contact in higher education</td>
<td>i. Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. International Relations</td>
<td>ii. Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for Teaching</td>
<td>ii. Head of School/Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. International Mobility</td>
<td>iii. Head of School/Department</td>
<td>iii. Migrant academic member of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Human Resources</td>
<td>iv. Migrant academic member of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Head of School/Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Migrant academic member of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Own study.

The positive response, enthusiasm, and support for the project by gatekeepers, from across the sample, are demonstrated in the interview quotations below:

I’m happy to help in any way: […] this sounds like a very significant and interesting project. Indeed, one of the things I have come to understand […] is the often under-utilised resource of international staff experience and perspective, not least at a time when British higher education is changing very rapidly.

_Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for Teaching_

_personal email, August 2014_

This [project] entirely resonates with some of my own experience at [overseas institution] where we explored four different dimensions of internationalisation, one of which was this sort of thing. I personally would like to see the development of these different dimensions here in the School and would welcome supporting you Natalie and hearing the outcomes of your research in due course. Please do let me know what we can do to help.

_Head of School_

_personal email, October 2014_

Vital here is the examination of the gatekeeper’s positionality in facilitating entry to the case-study institutions. For instance, in the email excerpts above both of the
gatekeeper's are migrant academics capable of drawing on their international perspective and academic cultural capital to assess the validity of the project. This double-beingness (Chapters 4 and 5) – of being here and there – draws attention to the embodied and emplaced difference (Dunn 2010a) of migrant and sojourner academic staff experience. Their continued transnational links between destination and origin locations produced a positive reaction to the project and provided a nuanced insight into the relationship between embedded experiences (overseas activities) and decision-making processes (displaying a positive response to the study). While being a non-UK academic in a senior management position is not necessarily a precondition for engaging with the study, an observation might suggest that gatekeepers’ “embodied and institutionalized cultural capital” (Waters 2016: 285) – for instance, international education and an interest in shaping institutional policies such as an internationalisation agenda – was fundamental in gaining access to the case-study universities and participants enabling the research to take place.

3.5.2 Semi-structured interviews
This section discusses semi-structured interviews as a research method, highlighting the limitations, merits, challenges, and unexpected emotions from the researcher and the research participants. Specifically, critical discussions will focus on participant recruitment and transparency, uncomfortable and humorous encounters, plus participants’ (mis)interpretation of both the researcher and the research project. In total, 43 interviews were undertaken with migrant academics, senior management and professional development staff, and final year undergraduate students. Of these, 34 interviews were conducted with non-UK academics from across the humanities and the natural, technical and social sciences, and different career stages. Seven interviews were conducted with senior management and professional development staff, and two exploratory interviews were undertaken with final year undergraduate students (see section 3.5.3.1 for a detailed discussion). One participant was interviewed in two capacities: as a senior manager and a migrant academic. Interviews were conducted from December 2014 to July 2015.
3.5.2.1 Migrant academic members of staff

The principal objective of the project (and phase I of the study) was to analyse the experiences of migrant academic staff with regard to the transfer and adaptation of international ideas and concepts in their teaching and learning practice. It set out to identify contextualised examples of knowledge transfer and to investigate what strategies non-UK academics employ to transfer previously acquired discipline-specific knowledge and pedagogical practices to a UK context of teaching and learning. While recent studies have reported on non-UK academics in British higher education, existing research points only cursorily to the rich experiences they can potentially bring to UK higher education (e.g., Luxon and Peelo 2009; Hsieh 2012). In this study, qualitative interviews were undertaken to address this research absence and to give a voice to non-UK academics, which throughout the research process was at times subdued, either by the non-UK academic themselves or the participating institution (Chapters 4, 5 and 7).

Recruiting

Migrant academic staff were identified through criterion sampling (Patton 2002) and selected according to the following characteristics:

- non-UK national
- received primary, secondary and higher education outside of the UK
- employed to undertake research and teaching
- full-time academic

Central to this research is the different higher education contexts experienced by migrant academics. In particular their postgraduate study, an educational setting that marks the onset of professional training as a postgraduate research student, and a learning environment in which to develop detailed and thorough discipline-specific knowledge. The higher education context that postgraduate students inhabit vary, thus I engaged with academics from a variety of educational backgrounds (Figure 3.1 illustrates the place interviewed academics acquired their PhD). Most strikingly, there is an absence of participating volunteers from Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, and Asia (excluding India and Singapore). Perhaps most significant, HESA statistics indicate that fewer than 22% of academics with a legal nationality bound to
these regions were employed on a teaching and research contract in 2012-13 (Africa = 4%, Asia = 16%, Latin America and the Caribbean = 2%, Europe = 60%, Northern America = 13%, Oceania = 5%; HESA 2014). Comparing these HESA figures to the nationality of interviewed academics in this study (Table 3.3), 2.9% originated from Africa, 9% from Asia, 57% from Europe, 20% from Northern America and 11% from Oceania, suggesting an overrepresentation of Anglo-American and European countries.
Figure 3.1 Places where interviewed academic staff acquired their PhD

\[ a \text{ Source: Own interviews, 2014-15, } n = 35 \text{ (includes the senior manager who was also interviewed as a migrant academic member of staff).} \]
Table 3.3 Non-British academics by world region compared to % of interviewed migrant academic members of staff in sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World area and country (legal nationality of interviewees)</th>
<th>HESA data, 2012-13</th>
<th>Own sample, 2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2555</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11341</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Geographic regions as defined by the United Nations (United Nations 2018).
b Based on the calculation of full and part-time academic staff on a teaching and research contract only.
c Includes the senior manager who was also interviewed as a migrant academic member of staff.
d Excludes individuals who identified as ‘Stateless’, ‘Europe not otherwise specified’, and ‘not known’.
e Data source: HESA staff record, 2003-04 to 2012-2013 (HESA 2014), and own interviews, 2015-16.

The varying educational contexts experienced by international faculty can affect the pedagogical practices and discipline-specific knowledge(s) which they are exposed to, leading to differing justifications for using specific conceptual, methodological and empirical content in their teaching materials and different pedagogical approaches in their teaching and learning practice (see Meusburger 2015; also Chapters 4 and 5). The majority of interviewed academics reported that their teaching styles and
discipline-specific approaches have been informed and shaped by their graduate training and undergraduate education and, therefore, it is important to make a distinction between the two (Chapters 4 and 5). The educational setting in which non-UK academics acquired their PhD or equivalent training was often spatially (institutionally and geographically) different to their undergraduate education, creating hybridity of academic experiences prior to working at the case-study universities. A further condition of participation were non-UK academics who were contractually employed to undertake research and teaching, so to examine the close link between research-informed learning and the internationalisation of the curriculum. Geographers, in particular, have advocated the benefits of research-led teaching to enhance the student experience (Healey 2005), a view shared by many migrant academics interviewed in this study, but not all.

The methods used to identify and recruit appropriate participants varied by the institution and academic department, reflecting, in part, the sampling procedure determined by the gatekeeping senior manager. Recruiting a sufficient number of migrant academics from across academic disciplines, different career stages, gender, and academic background proved to be harder than anticipated, perhaps reflecting the sensitivity of the study. All of the participants were contacted via email, either by myself or with the help of gatekeepers. Non-UK academics were identified from information publicly available on staff web pages or the social networking sites LinkedIn and ResearchGate. Their online profiles were searched for information pertaining to their biographical history, specifically, the institution in which they acquired their PhD or equivalent training. In most cases, this was explicit, however, where such information was absent social networking sites were used. LinkedIn and ResearchGate facilitated the identification of potential participants who were hard-to-identify from their university profiles and thus increased the project’s sampling frame (Baltar and Brunet 2012). Recruiting non-UK academics via email was an iterative process, shaped and informed by email encounters, interview experiences, and a “greater self-consciousness” (McDowell 1992: 400) of email as a research method. Emails were explicit in their content, containing a written overview of the project, the requirements of involvement, data usage and, most importantly, it named the gatekeeper who granted permission for the research to be conducted. This added legitimacy to the study, informing the intended participant that their institution supported the research. Campbell et al., (2006), for example, spoke of the legitimacy
lent to their research from associating with larger research projects. However, as I will discuss below, naming the gatekeeper involved was critically viewed by some migrant academic members of staff.

In total, 426 non-UK academics were invited to join the study, 8% agreed to be interviewed (Table 3.4). The number of international academics invited for interview varied by institution, reflecting the sampling size and access conditions imposed by the gatekeepers (Burnham et al., 2008). Though senior management granted access to participant universities, I argue strongly that the extent to which access was rationed or controlled potentially undermined the effectiveness of using gatekeepers to recruit participants. For instance, the Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for Teaching at University B contacted 220 non-UK academics through an initial call of expressions of interest. This was a targeted approach, contacting staff who had been identified by the university’s Human Resources as “‘non-British’ or with a PhD from a country other than the UK” (personal email, November 2014). Given the potential reach of the email, the response rate was low. Ten staff (5%) expressed an interest in participating, however when approached for interview three withdrew (four participants were later recruited by myself). The reasons for relatively few volunteering participants are manifold, but it potentially demonstrates a disjuncture between gatekeeper enthusiasm towards the study and an academic’s (un)willingness to volunteer as a research participant.
### Table 3.4 List of interviewed migrant academics by subject area, academic position, gender, and length of employment at the case-study institutions (organised thematically by academic discipline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject area</th>
<th>Academic position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Length of employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chemistry</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematical sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mathematics</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Computer science</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Computer science</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Computer science</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Computer science</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Computer science</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering &amp; technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aerospace engineering</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Aerospace engineering</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chemical engineering</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Materials technology</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Economics</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Economics</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Economics</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sociology</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Human &amp; social geography</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Human &amp; social geography</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Human &amp; social geography</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Human &amp; social geography</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Law</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Law</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business &amp; administrative studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Business studies</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Business studies</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Management</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Management</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Accounting</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Marketing</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Marketing</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mass communications &amp; documentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Media studies</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Media studies</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Media studies</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical &amp; philosophical studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. History</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. History</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. History</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Education</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*b* Subject areas as defined by HESA (HESA 2018b).  
*c* Source: Own interview data, $n = 35$ (includes the senior manager who was also interviewed as a migrant academic member of staff).
One possible reason for the lack of volunteers, particularly when approached via a gatekeeper, is the perception, by intended participants, that I was a “management tool or spy” (Deacon et al., 2010: 268). This intriguing methodological insight became apparent during the research process when a participant, reflecting on the interview and recruitment experience, said:

I think your initial email, for some people, is a bit too intimidating. […] I would never send an e-mail like that to respondents. Because you’re almost creating the wrong impression that you are someone deputed by the university to find out some of the stupid things that international staff do.

Professor, Male, PhD from Singapore

In the pursuit for transparency, for example, informing intended participants that the case-study universities would receive a detailed report of project findings, I may, inadvertently, hindered participation even if this was not the intention of the project. Feedback, honest but uncomfortable to receive, provided valuable insights into the complexities of research transparency and the necessity to construct email invitations carefully (Valentine 2005). Project sensitivity (Butera 2006), too, was cited as a reluctance to participate, explicitly outlined in the email extract below:

It […] sounds like an over the top evaluation of my teaching based on my ‘foreignness’ and as such sounds fairly sensitive and something I would not be comfortable with at all.

Reader, Female, PhD from the United States of America

To counter this response, the comment below was received following an expression of interest email:

This sounds like a very interesting project; I’d be interested in helping out.

Reader, Female, PhD from Slovenia

Such differing reactions bring into dialogue the positionality of informants and the need to “recognize and take account of our own position, as well as that of our research participants” (McDowell 1992: 409). Reluctance to participate based on project sensitivity was not an anticipated challenge; indeed, my own supervisory team consists of migrant academics. Therefore, it is difficult to explain why some staff positively responded to the project while others did not (Kristensen and Ravn 2015).
A relationship with senior management, while necessary for institutional access, could have interfered and prejudiced the research process (Deacon et al., 2010). I also propose that time constraints and workload commitments, participant misinterpretation of the project, and concerns about audio-recorded interviews and the identifiability of academics’ comments may have also contributed to participant reluctance (see Broyles et al., 2011). I, therefore, had to re-strategise my approach (Peticca-Harris et al., 2016) to overcome barriers and enhance recruitment. For example, the initial email of the request for participation was re-written. I also contacted non-UK academics directly, where appropriate, rather than via a gatekeeper. Dillman et al., (2009: 10) have warned that it is “now more socially acceptable” to refuse participation in a study at a time when individuals are inundated with emails appealing for their attention. As this thesis highlights an emerging research area within geography, discussions focusing on the challenges of recruiting and interviewing international academics are important to enhance our methodological understandings into qualitative interviewing (Kristensen and Ravn 2015).

Interviewing
Interviews, Valentine (2005: 111) explains, aim “to understand how individual people experience and make sense of their own lives”. It is a “data-gathering method in which there is a spoken exchange of information” (Dunn 2010b: 101). As I interviewed non-UK academics where, for many, English was not their first language (74%), pilot interviews were conducted with existing contacts in higher education. This was a useful exercise because it highlighted difficult to understand, ambiguous, and leading questions, as well as instilling confidence in the interview schedule (Bryman 2012). Questions were informed by a review of the literature and informal discussions with professional development staff, undergraduate students, support specialists, and non-UK academics, covering six core themes:

- academics’ biographical history
- their attitude towards UK higher education
- pedagogical approaches
- knowledge transfer mechanisms
- curriculum internationalisation
- institutional support

However, pre-testing does not adequately prepare you for the "uneven interchanges with informants" (Hoggart et al., 2002: 211). For example, while some academics understood questions, others required further clarification before answering. I also had to define words (e.g., underutilised) testing my own English-language ability and communication skills. Language capabilities, however, were not confined to non-UK academics. I, too, struggled to deliver some questions stumbling over words because of researcher nerves and anxieties, but these eased as the research process progressed. Nonetheless, the interview structure was modified after each encounter to reflect its strengths and weaknesses.

Interviewing academics from across different cultural and linguistic contexts enriched this study. At the same time, it raised important cross-cultural complexities involving power, positionality, identity, and language. The marked differences between myself and non-UK academics were tangible. I am British, a monolinguist and have no experience of another higher educational system; although, intriguingly, some academics thought I was an international student. This reminds me of an encounter I experienced at the RGS-IBG Annual International Conference in London, 2016 when a fellow delegate misread my student status as International EU until I spoke with an English accent. This assessment was based on my research topic; the individual was apparently surprised that a British student would be interested in studying migrant academics. Thrown by this comment, I never thought to ask the man concerned more about the assumptions upon which he made this judgement. Through these encounters, however, I was surprised at how easy it was for participants and/or conference delegates to misread aspects of my sense of self (for example, age, student status, and nationality). In re-reading my field notes, my perceived ‘foreignness’ may have been a measure of whether academics participated in the study, a kindred spirit perhaps who would be able to empathise with the experiences of being a migrant academic. Reflexively, these encounters reinforce for me questions about carefully and responsibly constructing new knowledge, so as not to “reinforce and perpetuate [...] stereotypes and damaging representations” (Skelton 2001: 96).

There were also marked differences between informants. Interviews were undertaken with non-UK academics from across the humanities and the natural and
social sciences, different career stages, gender, race, sexuality, age, disability, academic background, and the case-study institution. Interviews were conducted in English, which is unsurprising given the project’s focus on UK higher education. However, interviewing non-native English speakers was, at times, a challenging and tiring experience. For some, their weak control of the English-language appeared to frustrate and hinder their responses; this raises the question of how that affected what non-UK academics said and their translation of ideas and concepts across languages. Practical issues such as cross-cultural communication and understanding pose important “questions relating to whether respondents conceptualized questions” (Herod 1999: 317) in the same manner in which they were asked. Nonetheless, doing cross-cultural research lent a collaborative dimension to the study. Academics asked questions about my own school experience and the UK’s GCSE and A-level qualifications, which interviews revealed to be a source of confusion for most migrant academics, even those with the administrative responsibility of Admissions Tutor.

All interviews with one exception13 were conducted face-to-face, and all but two were audiotaped. Interviews were conducted in a location stipulated by the interviewee, with most taking place in the participant’s university office or the Students’ Union. Interviews ranged in length between the shortest recorded at 46 minutes to the longest at two hours and 13 minutes. Like Skelton (2001), I spent a considerable amount of time at the beginning of each interview explaining the purpose of the research and how data would be used, as well as encouraging participants to ask questions. Most importantly, I gave academics the opportunity to ‘opt-in’ or ‘opt-out’ of the research once it had been explained; all participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason. As Skelton (2001: 91) explains, “allowing people to ‘opt into’ research” is empowering.

Being supervised by non-UK academics shaped and informed how I approached the project’s research questions, as did my own positive experience as a school student taught by non-UK teachers. My role as a researcher then felt like a privileged insider, yet also simultaneously as an outsider (Narayan 1993). While my experiences are not wholly comparable to non-UK academics, I have researched a community which I am part of (DeLyser 2001) and interviewed academics who may become future work colleagues or research collaborators. Studying an academic

---

13 Questions were answered via email due to the participant’s time restrictions.
community to which I belong benefited this research, facilitating access to the case-study universities and research participants, despite issues with participant reluctance outlined above. My familiarity, general understanding, and knowledge of UK higher education institutions eased data collection and analysis. For example, the “lived familiarity with the group being researched” (Griffith 1998: 361) through my German advisors meant that I could discuss in supervisory meetings participant responses and experiences which contributed to the clarification and “conceptualization of the stories gathered” (Pherali 2012: 319). But, as Porteous (1988) reports, familiarity creates methodological dilemmas. He found that some participants excessively engaged with certain questions at the expense of others. Furthermore, he spoke about the difficulty eliciting information from participants “because respondents expected that I ‘knew it already’” (1988: 76). This resonates with my own experience interviewing academic staff. For instance, some participants controlled the interview discussing topics important to them, others spoke in institutional acronyms in the belief I knew their meaning, while a few shared sensitive information such as departmental bullying, gender inequality, and job dissatisfaction; these were emotional responses I was methodologically and emotionally ill-equipped to engage with. For example:

I have been incredibly disappointed [with UK higher education], which is something we can talk about going forward, and I’m actually leaving, which this university doesn’t know! So that is said in the, obviously in the utmost strictest confidence. I think that the system is just bonkers! [...] So my experience here has been absolutely horrific, like it has been horrific, to the point where I’m looking for any exit to get out of here. [...] I feel like it’s been a waste of a year, professionally, personally, pedagogically, research-wise. It’s a lost year. [...] staying here is career suicide.

Lecturer, Female, PhD from the United States of America

Such reactions, though extreme, bring into dialogue emotional geographies and the “importance of understanding and faithfully representing the emotional experiences” (Bondi et al., 2005: 4) of the researched. This body of literature seems to be a pertinent sub-discipline to frame this study because non-UK academics spoke about feelings of subjugation, exclusion, loss, sadness, and pride. Indeed, some non-UK academics described the qualitative interview as a ‘therapy session’. In doing so, methodological reflections dovetail with practical, theoretical and epistemological
concerns, including implications for the production of knowledge, the role of place (the case-study university) in recruiting participants, and the academics’ emotional attachment to the project and their place of work. It is also important to consider the “emotional impact of research on researchers themselves” (Bondi 2005: 231).

At the time of data collection, two academics revealed in the interview that they had resigned having accepted lectureship positions at universities in Australia and New Zealand. This is important, as the tone of these interviews were, at times, particularly acidic towards their academic department and UK higher education, although all interviews had elements of critical reflection within them and all had moments of laughter. Interviews with non-UK academics were conducted prior to interviewing senior management and professional development staff so that the academic responses could inform interview questions and themes.

3.5.2.2 Senior management and professional development staff
In Phase II, attention shifted to senior management and professional development staff. These interviews were included to investigate to what extent the case-study universities recognise and support non-UK academics as a valuable resource for teaching and learning. Questions were asked relating to the student experience, teaching and learning strategies, academic staff development, and internationalisation strategies. In particular, the interviews were undertaken to examine to what extent the participant universities actively seek to utilise the international teaching approaches of migrant academics.

Recruiting
The sample was identified using criterion and snowball methods. This involved a targeted approach by contacting intended participants involved in the strategic development of teaching and learning, with information detailing the overview of the study. In a few cases, participants were aware of the nature and scope of the project, having acted as an initial gatekeeper in the university’s “chain of negation” (Valentine 1999: 145). Where management declined to participate, either because they no longer worked at the institution or had only recently taken up their position, a snowball strategy ensued. For example, one senior manager wrote:

---

14 A further three interviewees have moved institutions within the UK, 12 have been promoted, and one has returned to the country where they acquired their PhD (July 2018).
I'm afraid that I won't be able to help you with your research because I have just left my post at [the case-study university]. However, I would suggest you write to/speak with [participant’s name], […] who may be able to help you. [Participant’s name] has a strong and long background in relation to the aspects you outline […] and if he is unable to help he may be able to suggest someone else.

Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching
personal email, June 2015

Three participants were recruited through snowball sampling. Interestingly, management unable to participate in the study voluntarily provided names of potential contacts, and thus snowball recruitment was possible. By way of introduction, management cc’d potential contacts into their email response demonstrating an existing bond between the two, an assumption that underpins the method (Berg 1988). As McCarville (2002) has found, an individual’s willingness to participate in a study increases if referred by someone they know. Snowball sampling proved to be a valuable technique, providing access to senior management who have the necessary experience required for the study. Ethically, snowball recruitment is problematic; respondents provide information about named persons without their consent (Borgatti and Molina 2003) this raises particular concerns regarding anonymity. To counter these worries, I argue that while respondents know the identity of referred individuals, they are unaware of their true involvement in the project. Snowball recruitment may have been facilitated by my own affiliation to a higher education institution, in that intended participants may have been more likely to take part in the study if the research was conducted by a non-university affiliated researcher. Furthermore, the collegiality within participant institutions (see, for example, Peters and Turner 2014) has performed a significant role in the study, providing a revealing insight into research enquiry and the process of selecting and recruiting research participants within a higher education context.

Interviewing

In total, seven interviews (with eight individuals as one interview was paired) were conducted from across the case-study universities. This is illustrated in Table 3.5 and shows uneven participation across the institutions. This was an unexpected outcome of the research process, especially when individuals confirmed their involvement (by
email or via telephone) and then failed to respond to messages requesting a meeting.

Table 3.5 Interviewed senior management and professional development staff by the case-study universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University A</th>
<th>University B</th>
<th>University C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Assistant Director, Teaching Centre</td>
<td>i. Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for Teaching</td>
<td>i. Vice-Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Academic Registrar</td>
<td>ii. Pro Vice-Chancellor responsible for Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Director, International Office</td>
<td>iii. Assistant Director, Teaching Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Teaching Development Advisor,* Teaching Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a joint interview conducted with the Assistant Director.

Source: Own interview data, \( n = 7 \) interviews (with eight individuals as one interview was paired).

These interviews provided a revealing insight into the gendered and racial positioning of senior management at participant universities, and the sometimes contradictory responses (within institutions) on educational practices and non-UK academics’ ‘value’ to UK higher education (Chapter 7). Of those interviewed, all were white with only one senior manager being a non-UK academic. There were also equal representations of gender, although this is not representative of senior management roles more generally. For example, 11 females (26%) currently occupy senior management positions at the case-study institutions. This underrepresentation of women and BME academics in UK higher education has been described as a “cause for concern” and a “critical issue for many institutions” (Equality Challenge Unit 2015: no pagination). Furthermore, the significant lack of international staff in senior management is surprising, given the recent rise in the number of non-UK academics (Universities UK International 2017a). While this is not the focus of the research, one could suggest that these absences reflect the sojourn and circular movements of

---

15 Based on the calculation of University Leadership Team committee members (May 2018).
international faculty, as well as the time it takes to be established in order to take on such roles (Jöns 2018a). In this study, I argue that international teaching approaches are more likely to be recognised and thus incorporated into UK higher education if a larger proportion of senior management and Head of Department positions are more diverse, for example through the appointment of migrant academics. Indeed, migrant academics currently appointed as lecturers should, in the future, be placed among senior management roles.

The process of gaining access to and interviewing senior management was suffused with acts of power and politics. While our shared commonality is higher education and in some instances research interests a power-free relationship was not guaranteed. Indeed, I approached all senior interviews fully aware of the asymmetrical relationship, in terms of hierarchy and status. Rather than allow the perceived power dynamic to overshadow the interview process, I embraced it. Consequently, “I rarely felt disempowered within the interviews” (Smith 2006: 651), unlike the power differential I experienced with some non-UK academics, which left me feeling, on occasion, inadequate and uncomfortable. While senior management did exercise power during the interview, I argue that this strengthened the research process in that the informant’s extensive interviewing experience and academic training manifest into a predominately comfortable and at ease interview setting. However, the layers of power retained by senior management and professional development staff had consequences for the researcher and data-gathering freedom, notably the temptation by gatekeepers to implicitly request information about the research process, staff responses and initial findings, which I felt obligated to share. Others demanded that the audio-recording of the interview be terminated when discussing institutionally sensitive material. Such cautious behaviour could indicate a lack of trust or suspicion towards the researcher (Hay 2010). More pragmatically, some participants “may not want their comments on the record” (Valentine 2005: 124). Whilst I was sensitive to participants’ wishes – indeed, one non-UK academic had to provide reassurance that a small, rectangle box located on his desk was an induction loop system to aid hearing and communication, rather than a recording device – some people’s uncomfortableness at being taped was troubling, momentarily hampering my confidence on the belief that I had portrayed myself as an untrustworthy and unscrupulous researcher. But it does raise an ironic dilemma; I expected informants to agree to audio-recording, despite my own anxieties about it.
Interviewing senior management and professional development staff granted privileged access to confidential (at the time of data collection) university documents. During one interview an informant discussed their university’s Internationalisation Strategy, recently approved by Senate. While this senior manager regulated the extent to which document contents were shared, I was struck by their altruistic behaviour and indeed the altruism displayed by all participants in the study. Senior interviews ranged in length with the shortest recorded at 41 minutes to the longest at one hour and 39 minutes.

3.5.2.3 Data analysis: semi-structured interviews

From the outset of this research, some assumptions about non-UK academics’ experience in British higher education were challenged, redefining the nature of the study. For instance, informal conversations with non-UK academics revealed a range of positive and negative experiences; most disturbingly, this included an individual’s account of feeling vulnerable and marginalised. This particular encounter explicitly highlighted the individual’s emotional turmoil of being perceived as the academic ‘other’ from being socialised into the ‘wrong’ language to previous experiences of academic output not being valued. This sense of emotional struggle, negotiating past and current workplace environments framed many qualitative interviews with non-UK academics, revealing a range of complex experiences such as xenophobic behaviour from students to compassionate encounters with colleagues. Such insights made me profoundly aware of the different ways in which non-UK academics experience similar higher education settings. It was not until data analysis, however, that I realised the full implications of these interview exchanges and the effect it had on the interpretation, representation, and production of knowledge.

The emotionality of working in British higher education from the subjective perspective of international faculty raises methodological challenges “about how researchers produce knowledge about the feelings of others” (Bondi 2014: 44). As I have noted, some non-UK academics volunteered deeply moving accounts of departmental bullying, gender inequality, and job dissatisfaction. These interviews were conducted with women from across the sample and of similar ages and racial positioning (white) to me. Although our shared commonalities were confined to these characteristics, I was emotionally affected – in the interview and during the data analysis – of their upsetting experiences of working in British higher education. This
resonates with Bondi’s (2014: 50) personalised account of feeling and embodying the “emotional quality” of her participants’ life story and, as I would come to find out, I, too, mirrored the feelings communicated by my research participants, a surprising and at times unwanted empathic engagement during the research process. And yet the capacity to understand the emotional experiences of our research participants has been positively valorised within geography and qualitative research (Kvale 2006; Evans 2012). This value of placing empathic connections and emotional experiences in the research process “can help researchers to understand more about how issues of power, identity, difference and commonality operate in research relationships” (Evans 2012: 503).

Reflecting on such methodological, ethical, and philosophical complexities within the context of this research are particularly pertinent in thinking about my own geographical imaging of non-UK academics as marginalised. Such framing is problematic, yet “marginality can be understood as a state of human being that is partially ‘outside’ mainstream institutions, cultures, practices, beliefs and spaces” (Parr 2001: 181). The axes of marginality embodied by non-UK academics in this study — such as, nationality, language, accent, sexuality, gender, age, and non-UK academic background — are implicated in participant’s self-framing and reproduced and understood through the complex emotions that ebbed back and forth from research participant to the researcher. Categorising non-UK academics as the marginalised ‘other’ plays an important role in understanding how ideas and academic practices are transferred to students at UK universities through “marginal(ized) everyday geographies” (Parr 2001: 181; Chapters 5 and 6). It also raises an important question about my own identity and whether my interpretation of non-UK academics as partially marginalised is “an act of social and cultural privilege, and as such an exercise in unequal relations of power?” (Ley and Mountz 2001: 235). In the following section, I discuss phase III of the research project, the online student questionnaire.

3.5.3 Student questionnaire survey
The incorporation of young people in this study is particularly important in understanding how their social, cultural, and educational (formal and informal) differences shape their perceptions, experiences, and consumption of university teaching and learning by non-UK academics. For example, existing studies have
examined how international experiences, specifically high-school exchange programmes, have the potential to equip students with “interreligious tolerance” (Weichbrodt 2014: 21) and “transnational cultural capital” (Carlson et al., 2016: 749). While such studies focus on internationally mobile students, in this study, I argue that non-UK academics expose the majority of ‘immobile’ UK students to international ideas and experiences, thereby potentially creating ‘global subjects’ at home and preparing them for an increasingly globalising job market within the UK and abroad (Chapter 6). To this agenda, the following discussion details the methodology adopted to capture the voices of British undergraduate students (Phase III of the study). It introduces online survey research and discusses questionnaire design, distribution, sampling, and the dynamic nature of undertaking questionnaire surveys with young people studying at one English university. Emphasis is placed on engaging with the student’s subjectivity as a concept to draw out and interpret their opinions and attitudes. Complementary interviews were also conducted with two undergraduate students from across the case-study universities. These were exploratory interviews to examine how young people’s perceptions of teaching and learning by non-UK academics are underpinned by geographical and “not necessarily self-evidently geographical” aspects of identity (Holloway et al., 2010: 588).

3.5.3.1 Pilot questionnaires and exploratory interviews
Prior to commencing field research, it was anticipated that interviewed migrant academics would act as a conduit in accessing undergraduate students to complete a questionnaire survey and, if willing, to participate in a focus group discussion. My experiences in the field, however, were significantly harder than expected, with only five academics from across the sample agreeing to provide student access. Such difficulties could not have been anticipated especially given my German advisers enthusiasm towards the approach, but rather points to contextual factors beyond my control, such as non-UK academics positionality, study leave commitments or the advice that “I don’t think it would be utile for you to recruit my students into your focus group” (interviewed migrant academic, personal email, 2015). Unforeseen concerns such as project sensitivity, as demonstrated below, were also brought to my attention, as discussed previously in section 3.5.2.1:
I would like to flag up that there are some ethical issues regarding your research that I find problematic, especially the question of how my students would evaluate my ‘foreignness’ and whether and how that would impact on their evaluation of my teaching.

*Reader, Female, PhD from the United States of America*

From these pilot questionnaires, two female undergraduates agreed to be interviewed, after I explained too few students had expressed an interest in participating in a focus group discussion. Both in their final year, the students were drawn from the UK and international non-EU student populations. Interview questions explored topics relating to classroom diversity, learning expectations and experiences, global outlook, and intercultural understanding. These research encounters were a rewarding experience, elucidating thought-provoking preliminary insights into student perceptions of being taught by non-UK academics. In contrast to the predetermined categories of the student survey, the open-ended interview questions provided an analytical framework through which to explore the multiple subjectivities of student emotions, opinions, attitudes, and, most importantly, how perceptions of teaching and learning by non-UK academics are contested and negotiated between different groups of undergraduate students (*Chapter 6*).

The information I collected from these interviews helped to identify fruitful avenues for future research, including examining the dynamics between students who have prior international experience with those without such exposure before attending the case-study universities. A series of tensions were also highlighted, including accent, language, and teaching style. *Chapter 6* presents a systematic analysis of quantitative survey data; however, I argue that there is a great need to further our understanding of these dynamic relationships through qualitative research methods, notably semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions (*Chapters 6 and 8*). By interrogating higher education spaces through the lens of British undergraduate students, the individual contexts that shape how young people perceive and experience university teaching and learning by non-UK academics can be critically understood. The timeliness of such enquiry is particularly pertinent at a time when British higher education is experiencing significant uncertainty following the decision to leave the European Union (Universities UK 2016).

---

16 In total, 78 pilot questionnaires were conducted: two at University A, 35 at University B, and 41 at University C.
3.5.3.2 Online questionnaire survey

By examining the impact of “foreignness as a teaching resource” (Alberts 2008: 198; *Objective 2*), I aim to reveal the relationship between student subjectivities and their consumption of university teaching and learning by migrant academic members of staff. The study is concerned with British undergraduate students and their production of particular sets of experiences, perceptions, and attitudes around academic diversity; in this case, exposure to international faculty, unfamiliar ideas, and pedagogical approaches. The project’s focus on the non-mobile student is motivated by a number of reasons. First, few studies have examined immobile students’ intercultural interactions and encounters, with most investigations focusing on the international student experience. An exception is a recent study by Colvin *et al.*, (2014) and the examination of first-year home students’ intercultural interactions at an Australian University (see also Dunne 2013 for research in an Irish university). Second, this approach provides a space for young people to recount their experiences of teaching and learning by non-UK academics at particular points in their university education. Third, it helps to garner insights about young people’s agency, resistance, negotiation, and consumption of different pedagogical approaches and unfamiliar discipline-specific knowledge(s).

The questionnaire survey, conducted in December 2015, was electronically sent to a systematic sample of 7,305 undergraduate students from across the humanities and the natural and social sciences, and academic years two, three and four at one of the participating universities. The response rate was 2.8%, or 207 questionnaires, of which 185 (Table 3.6) were analysed for this study (22 students identified as international EU or international non-EU). The low response rate can be attributed to over-surveying (Baruch and Holtom 2008), a concern raised by the case-study university; time constraints because the survey was distributed in December when students had coursework and exam commitments; the absence of follow-up emailing (Babbie 2016), a condition of participation imposed by the university; and no incentive in answering the survey. Nevertheless, a comparatively low response rate was not anticipated given informal conversations with undergraduate students, which revealed an interesting tension between a student’s day-to-day encounter with otherness and higher education’s enthusiasm towards internationalising the curriculum. That noted Bartlett *et al.*, (2001) have reported that
many “studies based on population census data achieve low response rates” (p. 49). Indeed, Bortz (1999) notes that a minimum sample of 1-5% of the population is sufficient to infer reliable and representative findings (depending on the context and if the sample size is at least $n = 100$).

Table 3.6 Survey respondents by academic discipline, gender and year of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Natural</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Abbreviations: [Hum]anities; [Social] Sciences; [Sport] Sciences; [Natural] Sciences; [Eng]ineering Sciences.

The survey placed significant emphasis on differentiating between UK and non-UK academic staff asking questions about a student’s teaching and learning experience; their perception, attitude, and behaviour towards international faculty, and their participation in networking events with staff and students from other national and cultural contexts. The questions synthesised learning and teaching into four sections addressing: first, a student's exposure to non-UK teachers (at school and at university); second, experiences of being taught by non-UK academics (e.g., assessment and feedback, teaching style, and course content); third, intercultural respect and understanding; and fourth, socio-demographic characteristics including questions about Erasmus and international work experience activities (Appendix A). Conceptually, the questionnaire examined the relationship between young people’s subjectivities and their perception of university teaching and learning by migrant academics. Indeed, a key research finding indicates that students with prior international experience (at home or abroad) before attending the case-study...
university are more tolerant towards cultural difference in their learning and teaching, compared to students without such international exposure.

As pointed to earlier, first-year undergraduate students were excluded from the questionnaire. This was from an observation that these students might not have encountered non-UK academics during their first semester at university; however, a recommendation for future research enquiry is the examination of Year One students, which could potentially provide a transition of experiences, attitudes, and perceptions (both positive and negative) from first to final year.

3.5.3.3 Data analysis: online surveys
The questionnaire blended quantitative and qualitative data and consisted of 22 questions, of which 21 subscribed to a fixed-response layout, and one an open-ended descriptive format. Chi-square tests were calculated to examine statistically significant differences between different groups of undergraduate students in terms of their perception, attitude, and behaviour towards university teaching and learning by non-UK academics. Gender differences, academic discipline, year of study, and international experiences (Erasmus and overseas work placements) were also explored. In methodological practice, the survey secured broad coverage (Hoggart et al., 2002) of the case-study university’s student population, yet there are criticisms of the research tool. The method’s strength in asking standardised questions to a target population (McLafferty 2003) restricted the potential to yield in-depth perspectives because of the questionnaires predominately quantitative design (McGuirk and O’Neill 2010). For instance, a student pointed out that “a scale from 1-5 to accurately [convey] my thoughts on all academic staff is not enough”. The open-ended question, then, captured valuable insights, some unanticipated, for future extensive research, including young people’s (lack of) agency and student disability which bring additional insight into the day-to-day experiences of UK students and the higher education institutions that shape their learning. In Chapter 6, findings gleaned from the online questionnaire will be discussed.

3.6 Conclusion
In this chapter, I have outlined the methods used in this study and engaged with debates around undertaking geographical research with young people and non-UK academics at three case-study universities. In doing so, I have demonstrated the
different ways in which the case-study universities interacted with the project and tried to make sense of the social relations that I developed and maintained during, and beyond, the research process. As a result, I have explored the emotional labour tied up in academic research (see Askins and Blazek 2017), from critically reflecting on the embodied emotions evolving from the study to better understanding their role in producing knowledge. From a critical perspective, the chapter revealed the unintentional ethical sensitivities associated with the study and the complexity in recruiting migrant academics.

Turning attention to the methods employed in this research, the combination of semi-structured interviews and online feedback surveys has afforded insights that will make three contributions to geographical and pedagogical literature. First, it will create new insights into perceived transnational knowledge transfer through non-UK academics (Chapters 4 and 5). Second, it will reveal the opportunities and challenges that non-UK academics and British undergraduate students identify in their mutual interaction (Chapters 5 and 6). Third, it will contribute to knowledge and understanding of different internationalisation strategies in UK higher education (Chapter 7). In the case of domestic students, further qualitative research is required to explore how student experiences of university teaching and learning by non-UK academics are constructed (Chapter 8). This unpicking of young people’s university teaching and learning is important, especially where higher education institutions want to succeed in producing ‘global graduates’ (Diamond et al., 2011; Lilley 2014).

There remains considerable scope to scrutinise further the triad of higher education-academic mobility-knowledge transfer. For instance, the focus on English universities presents a partial representation of knowledge transfer in teaching and learning through non-UK academics. Higher education institutions in Scotland and Northern Ireland, for example, might inspire further work on examining internationalisation strategies and may garner different findings to those presented in this thesis, given the nations’ vote to remain in the EU (The Electoral Commission 2016). Elsewhere, the chapter furthers the debate on the collegiality of higher education (see Peters and Turner 2014; Askins and Blazek 2017) through highlighting the generosity of the case-study universities and research participants who offered free labour, time and energy.
Chapter 4

Desiring the UK: motivations, imaginations, emotions, and disparate realities

Figure 4.1 Migrant academic staff’s impression of British higher education prior to gaining employment in the country.

4.1 Introduction

The voices of migrant academic staff working in lectureship positions in British higher education are seldom heard (for exceptions, see Luxon and Peelo 2009; Hsieh 2012; Pherali 2012). However, their motivations for transnational mobility provide an intriguing and powerful narrative of the differentiated processes driving migration decisions. The heterogeneous nature of scientific and academic mobility has been stressed in recent policy reports (Department of Trade and Industry and the Home Office 2002) and geographical studies (Ackers 2005, 2008; Jöns 2007, 2009; Cantwell 2011; Leung 2013; Ganga et al., 2016), illustrating a range of motivational factors “that constitute society, academia and the individual but also varying spatial relations of different research practices, which help to explain typical cultures of academic mobility and collaboration” (Jöns 2007: 97). These conceptualisations tend to be based on circular geographical flows (Latour 1987) associated with temporary, short-term scholarship exchange programmes, such as those run by the German
Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (Jöns 2007; 2009). A limited amount of investigation, however, has attended to the complex factors influencing migration for long-term or permanent appointments (Rumbley and de Wit 2017). While the most repeated motivations for this type of mobility differ only slightly from scientific and researcher migration (see, for example, Jöns 2007), interviewees in this study placed significant emphasis on complex emotional, economic and geopolitical considerations, creating new insights into the “distinct, yet interlocking, dynamics” (Rumbley and de Wit 2017: 7) around transnational academic mobility. In exploring the emotional constituent of migration decisions, this chapter contributes to emerging theoretical debates on the links between mobility, emotions and immigration policy (see, for example, Kenway and Fahey 2011; Mavroudi and Warren 2013).

This chapter, which is the first of two analytical chapters focusing on migrant academic experiences (see Chapter 5 for part two), provides the context of academic mobility to the UK and examines the experiences of migrant academic staff with regards to adapting to new institutional practices in a different cultural and learning environment. Indeed, in 2007, Universities UK (2007: 2) reported: “there is a need for greater understanding of the decision-making processes of prospective international staff”. The chapter’s empirical findings are based on the analysis of 35 semi-structured interviews with non-British academics from across the humanities and the natural and social sciences at three case-study universities (see Chapter 3 for Methodology). Organised into five sections, I, outline first the motivations that inform academic mobility to the UK. The responses of interviewees in this study revealed a variety of rationales for transnational mobility; for example, job constraints in home or PhD country, career progression, cultural experiences, better salaries, time for research and a reduced teaching load, existing academic contacts, the prestige of British higher education, and the reputation of the case-study university (Figure 4.2). Second, I focus on English as lingua franca and offer a conceptual framework (as a burgeoning field of future enquiry) for researching the affective politics of voice as a conduit for knowledge transfer in higher education teaching and learning. Third, I explore the scalar imaginations of UK higher education in juxtaposition to continental Europe and what role that plays in transnational mobility. Fourth, the romanticism of British higher education is discussed. In the conclusion section, I sum up the chapter’s main findings and sketch out their policy relevance.
4.2 “You will laugh why Britain…”

There's just a lot more options in the UK. New Zealand is a very small country and a very small economy, particularly in higher education, [...] I mean there's only about five universities in New Zealand so [...] the options for full-time jobs are relatively limited. [...] And of course speaking English is kind of quite a big priority for New Zealanders because we're not so much with the foreign languages!

For a young research focused academic, the UK is a very good place to be.

To be honest it was more a question of opportunity rather than a specific attraction. [...] I was looking for jobs everywhere in the world. [...] I wanted to come back to Europe, I'm originally from France. Living in Canada, I found distance was not easy to deal with.

A very practical reason. You go where there is a job, and there was a job here. It was not my choice!

I wasn't targeting UK in particular, I was also targeting Germany but it so happened that I found a position that suited me very well here, [...] being from an Eastern European country everybody wants to get a job in West Europe at that time at least. I did have a permanent job in Romania as a lecturer.

IT WAS NEXT CRISIS IN MOSCOW AND I SAID TO MY HOST AT [INSTITUTION] THAT I'M NOT GOING BACK TO RUSSIA!

If I'm being brutally honest it's because my partner is a European Union citizen and we met during my PhD, so to enable us the best opportunity to be together shall we say without the issues of visas and things like that, I started applying to jobs in the UK.

I wanted to go elsewhere to have time for research and the only other EU countries which are open or easily opened for foreigners are UK and the Netherlands, at least in my experience.

To be part of [...] avant-garde, English-speaking discourses were very appealing [...] and to be able to publish in English to reach a wider audience.


Figure 4. 2 Motivations for academic mobility to the United Kingdom.

*a Source: Own study.*
For a number of academics, the trajectory of securing a full-time lectureship position at the case-study universities was preceded by time spent in the UK as a Research Associate or Teaching Fellow. Here, 15% of the interviewees said that they had used their temporary research stay or teaching post as a springboard to gaining full-time, permanent lectureships within British higher education, as one academic explains:

I was in between two academic systems by that time and it wasn’t quite clear where I would continue my academic career and then I was encouraged to apply for jobs in the United Kingdom.

Senior Lecturer, Female, PhD from Germany

Looking to British higher education for employment opportunities following a period of temporary geographical relocation to the country is constitutive of existing literature on academic mobility and brain circulation (e.g., Robertson 2006). That is research stays abroad can generate subsequent academic mobility (Jöns 2009). As Ackers (2005) points out, “many scientists retain links with host institutions when they return home or move elsewhere, building a web of relationships across time and space which shape not only their own careers but those of their students and colleagues” (p. 122). Existing academic contacts developed through international conferences, ongoing research collaborations and an attraction to “centres of scientific excellence” (Martin-Rovet 2003: 1; also see Ackers 2008; Ackers and Gill 2008) in his or her discipline were also important motivating factors for choosing an academic career in the United Kingdom, as two interviewees commented:

Nothing in particular [attracted me to] UK higher education as such but it was really the research area, which is very strong in the UK but is only very sparsely represented in Germany.

Professor, Male, PhD from Germany

UK higher education obviously has got quite a good reputation in terms of how it sort of performs in the league tables, and so I looked at that as a good trade-off for both personal choices as well as my career.

Lecturer, Female, PhD from Australia

British universities are viewed favourably as hubs of scholarly and scientific innovation, a perception powerfully reinforced by worldwide university rankings (Jöns and Hoyler 2013; Hazelkorn 2015). They are also attractive employers for international academics seeking “long-term career prospects based on tenure-track
positions” (Hoyler and Jöns 2008a: 143). At a time of job insecurity and precarious contracts in many European countries, particularly Germany (Hoyler and Jöns 2008b; Jöns and Deakin 2014) and the United Kingdom (The Royal Society 2010; University and College Union 2016), some interviewees stressed that they were forced to look internationally for academic appointments because of a shortage of full-time employment opportunities in their home or PhD country (see also Ackers 2008; Cantwell 2011). For example, a lecturer in Media and Communication reported that limited career prospects in their country of origin spurred mobility:

The job search led me here I guess it’s kind of instrumental, the Canadian job market is really, really tight so I broadened out and I didn’t have an interest in going to the [United] States because the communication studies there is very different from what I’m used to in Canada, it’s more informed by the UK context so there is more of a natural kind of symmetry to the UK that was attractive and I have quite a few British collaborators and they helped clarify the system quite a bit cos I didn’t think I would ever be able to get a job here (laughs). […] but it was primarily motivated I guess by the need to broaden out internationally.

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from Canada*

The recruitment of international faculty has become an important strategy for higher education institutions to internationalise their campuses and attract world-leading academic talent (e.g., Universities UK 2007; Cantwell 2011; Altbach and Yudkevich 2017), yet for one interviewee the unexpected challenges of the job market point to explicit tensions between a UK and non-UK higher education context:

It was very, very difficult to get a job when I first moved here. […] I had a really strong publication record and I’d worked with people on projects that had funding […]. So I sort of felt like I was going to come over here and it was going to be, not easy, but realistic that […] I’d apply for a job and that I would eventually get one. […] It wasn’t until I managed to […] get that [temporary teaching] experience at [institution] that I was even able to really get interviews. […] it’s a really competitive sector anyway, but I think not having had any experience here of having done any of my research here really made it difficult to kind of get my foot in the door, so I felt quite shut out by the sector […] to begin with, and that was a bit frustrating and demoralising. But as soon as I got the [teaching] stints at [institutions] it just seemed to sort of, you know you were obviously, you were then a proven entity, so it wasn’t so difficult.

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from New Zealand*
In contrast to the lecturer’s experience above, a professor in their home country (lecturer at the case-study institution) reported the opposite:

It was easy to find a job in the UK; I found it easy, easier than I originally thought. […] I found out that they [the case-study university] were recognising the [international] experience I had abroad.

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from Spain*

Acknowledging the difficulties of gaining employment in British academia draws on broader conceptualisations of institutional practices, norms and cultures, and the epistemic community in which the academic is employed. The two opposing interview quotations also point to the differentiated considerations hiring committees gave to the academic’s international experience. For example, one interviewee drew attention to their department’s international aspiration:

The group that I was recruited into had a fairly international orientation. I don’t think [the case-study institution] was particularly international, or still is, but at that stage, the people […] that recruited me […] were quite, and still are, very international and they know how to build an international reputation for a school. And it is just idiosyncratic, I don’t think that in any other group people would have recruited me, it’s almost impossible because Singapore would have been too alien for [the case-study institution].

*Professor, Male, PhD from Singapore*

During the interview, this individual also noted departmental differences in the recruitment of academic talent, as the following quotation suggests:

Incidentally, I also applied to another department when I applied to the Business School here in 2005 and that department did not even shortlist me, and…But my CV for that department’s perspective was too good. But there is, there is, so it’s not institutional, it’s just the individual at times who has a different orientation and therefore is able to see what they think is talent and recruit.

*Professor, Male, PhD from Singapore*

In this example, the interviewee makes a distinction between the employability considerations of different academic departments within the same institution. This finding suggests that a department’s strategic aspirations can play an important function in internationalising the curriculum. Indeed, the interview quotation raises an
important point concerning academic hiring committees and their openness to academic staff trained in knowledge environments beyond the Anglo-American context. A further critical examination of the above quotation provides a fascinating example of an individual’s interpretation of UK higher education, where the Professor in Business and Economics perceived their Singaporean doctorate as being “too alien for [the case-study] institution”. Such a claim is surprising. For Scott (2015: S63) writes “Singapore […] can no longer be defined as ‘peripheral’ […] in this respect; indeed” Singapore is now recognised “among the world’s most developed higher education systems”. And yet for this academic, they considered their Singaporean qualifications as being a potential barrier to securing an academic appointment in UK higher education. Such a portrayal is indicative of a “geopolitical imagination” (Slater 1993: 419) and an expression of the binary between centre and periphery in knowledge production (Medina 2014), giving rise to the coloniality of knowledge (Quijano 2000, 2007). Lately, the geographies of knowledge centres have evolved in such a way that they are no longer dominated by an Anglo-American hegemony but are also characterised by a dynamic Asia-Pacific system (Jöns 2015; Scott 2015).

English, too, as the medium for scientific communication has been problematised by critical geographers. This is illustrated, for example, by Short et al., (2001: 10) who writes “the creation of a monolingual geography raises issues about what we are losing in terms of the range and subtlety of languages used to describe the world”. Non-native English speakers have passionately spoken of the challenges of being “forced continually and inescapably to dialogue/work on two parallel levels—within the context of their own national geographies, with their rules, logics, and languages, but also within the broader international (read Anglo-American) context, with its own logics and its own particular lingua franca” (Minca 2000: 287; also see Zilber 2015). Academics emplaced on the fringes of an Anglo-American academy have expressed political, linguistic, and cultural challenges of knowledge exchange in Anglophone debates (Garcia-Ramon 2003). Despite this unease, Rodríguez-Pose (2004), though empathising with Garcia-Ramon (2003), elegantly justifies the use of English-language in geographical discourse:

If our aim is to assure the survival of diverse geographical traditions, we have to guarantee that they are exposed to and interact with one another. This implies ensuring that they are widely accessible and read, which today means, whether we like it or not, publishing in English. Keeping
them within the narrow boundaries of linguistic scientific communities will ultimately contribute to sinking these traditions into oblivion” (Rodríguez-Pose 2004: 4).

From the perspective of international academics in this study, contributing to intellectual debates in the English language was an important influencing factor for academic migration:

I would be more challenged in an Anglophone environment than in Francophone because in Belgium and France I would have just like presented to them things and look as very new but they were not new somewhere else, and I want to be, you know, at the cutting edge. And the conversations were, I found them more interesting in England, […] in the UK and the US and in international journals.

*Senior Lecturer, Female, PhD from Belgium*

Probably 70% of my former colleagues had never published for example in English, […], which from my perspective, I'm someone who’s always been very interested in European comparison and international comparison as such, so it was much more interesting too, yeah, to have a post basically in the UK.

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from France*

While it is clear that interviewees want to produce new knowledge rather than reproduce old knowledge, there is a politicised dimension to their narratives that bring into dialogue wider debates about the supremacy of western knowledge and the hierarchical geographies of knowledge production (e.g., Noxolo 2017). The notion that interviewees’ former knowledge milieu is somewhat inferior to Anglo-American scholarship further perpetuates the divide between centre and periphery, English and languages other than English. It can also lead us to pose certain questions about the academic’s allegiance to an education system that once nurtured their intellectual development. For instance, the geographer (in the interview quotation above) conveys bewilderment that their former colleagues failed to produce English-language publications. They, on the other hand, demonstrate “a willingness to engage with the Other” and an “openness toward divergent cultural experiences” (Hannerz 1990: 239; see also Jöns and Freytag 2016). The geographer then is not anchored to a specific nation-state (Cantwell 2011) but instead embodies diverse locales which span across different linguistic, cultural, educational and national boundaries – that is, they are double-being, double-thinking (*Chapter 5*). For Bilecen
and Faist (2015), such individuals are brokers capable of transferring knowledge to new audiences by creating “bridges between otherwise unconnected people” (p. 218). Therefore, I argue strongly that migrant academics are advantageously positioned to contribute to the internationalisation of the curriculum and to promote intercultural understanding (Chapter 6).

4.2.1 Academic voice

The opportunity to work in an English-language country is seen as an investment in an academic’s career progression but is also a testament to the prevalent trends of publishing knowledge in the dominant lingua franca (Kitchin 2003; Paasi 2005). The need to publish in English brings into dialogue the sub-disciplines geographies of emotion (e.g., Anderson and Smith 2001; Davidson et al., 2007) and the geographies of voice/agency (e.g., Holt 2004; Kraftl 2013; Holloway 2014). For example, one interviewee, a geographer, continues to publish (albeit sparingly) in a language other than English as a means to demonstrate publication impact in the country they are researching. Most interviewees, however, viewed this as ineffective use of time and a wasteful activity bringing few academic rewards, for example:

I now tend to say no […] whenever I’m requested to do something in French […] because it isn’t valued, so here it’s basically zero, it doesn’t mean anything. […] So yeah, so actually I need to be strategic with how I use my time […]. So […] my position is no, I’m just not going to bother publishing it in French because it’s not going to bring me anything!

Lecturer, Female, PhD from France

Everything is in English, so for many concepts, if I suddenly want to talk about them in German, I would have to really think or maybe look them up in a dictionary, how can I say them in German?”

Lecturer, Male, PhD from the Netherlands

There is no sense to publish in any other language.

Professor, Male, PhD from Russia

What is evident from these interview quotations is the inherent ‘othering’ toward non-English language voices, which, in part, is perhaps being unintentionally reproduced by the migrant academics themselves, in order for them to be successful in a different academic and possibly language context (see, for example, Jöns 2018a). Attempts to increase the number of international submissions outside of the Anglo-
American academy has been a mission statement of the journal *Social & Cultural Geography* (SCG). For as Kitchin (2003: 253) highlights in a discussion about the journal’s Country Reports, “it seeks to disrupt and destabilize the prevalent trend towards English-language and Anglo-American hegemony in the international production of geographic knowledge”. In relation to this point, one of SCG’s strategies is “to recruit papers beyond the Anglo-American geography” (Kitchin 2003: 253). In an examination of the journal’s Volume 18 (2017, all issues), it indicates that 34% of articles and commentaries were anchored to knowledge environments beyond the Anglo-American academy. *Area*, too, has strived to increase publications by scholars from non-Anglophone institutions. This was acknowledged in an editorial in which Paul Wood, outgoing Physical and Environmental Geography Editor, was thanked for encouraging and nurturing “scholars whose first language was not English, leading to an increase in submissions by authors from non-Anglophone contexts” (Kraftl *et al.*, 2016: 398). Similar to the cursory examination of SCG, 27% of *Area*’s articles and commentaries (Volume 49, 2017, all issues) were authored by scholars working at institutions beyond the Anglophone setting. Further to this, 40% of articles in ACME were authored by scholars attached to non-Anglophone institutions (Table 4.1; see also Garcia-Ramon *et al.*, 2006; Jöns and Freytag 2016).
Table 4.1 Articles of authors with an affiliation in a non-Anglophone country in English-language journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>SCG</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>ACME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country affiliation of author(s)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea (South)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19†</td>
<td>19‡</td>
<td>15*,§</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† two joint articles of non-Anglophone and Anglophone-based authors.
‡ seven joint articles of non-Anglophone and Anglophone-based authors.
* one joint article of non-Anglophone and Anglophone-based authors.
§ three articles in a language other than English.
* Source: Own complication based on online journal volumes.

From the three interview vignettes above, there is an explicit acceptance that English is the medium for academic writing, complementing the aspirations of those interviewees who want to reach a wider audience. And yet participant responses are
still laced with frustration that linguistic skills, language diversity, and divergent academic contexts are not valued by the case-study institutions. For example, one interviewee criticised their department for displaying contempt towards a francophone conference:

I was invited to a conference in France which is basically, it's considered as probably the most, if you're invited at that conference, essentially it's because you're part of a very niche network of academic and top in the field, etc., and you need to be proud in a way if you're invited to this. So I ask essentially for money just to fund my travel to go there, and I saw the review on the [application] form because they were ranking from one to very important, to five, like yeah, do we really need to give money for this, and it was ranked five! (laughs) In the sense that it was considered as, yeah, there's no impact. [...] it was [...] valued as nothing. [...] I mean there should be a bit of consideration!

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from France*

In many ways, the opposing view about the relative importance of the geographic conference overshadows the interviewee’s academic achievement and intellectual excitement. From a mobility perspective, corporeal travel performs a significant function in the development and maintenance of long-term transnational networks, shapes the geographies of knowledge transfer and exchange, is used as leverage for career advancement, and contributes to the internationalisation of institutions and individuals (Ackers 2005, 2008; Cantwell 2011; Jöns 2011a; Storme *et al*., 2013; Derudder and Liu 2016; Storme *et al*., 2017). Here, it could be argued that this particular academic is engaging in activism (e.g., Taylor 2014; Halvorsen 2015), protesting against the university’s policy procedures to fund conference travel by using this study’s anonymity as a protective shield to voice their frustration.

While there is substantive literature on Anglo-American hegemony and English-language domination in knowledge production (as evidenced throughout this thesis), little work has attended to “the geopolitics of emotion” (Moïsi 2009) and the geographies of voice/agency (e.g., Holt 2004; Kanngieser 2012, 2015; Kraftl 2013; Holloway 2014) in the context of academic mobility and knowledge transfer in higher education teaching and learning. Indeed, since the early 2000s, cultural and feminist geographers have bemoaned the “silencing of emotion” in geographical research, urging for an increased “awareness of how emotional relations shape society and space” (Anderson and Smith 2001: 7-9). Thus, I pursue (as an avenue for future
Kanngieser’s (2012: 336) call “for a geography of voice and a politics of speaking and of listening”. For her, sound and voice have political significance linked to the “ways of knowing and inhabiting the world” (Kanngieser 2015: 80). Drawing upon this literature as an entry point, I have developed a pathway in which voice can be conceptualised in this study. In this pathway, identified as the Migrant Academic Pathway (MAP), my engagement with voice positions itself within an axis of agency but also explores the vulnerabilities of voice in a teaching and learning context. In so doing, I debate the geopolitical geographies of voice by emphasising its real and imagined dimensions, which I have conceptually expressed as ‘big V’ (‘V’oice) and ‘little v’ (‘v’oice).

Cultural geographers have explored the politics that underpin listening and speaking (Kanngieser 2012; Gallagher et al., 2017). Indeed, as Kanngieser (2012) points out, “voice and space – co-create one another” (p. 336). Through this understanding, I argue that voice, as a conduit for knowledge transfer in teaching and learning, can be affected by social value, gender, race and education (Boland 2010) as well as the migrant academic’s “agency in transforming the institutions and environments in which they are placed” (Madge et al., 2015: 687, emphasis in original). From this, the mobilisation of concepts, practices, and innovations are shaped by “the politics of place” (Massey 2005: 1). For example, in this, and the following chapter, gender, academic position, previous knowledge environment, and the case-study universities codes and customs influence what types of knowledge are seen as different or desirable by the participant university, therefore bringing into dialogue colonial discourses and their continued relevance in contemporary debates.

In the MAP, my proposition is that mobility affords the migrant academic greater voice, especially for those moving from peripheral educational contexts and non-English language countries to central locations of Anglo-American hegemony. The imagined utopia of exporting knowledge rather than producing research which “may be defined as marginal or irrelevant” (Paasi 2005: 769) was reported as an important influencing factor for academic mobility, as demonstrated by the interview quotations within this chapter. Thus ‘V’voice emerges as a constituent process of academic migration, from the confidence of working in a new educational environment, everyday interactions with colleagues and students, the development of friendships and supportive networks, and the agency to determine the language of academic output, for instance:
I enjoy being here so much that now after seven years in this country and in this academic system, I feel confident enough to continue here.

*Senior Lecturer, Female, PhD from Germany*

However, as I alluded to in the methodology chapter, interviewees’ experiences of British higher education vary considerably. Indeed, it could be suggested some academics reported incidences of ‘v’oice (see also *Chapter 6*), for example:

Last year I had a block of lectures in EU law and one of the things that I introduced without asking anyone obviously was this discussion on treaty, so this transatlantic investment treaty with the US that is being initiated. So, I spent half the lecture discussing how this was relevant and this year I’m not providing those lectures so a colleague is doing that and the module convener approached that colleague saying I don’t want you to talk about that nonsense […]. So there’s […] a lot of let’s say indirect suppression of the different EU approach that you can bring.

*Senior Lecturer, Male, PhD from Spain*

Here, explicit tensions are evident between the individuality of the international academic and the (British) module convenor who manages course content: in other words, there is a display of reticence towards different conceptual, methodological and empirical teaching materials. By illustrating the different voices of international academics expressed conceptually as ‘big V’ (‘V’oice) and ‘little v’ (‘v’oice), it brings into consideration the sensitive interplay between the “imaginative geographies” (Gregory 1995) of ‘V’oice (a motivating factor for academic mobility) and the situated realities of ‘v’oice (the decentred loss of intellectual agency). Thus, ‘v’oice may denote an inability to incorporate “international, intercultural, and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum” (Leask 2015: 9), raising important questions about an individual’s sense of place (Cloke *et al.*, 1991) within a specific educational environment. Indeed, as Leask (2004: 3) points out, teaching as a stranger “in a strange land […] is an intellectual challenge and an emotional journey […] which can lead to feelings of frustration, confusion and disorientation”. As I have evidenced within this chapter, emotions provide a fascinating insight in understanding an international academic’s behaviour, interaction, and relationship with a British higher education landscape and, therefore, creates new conceptualisations around how voice can influence knowledge transfer in a higher education teaching and learning context.
4.2.2 Scalar imaginations

In a final example of why international academics choose to pursue an academic career in the United Kingdom, I draw upon two distinct yet interlocking points of interest frequently discussed by interviewees: immigration policy and the scalar geographies of Europe. First, the perceived ease of navigating UK immigration as both a European Economic Area (EEA) citizen and a non-EEA foreign national, exemplifies participants’ “practical experiences of negotiating immigration policy” (Mavroudi and Warren 2013: 264). For example, in the interview quotations below, interviewees discuss immigration strategy as a motivating factor:

If we [interviewee and partner] were thinking about going somewhere we could both work, English language countries, which basically means you know Australia, America, Canada and the UK for us and visa options were too difficult in America and Canada! My partner’s got a British passport, so that was a pretty big pull I think (laughs). [...] Quite practical considerations.

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from New Zealand*

If I’m being brutally honest it’s because my partner is a European Union citizen and we met during my PhD. So to enable us the best opportunity to be together shall we say, without the issues of visas and things like that, I started applying to jobs in the UK.

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from New Zealand*

Possessing EU citizenship and being in a relationship with an EU citizen facilitates academic mobility to the UK. However, the privilege of owning EU citizenship may, in the future, prove problematic following the Brexit referendum. Nonetheless, the study’s empirics provide strong evidence of the link between emotions and mobility (Kenway and Fahey 2011), yet further expansive scholarship is needed at a time of political uncertainty and turmoil in the United Kingdom (e.g., Brexit) and the USA (e.g., Donald Trump elected as the 45th president of the United States). Second, the geographies of scale and the geographical importance of the United Kingdom in juxtaposition to continental Europe focused an individual’s job search. For example, Northern American, Australian, and New Zealand colleagues were primarily attracted to the United Kingdom. In contrast, those with national ties to Europe tended to look first to continental Europe, then second, to the United Kingdom. The wider scale of Europe was thus the primary pull especially for those returning from further afield, for example:
I wanted to get closer to especially my elderly mother who lives in Sweden, [...] so [...] it seemed best to return to Europe and this happened to be the job that I got. So I didn’t specifically look at UK universities, I could have got a job in Spain or somewhere else in Europe.

Lecturer, Female, PhD from Australia

I wanted to come back to Europe, I’m originally from France. Living in Canada, I found distance was not easy to deal with.

Lecturer, Male, PhD from Italy

These comments suggest that a return to Europe was driven by familial ties and obligations, for example, caring for elderly parents. Indeed, one interviewee “thanked [their] lucky stars [they] ended up in the UK, [and] not the US” because of ageing parents in continental Europe. The role of the family can be seen, therefore, as a primary pull in the decision-making processes for an academic’s return to Europe and, in this study, was an important rationale regardless of an academics age, gender and professional grade. Most profoundly, while familial closeness drove mobility, the geographical location of an academic’s institution to parental home appeared less important. For example:

[I was] trying to move back to Europe and be closer to my family but I had no interest in pursuing an academic career in my own country, so I was always going to look at a[n] English speaking country.

Lecturer, Female, PhD from Australia

The fluidity of being able to move freely between European nation-states because of EU citizenship maximises an individual’s employment potential, particularly for those academics with language capabilities other than English. Relatively cheap airfares can also influence location decisions (Ackers 2005). As a result, scale, as a key concept in understanding networked interactions between different places and spaces (Amin 2002), can usefully conceptualise the imaginations of academic mobility in this study whereby Europe, at a regional scale, is the primary pull and the United Kingdom, at a national scale, is the secondary attraction. The contours of different migration motivations presented in this section provide an exciting insight into the many push:pull motivations underscoring an academic’s decision to relocate to the UK (also see Altbach and Yudkevich 2017). It has also begun to open up for discussion the mobility-emotions-policy nexus. My study has much in common with
Mavroudi and Warren’s (2013) investigation on the interrelationship between immigration, academic mobility and the globalisation of higher education, and thus will contribute to emerging theoretical debates on internationalising the curriculum (Clifford and Montgomery 2017) and understanding the global mobility of international faculty for long-term or permanent academic appointments (Rumbley and de Wit 2017).

4.3 British higher education: a romantic engagement

*NT:* Having been in this system [British higher education] for three years, would you, knowing what you know now, would you have applied for your job [at the case-study institution]?

Interviewee: No.

*NT:* No?

Interviewee: Absolutely not! *Lecturer, Female, PhD from Australia*

When people talk of British higher education, “they primarily have in mind what goes on in a relatively small number of institutions” was the verdict from political scientist Graham Moodie (1991: 825). Indeed, one of the most vivid perceptions of higher education in the UK is through an Oxford and Cambridge prism (Thomas 2004). In exploring the imaginative geographies of British higher education through the refracted lens of international academics, one should be mindful of the romanticised disposition shown towards the university sector, which endows the universities of Oxford and Cambridge as being the country’s national universities (Vernon 2004). This is not surprising given that the University of Oxford “spread the imperial message […] through the schools of the Empire, often by means of textbooks published by the Oxford University Press” (Symonds 1986: 1). Tellingly, interviewees made judgements about the higher education sector based on the Oxbridge ideal. This romantic generalisation is both significant and problematic. For example, two interviewees said:

This is going to make me sound like I’m very naïve but I had heard of things like Cambridge and Oxford and things like that, I did not know
anything about many other universities at all, by reputation or otherwise. [...] I had not even heard of this [the case-study] university.

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from New Zealand*

I knew about Oxford and Cambridge. I knew that some of the oldest universities in the world are in this country, that it has a very long tradition [...] but in addition to that, I didn’t know that much. I knew that some very interesting people, doing very interesting research were based in the UK.

*Senior Lecturer, Male, PhD from Germany*

This narrow view of the higher education sector, captured in the portmanteau Oxbridge, obfuscates international academics impression of British academia which can have serious implications for the individuals themselves, their students and the employing institutions. This distortion, I argue, is manifest through an under examination of the links between the geographical imagination of British higher education (prior to taking up an academic position in the country) and the ‘real world’ educational landscape of the case-study institution (on arrival at destination university). The ways international academics think about British higher education is important because it informs and shapes their attitude towards research and teaching and, most importantly, their intentions to remain within UK higher education. This is useful for policymakers and institutions in understanding the aspirations of why and where (Thompson 2017: 77, emphasis in original) migrant academic staff move to. It also opens up for examination the challenges individuals encounter when adapting to new institutional practices in a different cultural and learning environment, thus research findings will help senior management and professional development staff to develop more suitable institutional strategies in supporting international academics (*Chapter 8*).

For some academic staff, their cognisance of higher education in the United Kingdom was curiously limited:

*I knew nothing about UK [higher education], it was, for me it was, you know, a big discovery.*

*Professor, Male, PhD from Canada*

All I knew was that there was this thing called the REF [Research Excellence Framework] and at some point, I would have to be REF’d, but that’s not something that has really kind of put the fear of whatever in me [...]. Yeah, so that’s about all that I knew. I knew, and then I knew that some courses tend to be co-taught, so I knew that there was more co-
teaching than just you teaching your own course. So those are, that was all I knew basically.

_Lecturer, Female, PhD from the United States of America_

Such a distinct lack of knowledge about the teaching and research landscape is surprising, given that some interviewees had travelled in excess of 11,000 miles, exchanging “comfortable spaces of knowing [...] [for] uncomfortable places of becoming” (Phillips _et al._, 2009: 1455). While this unawareness may seem startling in truth few individuals made a distinction between the PhD setting that they encountered and the destination institution that they were anticipating. Only on arrival did interviewees realise the extent to which worldwide educational systems can differ, as one academic explained:

> It’s kind of funny because before coming here, I...So I had assumed every university was pretty much like a North American university, so the universities I knew about were the Canadian schools and the American schools, and they were exactly the same. So I mean why would it be different...and it’s a pretty good system, why would it be different to anywhere else? But it’s, at the same time, it’s very strange because the UK is sort of this education black box that people in North American don’t understand. It means that...so at least in my discipline, economics, it’s much harder for students coming out of a PhD programme here to get a job in North America for this reason because people aren’t sure about their training whereas, in North America, it’s very, very standardised. But...so the truth is I didn’t know anything about the UK [higher] educational system, but I assumed it was pretty much the same as the North American system, and I was shocked at how different it is. It’s very different.

_Lecturer, Male, PhD from Canada_

The assumption that national higher education systems are alike is perhaps a little naïve and exposes this individual’s inadequate preparedness for the potential challenges of teaching at an English university; for example, the unfamiliarity of classroom norms, student expectations, marking frameworks, and assessment criteria. The rationale for this particular academic, constructing a homogenising viewpoint of British and American higher education, might be explained as a

---

17 The distance measured using the Google Maps Distance Calculator (see [https://www.daflogic.com/projects-advanced-google-maps-distance-calculator.htm](https://www.daflogic.com/projects-advanced-google-maps-distance-calculator.htm)). Although this is a crude measurement, which does not take into account the multiple mobilisation processes of some interviewees (see Latour 1987), it does illustrate the spatial reach of migrant academic staff working in British academia and the global orientation of their academic credentials, as well as the home of different practices, concepts and innovations (see also Figure 3.1, Chapter 3).
mechanism to remain connected to their educational roots and their North American homeland. Notions of a unitary system may also have occurred based on hegemonic discourses dominated by an Anglo-American academy and the increasing “homogenization of publication practices across the sciences and humanities” (Jöns and Hoyler 2013: 47). In Europe, regional higher education systems are stimulated by international organisations such as the Bologna Process and the creation of EHEA, launched to promote “greater compatibility and comparability of the systems of higher education” (Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve communiqué 2009: 2). And yet, as Teichler (2012) critically notes, higher education across the various European nation-states remains highly heterogeneous; an assertion supported by Marginson (2006) and Maringe and Foskett (2010) in academic debates about global higher education.

The different geographies of an interviewee’s upbringing also have a significant influence in shaping divergent geographical imaginations of British culture and higher education. For example, one interviewee reflected on their reading of English literary texts growing up in India, inspiring a romanticised longing:

I’ve always wanted to actually live in the UK (laughs) which sounds strange but I have because maybe because of the books that I’ve been brought up on.

Senior Lecturer, Male, PhD from the United States of America

This expression of colonial influence and what seems a marriage of happiness between two cultures is aptly captured in Gāmini Salgādo’s posthumous publication *The True Paradise*, for Salgādo is introduced as an “exceptional person growing up in one culture and gradually being possessed by another, by European attitudes” (Salgādo 1993a: no pagination). Comparing Salgādo’s experiences with those of the international academic above may require a leap of imagination. What is apparent, however, is that both individuals shared a romanticised yearning, professionally and privately, for the UK. This romanticised theme runs strongly through almost all interviews undertaken with international academics, which can distort and mask the reality of higher education in the United Kingdom. Such a romanticised interpretation

---

18 Born in 1929 in Ceylon, Salgādo was the first South Asian to achieve the personal title of Professor at a British university (Exeter). Prior to this, he taught English Literature at the University of Singapore, Queen’s University, Belfast, the University of Sussex (1963 – 1976), and at Earlham College, Indiana. Salgādo read English and Philosophy at the University of Nottingham, followed by a doctorate at the same institution. He died June 1985 in England (Medcalf 1985; Copplestone 1993; Salgādo 1993b; Simons 2003).
signifies a fictional construct of life in Britain. This is eloquently captured by Salgādo’s wife who penned the afterword in his autobiographical book, *The true paradise*. She wrote:

Had he lived, I think Gāmini would have put together the memoir I have collected here as one book. I think he would have followed it with a revised version of his student days in England, when his romantic dream of the country was confronted by the realities and prejudices of post-war Britain.  
(Copplestone 1993: 181)

Growing up in a post-colonial landscape opens up an unavoidable dialogue of the “links between international education, modernity, colonialism and imperialism” (Matthews and Sidhu 2005: 56). For example, the quotation below suggests an education of sameness:

I [...] was [...] kind of proved correct [...] that the UK higher education system was very similar to the Indian higher education system where I was actually, did my undergraduate and postgrad[uate] before I did a PhD at [institution]. Not surprisingly because I mean most of the former colonies have actually modelled their education system after the UK. So, in terms of that probably not that many big surprises, I did expect it to be a bit like this. It’s very different from the US education system but it’s not very different from what I expected it to be, and maybe not very different from my own sort of experience as an undergraduate in you know the examination systems and the teaching system to an extent.

*Senior Lecturer, Male, PhD from the United States of America*

Rather than being a signifier for pedagogical diversity and difference, this particular individual implies a homogenising perspective and experience in teaching and learning. However, it could be suggested that this individual fails to acknowledge the truly international dimension of being socialised and educated in the less developed south and its practical application to internationalising the curriculum and to promoting cultural understanding. For example, one interviewee looked beyond the classroom walls to give a compelling and emotionally laden account of how their challenging upbringing has strengthened their problem-solving capabilities:

Getting up, you don’t know whether light [electricity] is going to be there or not. Simple. Power was a major issue. It was almost like power failure is more like a (laughs) guaranteed thing than having power! So it was a very big thing. So for example, here [in the United Kingdom], every house has
its own gas, electricity and everything, there’s nothing like that [in India] [...], it was like if you’re rich you’ll get it, if you don’t, you don’t, or even if you’re rich you get it sometime and it’s gone some of the time. So it is like that. So the [daily] challenge is different. I mean Bill Gates, famously he said, when a lot of IBM staff were seriously worrying about a particular computer virus problem [...] he just brought in this guy, intern, from India, who is there just for two month internship to the place in Seattle, and then he just came and then he asked him to look at it and then he sorted it out in three hours. Because he looked at things in a very different way.

Professor, Male, PhD from India

Through the frame of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986), this individual’s rich and nuanced biographical account is exemplary in demonstrating how cultural difference, dispossession, alternative spaces, identity, and emotion can be harnessed to internationalise the curriculum. The outcome is potentially a force for individual transformation producing students with “global souls” (Bennett 2008: 13), rather than graduates who are “restricted or parochial of mind” (Leask 2015: 23; Chapter 6). Of particular note, the interviewee casts light on their competency to employ non-western problem-based methodologies to UK higher education. Thus, my research findings complement the work of educationalists and geographers who have written about the advantageous benefits international academics can bring to their host institution (e.g., Alberts 2008; Luxon and Peelo 2009; Green and Myatt 2011; Trahar, 2011; Hsieh, 2012; Pherali 2012; Thomson 2014). Indeed, this dissertation advances debates through a unique focus on the differentiated perspectives of international academics and highlights how knowledge transfer practices are inflected by everyday interactions, institutional idiosyncrasies, and the heterogeneous experiences of migrant academics (to be discussed further in the following chapter).

By drawing attention to this individual’s embedded social differences of race and class, I might reproduce distinctions of the Orient. In Said’s (1978) theory of Orientalism, he argues that Western representations of the East essentialize the Orient as exotic, backward, irrational, and subordinate, while the West/Occident is enframed as progressive, rational, dynamic and democratic. By proposing that the academic’s experience of dispossession and hardship (outlined in the interview quotation above) is a valuable teaching resource, their ‘otherness’ becomes a commodity (Robbins 1993) or a valuable resource in internationalising the curriculum. Seen thus, by seeking to internationalise the curriculum through biographical stories of dispossession, for instance, do we fetishize the hardship and
suffering of others? Relatedly, geography’s deeply entrenched roots with imperialism, colonialism, and racism remain (Radcliffe 2017; Sidaway 2017). Against this backdrop, intellectual interventions and social movements have campaigned to challenge oppressive higher learning spaces steeped in coloniality. Most recently witnessed through student protests such as ‘Why is my curriculum white?’ (University College London) and ‘Rhodes Must Fall’ (University of Oxford). Within geography itself, the critical consciousness of the discipline’s “unbearable whiteness” (Derickson 2017: 236) is an uncomfortable process (see also Esson 2018). As Radcliffe (2017) powerfully notes in a guest editorial on decolonising geographical knowledges:

> Although racism is generally more subtle in university spaces than other public spaces, they remain profoundly unequal racially. Academic geography is no exception: racism and colonial-modern epistemic privileging are often found in student selection and progress; course design, curriculum content; pedagogies; staff recruitment; resource allocation; and research priorities and debates. (p. 331)

Within the academy, the discourse around decolonial thought and practice have become increasingly important. This is exemplified by the 2017 Royal Geographical Society (RGS) with the Institute of British Geographers (IBG) Annual International Conference chair’s theme Decolonising geographical knowledges: opening geography out to the world (RGS-IBG 2017). In responding to this conference agenda, this thesis highlights how contemporary higher learning spaces continue to marginalise and discount knowledge(s) that are seen as different by the case-study universities (Chapters 5 and 7).

Returning to the notion of romanticism, this study’s empirics contribute a fascinating insight into the disparate realities of the migrant academic. For instance, one interviewee dispelled the ‘romantic dream’ fable, explaining:

> My perception of higher education here I think was an illusion! (laughs) So I’ve been here for a couple of months, I started in January and I’d say I’m quite new and maybe still I’m a little bit under shock because…it was not…yeah, it was completely different than I imagined because I…thought that higher education here is, especially my perception of students, or how I imagine students, was completely different. I thought that because they pay so much money here, they would be very demanding, very interested and very engaged, you know! Yeah, I was terribly scared before having my first lectures here because I thought they’ll ask so many questions and you know it will challenge me! And I
won’t be able to answer some questions or whatever! (laugh) Yeah, and then I was here big lecture theatre, and people just looked at me and absolutely disinterested and disengaged and whatever, and it went this way through the semester and it was…And then I’m, basically I thought at the beginning maybe it’s me, but then I talked to colleagues and they told me exactly the same stories.

Senior Lecturer, Female, PhD from Germany

In the interview quotation above, the imagined beauty of teaching university students is converted to an unpleasant truth soon after arrival at the case-study institution. For this individual’s optimistic imagining of British higher education is obscured, they posit, by the deceptive trickery of expensive tuition fees paid by unengaged students. If participant universities are to benefit from diverse intercultural experiences and approaches from international faculty, then institutions must deliver an optimum adjustment service to help offset inevitable culture shock (Oberg 1960). This is despite Universities UK reporting in 2007 that “higher education institutions need to ensure that international academics receive appropriate induction, support, and guidance” (Universities UK 2007: 2). Indeed, as my research findings indicate, the case-study institutions must develop more suitable institutional strategies to better accommodate the needs of academics (both professionally and personally) who are unfamiliar with a UK higher education teaching and learning context (Chapter 8).

The study’s empirics also suggest higher education in the United Kingdom is a source of optimistic inspiration, for interviewees described British academia as being traditional, competitive, leaders of academic excellence, research-intensive, and world-leading. Vocabularies like these, about an education sector that “can be traced back to the twelfth century” (Tight 2009: 4), are particularly insightful and confirm the importance of education branding in promoting UK universities as world-class institutions (Sidhu 2006). Organisations such as the British Council have become increasingly cognizant of marketing UK education, with promotional literature emphatically stating, “the quality of British higher and further education is recognised worldwide” and that “an education in an English-speaking country is now considered the essential passport to intellectual citizenship of the world” (British Council 2000: 20). This positive imaging of British higher education is in juxtaposition to the negative adjectives some interviewees used to problematise the sector, describing it as elitist, expensive, and unequal. Interestingly, positive appraisals relate more to research, while negative comments tend to refer to teaching. While these descriptive
narratives are unsurprising, given the educational system is considered to be polarised, divided, and exclusive (e.g., Dorling 2014), there was a tendency for interviewees to trumpet the Russell Group “as an elite cadre” (Boliver cited in Havergal 2015: no pagination), as the following quotations illustrate:

I don’t need to be at an Oxford or a Cambridge, like I’m not motivated by brand, but [...] I was like if I move to the UK, it has to be a Russell Group.  

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from the United States of America*

Somebody mentioned when I was in New Zealand there is this thing called the Russell Group (laughs) – never heard of that before in my life. [...] And I got told, just start applying to ones in the Russell Group. And I was like, okay (laughs). [...] the idea that I could you know do research is all I really wanted to do. So the fact that this Russell Group term meant that you got to do research as well [as teach], that’s all I wanted.  

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from New Zealand*

This favouring of ‘elite’ universities exposes the valorisation of institutional reputation, in that, migrant academics tend to be seduced by brand image, in particular, early career researchers (like those in the interview vignettes above) who propagate the view that institutions outside of the Russell Group are mediocre and perilous for career advancement. Universities, therefore, have “powerful roles in […] generating, attracting and mobilizing talent” (Florida *et al.*, 2006: no pagination).

A focus on Romanticism in contemporary British HE is important for three reasons. First, Wylie (2010) reflects on the rather gloomy financial landscape of UK universities, in which the academy has undergone “a new research funding and auditing regime that potentially places a premium on external grant income, on work from which a certain type of economic ‘impact’ may be derived, and that steers funding towards ‘science’ *per se*” (p. 213, emphasis in original). The rise of neoliberal ideology on university research and teaching leads to my second point, the aptly entitled book *The Toxic University* (Smyth 2017). Reflecting on the increased marketisation, managerialism and casualisation of academic labour, Smyth’s timely manuscript proffers a critical narrative of neoliberalism in higher education. Against such a horizon, Waters (2018) expressive book review raises a series of targeted thoughts about the contemporary university curiously missing from Smyth’s (2017) volume. This includes the much-publicised University and College Union (UCU) pensions strike, in which Waters (2018: 729) speaks about “a sense of depression
and despondency, as well as uncertainty about the future (the future of the academic self, the academic community and the university as a place of learning)”. This contributes to my final, and perhaps most pressing concern for UK higher education: the political and legal severing of the UK from the European Union. As Marginson et al., (2018) note, British universities rely heavily on highly qualified and skilled non-UK EU academic staff and students. Many have spoken against the referendum’s decision; not least migrant (as well as British) academics bereft at the UK’s withdrawal (e.g., Academics Anonymous 2017, 2018; Talbot 2017; Grounds 2018; Moss 2019); the toxic university sitting uncomfortably against the romanticised university. The lineaments of Romanticism pervade the vocabulary and imaginaries of geographical texts, educational practices, and influential British universities. The expressions of emotion, individual self-reflection, exploration, discovery, enchantment, and subjectivity – defining features of Romanticism ideals – breathe life into the interview quotations that enliven this dissertation.

Romanticism has long been an integral part of geographical study, the image of German explorer Alexander von Humboldt considered the very embodiment of the European, Romantic movement (Rupke 1999). Its genealogy lends itself to poets, musicians, and artists in the late eighteenth century supposedly “able to Romanticize the world by giving the commonplace a lofty meaning, to the ordinary an occult aspect, to the well known the dignity of the unknown” (Peer 2009: 3). Implicit in this philosophical cogitation, is “the mind’s own subjective experience of reality” (Black 2002: 24). The belief that rational thought cannot adequately explain life “led the romantics […] to seek knowledge through the non-rational, including as their subject matter such human intangibles as the imagination, spirituality, and play” (ibid). Over a decade ago Philo (2013) concluded that human geography was experiencing a ‘new’ romanticism; indeed, a post-colonial critique – a stance largely affiliated to romantic geographies – is no way exempt from the biographical stories that feature in this thesis. What it means to be a (migrant) academic in British HE, and how these academics identify themselves, are reflected in the analyse developed in this and the following chapters. From overtones of frustration, struggle and excitement to the mystical, even magical, allure of UK HE, the narratives are one of academic resilience and agency; an agency that is being achieved through ongoing post-colonial and feminist objections.
Chapter 4: Desiring the UK

The Romantic inflexions imbricated in the study’s participant universities can be traced to geographies of otherness, witnessed through implicit and explicit institutional forms of marginality, precarity, and subalternity. These observations are legion, promulgated through acts of differentiation, racism and negative stereotypes. The snare of such practices can be found in curriculum design, course content and pedagogies (Chapters 5 and 7), as well as student encounters with otherness (Chapter 6). Present within such canons lies the work of Edward Said and Bruno Latour. Together, these key thinkers on space and place (Hubbard and Kitchin 2011) have contributed to the ways in which colony, empire, and exploration are theorised within human geography, particularly work that tends to post-colonial, historical and cultural studies sensibilities. In Orientalism, Said (1978) showed how stereotyped representations of Eastern culture by the West laid the foundations for the latter to achieve hegemony over the former: “in short, […] a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (p. 3). The binaries of opposition central to Said’s discourse has given rise to criticism, not least the absence of women as an analytical framework through which to study female colonial travellers (Morin 2011). Beyond Said’s Orientalism approach, Latour’s (1987) ‘centres of calculation’ portrays a series of dispersed, interlocking nodes crucial for explorative travel, the formation of scientific networks and the construction and dissemination of knowledge. Furthermore, Latour’s model provides a lens through which to examine colonial encounters and imperial representations of the world (Fulford et al., 2004).

As such, the romanticism which permeates these theoretical debates is instructive for critiquing certain currents within present-day human geography, for instance, ongoing colonial knowledge production and recent calls to decolonise the curriculum.

A focus upon decolonising geographical knowledge is part of a vibrant intervention within geography, characterised by recent special issues, for example in Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers (2017) on ‘decolonising geographical knowledge’ (edited by Radcliffe); and an issue on ‘decolonising geographical knowledge in a colonised and re-colonising postcolonial world’ in Area (2017) edited by Noxolo. There have been some compelling papers, too, progressing further aspects of these debates – including Esson’s article in Area (2018) entitled “the why and the white”: racism and curriculum reform in British geography’. This moment of intervention is also paradoxical, for Jazeel (2017: 334) reminds us “that the ongoing coloniality of geographical knowledge production is […] widely
accepted”. As a strategy to reform curriculum content, decolonial approaches include attempts to develop “accountable pedagogical praxis” by attending to Indigenous geographies in the teaching of undergraduate students (Daigle and Sundberg 2017: 338). In other work, Hinton and Ono-George’s (2019) recent contribution on anti-racist pedagogy demonstrates how teaching an interdisciplinary module on race and racism can be transformative, wherein students are better equipped to challenge racist behaviour within and beyond higher education.

World university rankings, too, are saturated with enduring legacies of colonialism. Jöns and Hoyler’s (2013) study, for example, illustrates the uneven geographies of knowledge production in higher education, identifying striking disparities between universities in the global North and South. These patterns, Waters (2017: 290) writes, are constitutive of “long-standing material inequalities between regions and countries”. The attractiveness of a world-class institution is discussed by migrants in this study: the institutional cultural capital of Russell Group universities ascribed value, while the less prestigious given a peripheral standing. The role of Anglo-American hegemony in the production and circulation of knowledge is discussed further in the following chapter.

4.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed the experiences of migrant academic staff coming to the UK with regards to adapting to new institutional practices in a different cultural and learning environment. The chapter has focused on the specific motivations for mostly long-term or permanent migration to the UK. In so doing, I have presented enlivened debates about the academic’s migratory context, revealing a variety of rationales for transnational mobility spanning economic, geopolitical, and personal motivations. By examining these contextual factors, the study provides new insights into the “distinct, yet interlocking, dynamics” (Rumbley and de Wit 2017: 7) around transnational academic mobility situated within a UK context of higher education. These global flows also explored the emotional constituent of migration decisions, this chapter thus contributes to emerging theoretical debates on the links between mobility, emotions and immigration policy (see, for example, Kenway and Fahey 2011; Mavroudi and Warren 2013). Findings from this chapter can be summarised in six main points.
First, this chapter has contributed an important focus to understanding the motivations for academic mobility, revealing British higher education as an attractive employer for international academics seeking “long-term career prospects based on tenure-track positions” (Hoyler and Jöns 2008a: 143). Closely related is English as lingua franca. We see this most clearly in interviews, for example, where migrant academics cited their desire “to be part of […] avant-garde, English speaking discourses” and “to be able to publish in English to reach a wider audience”. This highlights how working in an English-speaking country is perceived as beneficial to progressing one’s academic career, but also builds upon previous research around Anglo-American publication spaces (see, for example, Paasi 2005; Jöns and Hoyler 2013).

Second, the chapter has offered a conceptual framework (as a future avenue for research) for researching the dynamics of voice in higher education teaching and learning. Through this, I argue that voice, as a conduit for knowledge transfer, can be affected by place, social value, gender, race and education (Boland 2010) and the migrant academic’s “agency in transforming the institutions and environments in which they are placed” (Madge et al., 2015: 687, emphasis in original). From this, the mobilisation of concepts, practices, and innovations can be shaped by “the politics of place” (Massey 2005: 1). For example, the case-study universities codes and customs influencing what types of knowledge are seen as different or desirable. Exemplary here is the quotation from the senior lecturer in Law who discussed “indirect suppression” of certain disciplinary-specific course content (see section 4.2.1, this chapter).

Third, the chapter’s analysis highlighted the relative ease of navigating UK immigration as a European Economic Area (EEA) citizen. In terms of non-EEA foreign nationals, their relationship status mattered, for example, if your partner is an EU citizen. This provided additional motivation for academic mobility, as one interviewee commented the UK is “open or easily opened for foreigners”. In a post-Brexit landscape, these geographies are likely to be re-shaped along fragmented ‘Leave’ or ‘Remain’ political divisions. Early signs indicate that “EU citizens already living in the UK will keep their rights to do so after Brexit” (Sumption 2018: no pagination).

Fourth, and conceptually, this chapter explored the scalar imaginations of academic mobility. In effect, there are inherently different geographies of scale (Amin
2002) depending on the academic’s biographical history and language capabilities. For example, in searching for employment opportunities, those with national ties to Europe tended to look first to continental Europe, then second, to the United Kingdom. The wider scale of Europe was thus the primary pull, especially for those returning from further afield. North American, Australian, and New Zealand colleagues, in contrast, were primarily attracted to the United Kingdom.

Fifth, I highlight how an academic’s biographical history can be harnessed to internationalise the curriculum. The outcome is potentially a force for individual transformation producing students with “global souls” (Bennett 2008: 13), rather than graduates who are “restricted or parochial of mind” (Leask 2015: 23; Chapter 6). In turn, the research also shows that different conceptual, methodological, and empirical content is not always welcome (Chapters 5 and 7).

Sixth, and most strikingly, there was a tendency for interviewees to romanticise British higher education. This finding is most useful for policymakers and institutions in understanding the aspirations of why and where (Thompson 2017: 77, emphasis in original) migrant academic staff move from one knowledge environment to another. Within this, such findings can help senior management and professional development staff to develop suitable institutional strategies to attract and retain world-leading academics.

In the next chapter, I will examine how migrant academic staff use their differentiated experiences to transfer and adapt international ideas and concepts into their teaching and learning practice.
Chapter 5

Double-being, double-thinking: the anatomy of migrant academic staff

We international academics bring a range of interesting benefits to our new British institutions. A culturally and linguistically rich mix of academics enhances the experience of students. [...] We incorporate into our teaching our homegrown literatures, scholars, histories and ways of life. We provide experiences and narratives that might otherwise be harder to access and more remote and abstract (Thomson 2014: no pagination).

5.1 Introduction

One of the central contributions this research offers geographical and pedagogical literature is contextualised examples of knowledge transfer in a UK higher learning setting. Important here is not only the academic’s contribution to internationalising the curriculum but also the “organizational arrangements of the university” (Altbach and Yudkevich 2017: 3), which can limit and restrict opportunities for synergistic teaching and learning best practice (see also Chapter 7). From this perspective, knowledge transfer can play out in a praxis of inequality, micro-aggressions, ambivalences, and masculinity themes that characterise UK higher education itself (see, for example, Gabriel and Tate 2017). Thus, there is a need to recognise and understand the internal divides within higher education and their role in (de)valuing pedagogical perspectives and discipline-specific approaches that originated or were shaped outside of the UK; in particular, by reflecting on the multiple spatialities of knowledge transfer in an English context of higher learning and teaching. This chapter will therefore critically investigate the complex and contradictory ways in which everyday geographies in the academy shape, inform, embrace and silence alternative (and hidden) voices, and different ways of thinking.

For many years British higher education was rooted in neo-colonialism, an insular attitude that foregrounded Anglo-centric knowledge(s) and educational models (Brown and Jones 2007). Even today, it is evident that colonial privileging and the subjugation of otherwise non-minority groups continues to pervade institutional structures and academic scholarship (e.g., Domosh 2015; Derickson 2017; Esson et al., 2017). Attempts to dismantle the dominance of colonial patterns of power comes at a time when “white supremacy, misogyny, and virulent nationalism” (Roy 2016: no pagination) sweeps across Anglophone contexts in the
wake of the Brexit referendum and Donald Trump elected as the 45th president of the United States. The geographical discipline, for example, “is characterised by its whiteness among academic staff and undergraduate students” (Radcliffe 2017: 331). Against this backdrop, the 2017 RGS-IBG Annual Conference theme – Decolonising geographical knowledges: opening geography out to the world (RGS-IBG 2017) – was a timely intervention to interrogate further institutional and epistemic knowledge claims. For Noxolo boldly notes, British geography “displays little practical contemporary openness to difference and diversity in its knowledge production processes” (2017: 317, emphasis in original).

Despite the establishment of the Race Equality Charter19 and Athena SWAN20 directives to advance equality and diversity in the academy, racialised exclusion in this study’s participant sample was unexpected yet distinctive by the absence of participating black academics at the case-study universities (note: 11% of academic staff interviewed for this study were of Asian or Arab ethnicity and 89% were white). This finding speaks to figures published by HESA that reveal higher education institutions did not employ black academics in senior management positions – “managers, directors and senior officials” – in 2015-1621 (HESA 2017a: no pagination). Of all my efforts to involve academics of colour, the dominance of white research participants is an issue. Certainly, it means that the voices of other ethnic groups are not as well represented as their white peers. However, in the context of this study, it is important not to fetishize skin colour as the only barometer for diversity and difference, but simply one axis of differentiation within a matrix of differences. To be clear, this comment does not seek to undermine or trivialise the continuing “everyday experience of racialisation and racisms in the UK academy” (Noxolo 2017: 317; also see Esson 2018). Indeed, the underrepresentation of BME research participants in this dissertation is emblematic of British higher education

19 Developed in 2012 to advance race equality within higher education for minority ethnic staff and students (Equality Challenge Unit 2017).
20 Launched in 2005, the Athena SWAN Charter was established to advance the careers of women in science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medicine (STEMM) research and academia. In 2015 the Charter was expanded to tackle the unequal representation of women in arts, humanities, social sciences, business and law (AHSSBL; Equality Challenge Unit 2017).
21 Thirty academics refused to provide ethnicity information (HESA 2017a). Moreover, given the agency’s rounding strategy, all numbers are “rounded to the nearest multiple of 5” (HESA 2017b: no pagination). As such, 0, 1 and 2 are rounded down to zero and would, therefore, remove all counts of individuals, for example, Valerie Amos, Director of SOAS University of London, if she identifies as black.
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(Desai 2017), cross-cutting scholarly disciplines as one respondent nervously articulates:

I mean there’s still a problem there are no black professors in this department. There’s a pretty bad racial hegemony generally, like we’re international but we’re white (laughs), you know (laughs) like we’re all white.

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from Canada*

Alongside the racial frames of struggle discussed above, I argue that migrant academic members of staff might also be located within the aforementioned framework of difference, diversity, and marginality. This framing is propagated by Parr’s (2001) definition of marginality, “understood as a state of human being that is partially ‘outside’ mainstream institutions, cultures, practices, beliefs and spaces” (p. 181; see also Methodology Chapter for a detailed discussion). This ‘othering’ of migrant academics focuses on the heterogeneous contributions overseas trained lecturers can make to the internationalisation of the curriculum, both implicitly and explicitly. That is, they bring different empirical, conceptual, and methodological content into their teaching materials, apply different pedagogic approaches, and utilise their international networks to enhance the student experience (Alberts 2008).

The argument that builds within the chapter outlines how the constitutive elements of knowledge transfer vary according to contextual factors, such as the complex interplay between institutional differences in practices, norms and cultures; academic discipline; geographical context; and the individuals themselves. Emphasis is placed on the decision-making processes involved in drawing upon distinctive academic experiences and, in some cases, an individual’s transitory realisation that “their international academic capital” (Pherali 2012: 318) can be leveraged as a valuable resource in British higher education. For example, one participant concluded:

It did [the interview] make me think a lot and actually, yeah, that I maybe should value a bit more these [differences] instead of feeling something that is more like a handicap in a way that I have to struggle about.

*Senior Lecturer, Female, PhD from Belgium*

I also uncover evidence that contradicts dominant discourses or contextualised examples of international academics who “share the need to make connections between what happens here and what happens elsewhere” (Thomson 2014: no
pagination), with some academics reporting the ostensible opposite. As a result, I draw connections between distinctive academic practices and colonial influences in shaping pedagogic spaces (Madge et al., 2015) and seek to sketch out the contours of knowledge transfer from a Commonwealth, European, and rest of world geographical imagination. In so doing, I engage with some of the political influences underlying current and future forms of knowledge transfer and the shifting patterns of global knowledge production and dissemination (see Hoyler and Jöns 2008a; Jöns 2015; Scott 2015; also see Chapter 4).

In the interview vignettes that punctuate this chapter, we see attempts by migrant academic staff to challenge and subvert departmental and/or institutional schools of thought. The tales of marginalising and discounting knowledges and experiences anchored in ‘other’ higher learning spaces abound (Mestenhauser 1983; Sandhu and Asrabadi 1994; Clifford and Henderson 2011; Trahar 2011; also see Chapters 4, 6 and 7). The following, therefore, vividly demonstrate contextualised examples of interviewees (from across the natural, technical and social sciences and the humanities) who effectively incorporated new forms of pedagogy and discipline-specific knowledges into their teaching and learning practice. However, the study’s empirics also reveal a spectrum of intolerance, discrimination, and resistance to different ways of thinking, endorsing Noxolo’s (2017) claims of reticence towards diversity and difference in the academy (see Chapters 3, 4, 6 and 7).

By critically examining the heterogeneous, anecdotal contributions individuals make to the internationalisation of the curriculum and to promoting intercultural understanding, I propose the concept double-being, double-thinking (developed after Thomson 2014). This conceptual framework complements the different academic contexts and geographical locations that non-UK academics astride. Drawing out the ambivalences of barriers and intolerances towards transnational knowledge transfer and the empowering impact migrant academics can have on British higher education (also Chapter 6), this chapter serves as an emancipatory and empowering documentation of life experiences; focusing on an individual’s distinctive academic and cultural capital, rather than (deliberately) reinforcing marginalised and peripheral imaginations of the academic ‘other’. Here, Bourdieu’s (1986) theoretical contribution ‘forms of capital’ can be usefully employed to examine migrant academic staff’s overseas experiences as a valuable resource for internationalising the curriculum. According to Bourdieu (1986: 16) “capital can present itself in three fundamental
guises": economic (material wealth), social (networks, connections and trusted relationships with others), and cultural (skills, knowledges, educational qualifications). Through this theoretical lens, migrant academic staff’s social and cultural capital acquired in overseas knowledge environments may shape UK undergraduate student’s international outlook, intercultural understanding, and career plans and aspirations (Chapter 6) but may also be constrained by the conditions of the case-study university.

In the pages that follow I critically analyse the experiences of migrant academic staff working at universities in England, in regard to the transfer and adaptation of international ideas and concepts in their teaching and learning practice. In this respect, the chapter advances thoughts on the complex connections between academic mobility, knowledge transfer and the internationalisation of higher education. Through interviews, sampled participants make clear the strategies they employ to incorporate previously acquired discipline-specific knowledge into the content of the curriculum. Emphasis is also placed on the benefits and challenges of bringing different pedagogic approaches to a UK context of higher education teaching and learning. Throughout the chapter, contextualised examples of transferable best practice can be identified.

5.2 Awkward geographies of knowledge transfer

I can’t really say that it’s been informed by Singapore […]. I can’t narrow it down and isolate Singapore as a contributory factor. Even in the UK, there are colleagues that I work with who taught me new skills, and I suppose I’ve taught them a couple of things they didn’t know, so there’s a nice blend and there is some interaction going on and all of that I think has informed what I do here. So yes, I think it’s definitely, definitely my background and where I have done my, where I did my undergraduate, postgraduate work, and the people I interact with, and because of the travelling that I do and various conferences that I go to. So it’s all a blend, all of that is in some ways informing my teaching here. […] Whether we can isolate very specific bits and attribute causality I’m not sure, but it’s all playing a part, definitely.

Professor, Male, PhD from Singapore

I’m now about to shape geographical debates in Anglophone geography through a reference to the concept I used in my PhD, which has been influenced by the way I was taught and I taught geography in Germany. Paradoxically, most of that thinking was shaped by English-language literature in geography and science studies, not from German debates.

Senior Lecturer, Female, PhD from Germany
These opening vignettes are a useful starting point for this section, highlighting a number of complex connections between transnational academic mobility and the awkward geographies of knowledge transfer. The interview quotations are clearly concomitant of the globalisation of higher education: the blurring of juridical boundaries, borderless knowledge, cross-border relationships, and the global movement of academics, information, and materialities (Marginson and van der Wende 2007). The argument outlined in this section, denoted by the term ‘awkward geographies’ and spurred by the interview quotations that punctuate this chapter, reflect, first, the difficulty in situating the origins of specific academic practices and subject-specific knowledges (as evidenced above) and, second, comments from some interviewees who argued that they bring nothing different to UK higher education despite their overseas training. These insights challenge the assumption of this thesis that migrant academic staff do integrate an international and intercultural dimension into their teaching and learning practice and, therefore, shape an internationalised curriculum. This develops the scholarship of Jo Norcup (2015) who discussed the awkward geographies of knowledge production and circulation in a geography education journal, namely *Contemporary Issues in Geography and Education* (CIGE). The term also responds to my own awkward performance with the study. Specifically, agonising over the qualitative interviews and whether I had asked the correct questions in order to engage with the chapter’s research questions, as well as the awkwardness around claiming ownership of this HEA-funded doctoral project (see Methodology Chapter for a discussion about researcher nerves and anxieties). This chimes with the work of Jazeel (2007: 287), a UK-based academic who experienced “awkward encounters between notionally situated ‘local’ and ‘foreign’ scholars” when undertaking research in Sri Lanka.

From the outset of this research, I, perhaps a little guilelessly, assumed interviewees would be able to reflect on the transfer and adaptation of international ideas and concepts in their teaching and learning. Not least when teaching qualifications (for example, Fellowship of the HEA), a requirement for many new lecturers, require significant reflection around teaching practices. A thought-provoking outcome of this research, then, is that interview questions around teaching and learning were surprisingly difficult to answer. In most cases, participants responded with blank stares, confused expressions or inarticulateness when asked
to explain how they incorporate “international, intercultural, and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum” (Leask 2015: 9). This was no fault of the respondents or mine. Instead, this served to be a challenging and abstract question few interviewees had given much attention to. Indeed, as I would come to find out, pedagogical reflection and internationalising the curriculum are objects of little deliberation or scrutiny. For participants in this study, and I dare say most academics, their teaching and learning practice “has accumulated through straightforward usage” – that is, it is “an intuitive knowledge” (Latham 2003: 2001). One methodological conclusion that might be drawn from this is that qualititative semi-structured interviews disadvantaged this particular question, whereas solicited participant diaries22 (Zimmerman and Wieder 1977) might have elucidated more responsive insights around the differentiated strategies employed in international knowledge transfer. Alternatively, a potential avenue for future enquiry could include documentary research (for example, module handbooks, reading lists, and lecture slides/notes) in combination with semi-structured interviews. Nevertheless, one interviewee, a geographer, commented:

This is a challenging question and I’m not quite sure that I both understand and second [can] answer [it], I’m not sure. I’m not sure. I mean that would be, that would require days of thinking, of reflecting ‘cause I, consciously I’m not sure what I’m doing in order to transfer the knowledge.

Lecturer, Male, PhD from the United States of America

This was not an uncommon response, and at one point during data collection, I had come to dread this part of the interview. That being so, questions were constantly re-written in the hope that each iteration was simpler than the last for Anglophone and non-Anglophone academics to understand. Interview dread illustrates a negative fieldwork experience but also speaks to the practical considerations that interviewers “ask the right or appropriate questions” (Valentine 2001: 44). Cross-cultural communication and understanding “relating to whether respondents conceptualized questions” (Herod 1999: 317) in the same manner in which they were asked also presented multiple challenges (see Methodology Chapter). As with any fieldwork, there were also anxieties around collecting sufficient evidence to examine the role of

---

22 The use of solicited diaries is inspired by Zimmerman and Wieder’s (1977) diary: diary-interview technique, a methodological tool which combines participant diaries and qualitative interviews.
migrant academic staff to internationalisation processes ‘at home’ (Trahar and Hyland 2011). For example, in one self-indulgent diary entry, I had concluded rather curtly halfway through data collection that migrant academic staff do not engage in knowledge transfer, and that identifying contextualised examples of such practices was “becoming an elusive and unachievable aspect of my thesis” (diary entry, May 2015). However, as my supervisory committee points out, knowledge transfer is the result of many years of studying, reading, researching, and attending conferences.

While Mason (2002: 5) cautions against such “ego-centric or confessional tales”, this reflexive act points to the stickiness of knowledge transfer as a concept and what it actually means in the context of teaching and learning. Faulconbridge (2006), for example, differentiates between knowledge transfer and knowledge creation. In his view, on the basis of empirical material collected about professional service firms in London and New York, knowledge is rarely transferred directly between settings. Instead, Faulconbridge points to the “social production of new knowledge” because of “cultural and institutional influences on knowledge […] practice” (2006: 536-537). A similar line of argument is posited by Williams (2006: 604) who argues that “knowledge transfer is perhaps better thought of, in the case of international migration, as knowledge translation”. That is, knowledge evolves – ideas are constantly adjusted, modified, and reshaped. When phrased in this way, perhaps it is no wonder that some academics found it difficult to differentiate between past and present acquired knowledge. This is conceptualised most elegantly by Czarniawska (2001), who writes: “it is people, whether regarded as users or as creators, who energize an idea every time they translate it for their own or somebody else’s use (p. 126). Watching ideas travel, ‘[w]e observe a process of translation […]’ (Latour 1992: 116)”. This metamorphosis of knowledge by virtue of travel is captured by Said’s (1983) travelling theory, the resultant conclusion being that ideas and theories are exposed to different processes of institutionalisation and representation “from those at point of origin” (p. 226). There are, Said (1983: 226-227) claims, four common stages to how ideas and theories move: origination (the point at which an idea emerges or enters discourse), circulation (the movement of ideas from one context to another before gaining prominence in a new situation), institutionalisation (the acceptance, resistance or toleration of a new idea), and revivification (once accepted, a theory is reinterpreted and transformed to accommodate its new position). In the work cited above, however, the movement of knowledge for the
purpose of higher education teaching and learning remains empirically under-researched, specifically in the context of how pedagogical and subject-specific knowledges move from one knowledge environment to another.

This thesis builds upon these themes but importantly extends the scholarly focus to higher education teaching and learning in response to Kim’s (2009: 398) call for a detailed “investigation on the mobility and recruitment of international academics and their impact on the internationalization of British HE”. In so doing, the chapter points to the problematic transfer of expertise and information, for Meusburger (2013: 16) argues making “knowledge public and easily available does not automatically mean that it is understood and accepted” (see also Jöns 2018a; Chapters 6 and 7).

5.2.1 Previous knowledge environments
One of the strengths of this comparative research illustrates the different and, at times, contradictory ways in which “scientific concepts, practices, or technical innovations” (Meusburger 2015: 266) acquired in non-UK pedagogic environments are perceived by the migrant academic, which would link to the aforementioned conceptualisation about awkwardness in knowledge transfer. While such individuals may seem ideally placed to internationalise the curriculum (Brewer and Leask 2012), the narratives from some interviewees indicate that little consideration is given to their international experiences. This is explicitly highlighted in the interview quotation below:

I suppose my approach to research was probably formed in Australia and that may have an influence on my teaching and learning here. So maybe my research projects I did in my undergraduate in my honours year that was pretty formative. So that was with one particular supervisor who had a very methodical way of doing chemical research. That may have informed my teaching and learning here, my PhD possibly as well. But as I said, most of my learning or most of my lecturing experience has been [in the UK] essentially. […] Australia hasn’t had a hell of a lot of impact on it.

_Lecturer, Male, PhD from Australia_

In this instance, the interviewee only cursorily points to the rich overseas pedagogic experiences and methodological content they can potentially integrate into a UK context of higher education. Instead, the individual appears to dismiss the value of their overseas credentials. In the most obvious sense, this observation draws on the
spatial configuration between the participant’s international education and their local professional experiences. For instance, this academic obtained their tertiary education in Australia, followed by postdoctoral appointments within the same country. Thereafter, they held postdoctoral, teaching fellow and an industrial placement in the UK prior to taking up an academic position at the case-study university. This suggests that it is the latter with its relational closeness to UK higher education that the interviewee claims to be a pipeline for their subject-specific knowledge and pedagogical approaches. Taken together, this biographical information provides an important insight into understanding the geographical and professional influences upon teaching and learning.

According to Morgan (2004), localised learning and physical proximity in knowledge production “is the essential prerequisite for deep learning” (p. 5). This reminds us that geography matters. By this, I draw on Lave and Wenger’s (1991) situated theory. They suggest: “learners inevitably participate in communities of practitioners and that the mastery of knowledge and skill requires newcomers to move toward full participation in the sociocultural practices of a community” (Lave and Wenger 1991: 29). It is argued then, that the social capital the chemist acquired from working as a Teaching Fellow in the UK may have enhanced their employment opportunities in securing a lectureship at the case-study university. In other words, the role that institutional social capital (Bourdieu 1986) played in this individual’s employment trajectory might explain their inefficacy to recognise their international credentials as a force to shape and inform pedagogical perspectives because of complete, adequate and relevant teaching interactions in the UK. More generally, their international credentials might not be necessary at the case-study university. This is a salient reminder of Chapter 4, when a Lecturer in Media and Communications explained that the UK labour market failed to acknowledge their overseas experiences, pointing to “the depreciation of their cultural capital” (Weiss 2005: 720). It was only after securing temporary teaching contracts in the UK that full-time, permanent lectureship positions were yielded. As Bilecen and Van Mol (2017) have demonstrated, international mobility can produce and reproduce social disparities, as well as opportunities for migrant academic staff (Chapter 4).

Interestingly, and paradoxically, the clear statement captured in the quotation above softens when the chemist reveals that they draw on their foreign education, life experiences and upbringing to actively encourage students to consider an
international career, indicating, in truth, the importance of their international educational influences. For example:

I try to instil particularly in my PhD students that the UK isn’t the centre of the universe in terms of chemistry, you can go other places. And sometimes it’s better to go other places just to experience what chemistry’s like outside of this particular environment. The UK chemistry environment can be pretty oppressive sometimes and it’s good to get out of that particular bubble and experience what other departments are like. […] [I] try and get that across to my students, definitely.

Lecturer, Male, PhD from Australia

These polarised responses between epistemological approaches and international outlook speak to the importance of differentiating between different types of knowledge. By looking at different knowledges (empirical, methodological, and conceptual) universities will be better placed to engage in internationalisation strategies 'at home'. From a geographical perspective, it highlights the role of international faculty “as key actors in the knowledge economy” (Jöns and Hoyler 2013: 46) as they provide powerful testimonials of the global realities of studying and working abroad. It is through these claims that immobile undergraduate student career plans and aspirations can be reconceived (Chapter 6).

By encouraging interviewees to reflect upon their classroom activities, in some instances, like the individual quoted above, differences exist between one’s academic voice as a UK-based chemist and their personal interest in providing internationally-oriented careers advice. On one level, this geographical disjuncture points to the spatialities of knowledge production, an impassably erected frontier provoked by local, place-based institutional processes, practices, norms and customs. On the other, there is a conceptual disjuncture – a failure or missed opportunity to pedagogically engage with their educational roots. Such scholarly praxis unpicks the awkward geographies of negotiating between local and overseas experiences but also highlights the plural identities that have become woven into an academic’s daily routine. This is explicitly captured in the interview quotation below and, perhaps most notably, presents neoliberalism as being symptomatic for aiming to inculcate an institutional identity:

I’ve kind of taken on an institutional identity here, I think I’ve kind of immersed myself in that in order to be able to do the job successfully, so I
don’t think of myself as a, I think of myself as a New Zealander, but I don’t know that I think of myself as a New Zealand academic. [...] that part of me, that personal national identity part is I guess important for me as well to kind of, I always start with lectures at the start of the year with students that I always point out to them that I’m a New Zealander, so you know my accent is slightly different but they’re probably having trouble placing it because they may not know a New Zealand accent! Or [they] think I’m Australian, and it’s also to kind of, yeah, to situate myself against I guess UK colleagues. But it’s, and so I always make a point of saying that to students, because I guess that helps me to then introduce some of those personal anecdotes later on as well but I don’t know why I feel the need to kind of do that, to situate myself apart from the UK staff! I think it helps just students to kind of understand that they are being taught by this kind of wide range of staff, and I think because a lot of our students are international, they do struggle with the, like you know they struggle with all accents from Europe in general anyway but they wouldn’t necessarily know that … I mostly get accused of being American actually from (laughs) rather than Australian! I don’t know if that’s better or worse, but …! Yeah, so I feel like I need to kind of do that so that, I don’t know why, I actually have never really kind of questioned why I feel the need to do that, but just to kind of let them know that they shouldn’t assume that I’m a British person I suppose.

Lecturer, Female, PhD from New Zealand

By valuing cultural difference, this individual effectively “trad[ed] on anecdotes” as a strategy to extrapolate theory in order to illustrate discipline-specific content (Luxon and Peelo 2009: 656). This academic also recognised the importance of integrating themselves into the epistemic community in which they are employed. In doing so, the respondent candidly reveals that by mapping one’s academic self onto British higher education significantly improved their employment opportunities and scholarly success (see also Beaverstock 2017; Jöns 2018a). However, it could be argued that this underplays the migrant academic’s double-beingness. And yet, at the same time, it highlights the different ways in which they “find themselves caught between personal patriotisms and a denationalized view of knowledge” (Metcalfe 2017: 132). This juggling of plural identities is discussed by another interviewee below:

Well, it’s, like so many things in the 21st century, it’s a mix of things. I do identify myself as a UK academic in terms of [case-study university] is where I’m from and where the university that [I] kind of represent in the broader meaning and the place where I aim to work for the foreseeable future. But of course I know that there is baggage that I have in terms of coming from Germany, you notice that on a daily basis when something administrative goes wrong in this country, it’s something that reminds me
of what it means to be German, that there is a certain expectation of order and proper procedure that this country cannot always match.

*Reader, Male, PhD from Germany*

In this extract, the interviewee expresses positive ties to the case-study university but continues to exhibit German socialisation (double-being, double-thinking), particularly when discussing administrative procedures. One respondent, in contrast, dissected the axes of their institutional identity, by punctuating it with aspects of difference and dis-identification from colleagues and departmental codes and customs:

I’m proud to be a non-UK [academic] if I’m honest. Because I mean, I’ll give you an example, another one. I had 14 plagiarism meetings last week. [...] And yeah again [British] colleagues have told me ‘don’t, why you doing that? You’re making work for yourself, don’t’. Now being from New Zealand we took that very seriously and if you did it once, you got a zero. But because this system here is you know resubmit and all this sort of jazz, it’s like ‘well, you’re gonna have to deal with them again. Don’t bother’. So in that, I bring with me the New Zealand approach in that: ‘look, you’ve got to know what you did, don’t do it again’ (laughs). [...] I mean it would make my life easier to look away all the time, but I don’t want to. [...] and everyone always says to me ‘you just make too much work for yourself, [interviewee’s name]’. But I’m kinda glad that I’m maintaining the integrity of the degree. I’m making sure people read (laughs). I’m actually thinking about putting like a disclaimer on my next module outline ‘if you’re offended at the concept of reading, please don’t take my module!’

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from New Zealand*

This self-identification as ‘non-UK’ might conjure negative interpretations of Othering. However, when intersected with academic mobility and the reproduction of self, this academic demonstrates how teaching approaches that originated or were shaped in different knowledge environments can be leveraged “as a valuable resource to be mined for teaching” (Luxon and Peelo 2009: 656). When challenged to conform to local practices, they resisted and continued along their chosen route. The reluctance of colleagues to embrace academic difference, prejudices alternative norms of academic practice. And yet, by countering negative performances of Othering, this interviewee provides a striking example of how international ideas can travel, linking distant and distinct places and spaces. From this perspective, the interviewee performs the role of a knowledge broker, individuals who “recombine past experiences in new ways for new audiences” (Hargadon 2002: 43). Migrant
academics are, therefore, ideally placed to transfer new concepts, practices, and innovations to otherwise unconnected individuals, by creating bridges across ‘structural holes’ (Burt 2004). In this research, structural holes represent different knowledge milieus. In Germany, for example, Bilecen and Faist (2015) explored brokerage through the lens of international doctoral students. Focusing on friendship networks as a conduit for the dissemination of knowledge, their study examines the “social conditions that underlie knowledge circulation” (Bilecen and Faist 2015: 230) – three social conditions were identified: solidarity, trust, and reciprocity.

Returning to the Marketing lecturer quoted above, and drawing on Bilecen and Faist’s (2015) work, solidarity seems to refer to the participant’s teaching behaviour emerging from doctoral study in New Zealand rather than shared experiences with local colleagues. There could be multiple reasons for this. An important starting point is that the interviewee was in the last throes of their PhD while in the first weeks of teaching at the case-study university. Indeed, at the time of the interview, the respondent had been a lecturer for less than 17 months. Second, they exhibited temporary feelings of belonging disclosing in the interview a disappointment with their academic department and regret at applying to that ‘type’ of an institution. Contrary to the individual experience outlined above, for most participants time constraints, institutional adjustment and “just trying to keep my head above water” were cited for being less innovative in their academic approaches and pedagogic practice.

As exemplified in the chapter so far, interrelationships can be drawn between academic belonging and nationalism. Metcalfe (2017: 134), for example, reflects upon her “academic mobility between the United States and Canada”, in particular her awkwardness of being “caught in an in-between state whereby the narrative of the origin [the United States] has the effect of destabilizing the present” [Canada] (Braidotti 2011: 59). For Metcalfe (2017), transnational mobility “sets the conditions for epistemic and ontological change at the level of the individual” (p. 131). In time, Metcalfe would become a Canadian citizen. In this example of academic migration, “questions of ontology – about changing the inner self” (Fejes 2016: 402) are particularly pertinent in the context of this research, for example, the transformation of one’s academic identity.
5.2.2 Differentiated knowledges

I think overall the British system is better in terms of teaching techniques, so I took those on board rather than...it wouldn’t be too useful to try to teach the way I used to teach because I can see it’s not as good.

Senior Lecturer, Female, PhD from Austria

This comment about the perceived superiority of teaching techniques in British universities seems to hold for participants coming from non-English language backgrounds in continental Europe and those who have integrated into British academia after several years of working at the case-study institutions. Changes to teaching and learning practice by adopting a British paradigm of higher education instruction can disunite interviewees from their pedagogical roots and create ambivalences about migrant academics’ role in internationalising higher education. However, I am of the opinion that the interview comment above potentially undermines the transformative influence migrant academics can have on British higher education, from their cosmopolitan attitude, multilingualism (Garcia-Ramon 2003), and ability to “link debates across cultural contexts” (Jöns 2018b: 35). Yet when it comes to the individual quoted above, the rejection of alternative ways of pedagogical thinking is driven by the perception that teaching and learning practices acquired in overseas settings are detrimental to maintaining high-quality student learning in a UK context of higher education (for debates around quality assurance, see Chalkley et al., 2000; Gribble and Ziguras 2003; Green et al., 2012; also Chapter 7). It is tempting then, to associate this self-imposed silencing of overseas techniques to mandatory higher education teaching qualifications (for example, the Higher Education Academy Associate Fellowship and the Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education), which are increasingly becoming “a condition of appointment and promotion” across higher education providers (Advance HE 2017: no pagination). As Pherali (2012: 330) notes, professional development programmes provide fundamental insights into the “social and cultural aspects” of British higher education. While my research is in consonance with Pherali’s study in the sense that migrant academics’ knowledge of UK higher education is minimal on arrival (Chapter 4), I argue strongly that induction and professional development courses might also dissuade migrant academics from incorporating difference and diversity into their teaching and learning framework (Minocha et al., 2018).
Allied to the interview quotation above, one interviewee revealed the justification behind their pedagogical disconnect:

Whatever pedagogy I bring from the other planet (laughs), it’s not possible really to adapt here.

Senior Lecturer, Female, PhD from Belgium

This self-identification as an ‘alien’ of not being from ‘here’ (the United Kingdom), points to embodying alternative norms of pedagogical practice, which, seen loosely, can construct negative identities of the academic Other. For instance, existing studies reveal a concerted effort by some migrant academics to disguise (Green and Myatt 2011), “camouflage” (Clifford and Henderson 2011: 115) and “overlook” (Jiang et al., 2010: 166) cultural differences in regard to academic practices. Imaginations of British higher education as a space of alienation (and belonging), resonates with Blunt and Varley’s (2004) work on geographies of home. Viewed in this way, the narrative of international migration represents a separation from a homely space of comfort, familiarity, belonging and identity, to a place of (temporary) estrangement and dislocation (Ahmed 1999). In Blunt and Varley’s (2004) work, claiming a home is a process of balance “between memory and nostalgia for the past, everyday life in the present, and future dreams and fears” (p. 3). Moreover, Gribble and Ziguras (2003) writing about Australian academics participating in offshore teaching programmes, usefully point out that students are accustomed to specific learning paradigms, as such mobile academics need to understand and be prepared for the specificities of distinctive academic cultures. However, this could be read as systemic blocking of differentiated educational practices which “prevents the cross-fertilization of differentiated knowledge or ideas across systems and thus stifles the creation of new knowledge schemes” (Hutchison 2016: 256). A more affirmative understanding of participants’ heterogeneous epistemes could be remedied through exploratory workshops which specifically focus on the sharing of international best practice, rather than perceiving overseas epistemes as a professional deficiency (see policy recommendations, Chapter 8).

The problematic transfer of teaching approaches between different higher learning spaces reflects wider geographical debates, in which Gertler (2003: 95) claims that “tacit knowledge transfer, when attempted across major institutional-contextual boundaries, will be subject to formidable obstacles, […] because of
fundamentally different institutional environments”. Indeed, Meusburger (2017) draws attention to knowledge transfer naivety, specifically, the assumption that new knowledges will be enthusiastically received and taken up. Notwithstanding this, many of the study’s participants from across the natural, technical and social sciences and the humanities expressed discipline-specific homogeneity, in which there seems to be a lucid stretching of educational instruction across and between distant and distinct educational and institutional systems, as one interviewee observed:

Economics is just so standardised […] we all tend to follow a very similar structure in terms of how we teach, […] I suspect […] it just doesn’t look that different here [in the UK] as it does in North America.

Lecturer, Male, PhD from Canada

This pedagogical disjuncture between different academic disciplines provides a framework for understanding the “varying spatial relations of different research practices” and highlights “the differences between empirical, experimental, theoretical and argumentative-interpretative” informed work (Jöns 2007: 99). In economics, standardised terminologies and methods can make it easier for practices to travel, especially when their technical counterparts are bound to fields such as mathematics. By focusing on the higher education context interviewees were exposed to, explanations can be made to what role geography plays in mapping the contours of knowledge transfer. For example, striking disparities between a Commonwealth, European, and rest of world geographical imagination are evident in interviewees’ narratives. This is illustrated by the respondent below, who applies a geographical perspective when comparing their undergraduate experience in continental Europe to their doctoral studies in North America:

The way you write papers, the way you come up with the research question, the way you frame it, the way you develop the methodology it’s not very different from this system [British higher education]. It's very different from the [undergraduate] system [in continental Europe], absolutely. But exactly because I've been trained also in the US for me was not hard to adjust and to transfer the knowledge and both to transfer the ways knowledges should be produced in terms of the data collection and data analysis. But yes, it would be very challenging if you had to transfer that type of knowledge to [a continental Europe] academic system or the other way round 'cause they don't work the same. […] So, you really
have to adjust to completely unique way of conveying information yeah but not so much jumping from there [the United States] to here [the United Kingdom].

*Lecturer, Male, PhD from the United States of America*

Buoyed by Bourdieu’s habitus (1986), in particular the accrual of social and cultural capital, graduate study encounters with an Anglophone education affords the migrant academic the “‘right’ credentials” (King *et al.*, 2011: 178), in which epistemological homogeneity acquired in centres of academic dominance can help to assimilate individuals “into particular ways of knowledge creation” (Brooks and Waters 2011: 90). For Gregory (1998), this “produces a *double* geography […] a hierarchy of *spaces of knowledge production* in which some sites are valorized as more central than others” (p. 57, emphasis in original). This is not to say that pedagogical inflexions and discipline-specific knowledges are limited to the parochialism of Anglo-American hegemony. Rather, it is through a “matrix of spatialities” (Harvey 2005:104) that the contours of transference and adaptation are performed, articulated by the different typologies of knowledge, migrant subjectivities, and the case-study universities codes and customs. It is through these concepts, I posit, that the geographies of knowledge transfer in a UK context of higher teaching and learning can be better understood.

### 5.2.3 Contextualised examples of knowledge transfer

My [teaching] philosophy is about inclusivity and it’s also about innovating on assessment. That’s like a big thing for me and coming here has been an amazing challenge because people are really attached to the essay, exam format. That I absolutely abhor and I don’t think it’s useful. […] I make students have thesis statements which is where they say ‘in this paper, I will argue’ which blows their mind. Yeah like another thing is that, so the module that I taught last year was a third-year module and I didn’t set them essay questions, I said ‘you choose your own essay question’. And this is seen as really, really odd here.

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from Canada*

In this interview quotation, the interviewee views their overseas credentials as a valuable asset for incorporating difference and diversity into the content of the curriculum. Furthermore, in attempting to challenge and subvert departmental and/or institutional schools of thought, this individual exposes the unwillingness and barriers colleagues have exhibited in relation to different ways of thinking, potentially
hampering the academic's contribution to internationalising the curriculum. They go on to state:

I do feel like I don't have a lot of force or sway in the department even though I, I think I bring something unique in terms of like these kind of pedagogical insights from other places you know but yeah maybe if I was a bit older, I'm not sure. Maybe if I was a man. [...] I don’t actually feel junior in terms of my experience; I have Senior Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy actually (laughs). [...] I think a reluctance to change is really the issue. You know I was proposing that we should have rubrics attached to all of our assessments, like so that students know what they’re being assessed on. God, like people are so resistant to that idea. They’re like ‘it’s so formulaic’. I’m like ‘it’s not, it’s transparent’. That’s all it is.

Lecturer, Female, PhD from Canada

For this young female academic, the opportunity to employ overseas acquired pedagogical insights has been shaped by the locally-specific nature of the case-study department and perceived gender-based discrimination. Indeed, women’s everyday geographies in higher education remain disproportionally unequal to that of men (e.g., European Commission 2016; Maddrell et al., 2016). In an increasingly competitive knowledge economy, we should ask why novel ideas, methods, and theories, as discussed by Meusburger (2017), tend to be rejected, contested and criticised despite their technological, pedagogical and research-based value. Similar forecasts can be levied at discipline-specific clashes of knowledge. This led one interviewee to dissect the different typologies of knowledge and evaluate their applicability to a UK context of higher learning and teaching:

I want to be very clear in the differentiation between knowledge transfer of content, of content in terms of concepts and ideas, then case-study contexts and then methodological considerations. So in terms of knowledge transfer in terms of content, conceptual approaches I had to block out my German background and fully adapt to the English-speaking literature because of research-led teaching. In terms of case-study contexts I could use my own research which is based on case-study context in Germany and elsewhere so I’m able to convey some different perspectives, not necessarily that all students connect to it, but in a module of globalisation, they should. And in terms of methodology it’s possible now to integrate some methodological ideas. In terms of methodology in a methods course, I’ve been able to integrate ideas on statistical analysis via practical sheets without these debates necessarily being reflected in the textbooks because in method[s] teaching you use textbooks and my methods teaching is shaped by German textbooks.
In considering the pedagogical and subject-specific decisions migrant academics make with regards to Anglophone–non-Anglophone reconciliation debates, Heike Jöns, a German-native speaker, elegantly reflects upon her academic trajectory in the United Kingdom. Based on (auto)biographical inquiry, Jöns (2018a) explains that in order to contribute to geographical debates in the dominant lingua franca, she had to “adopt a different style of thought and argumentation”, and “focus on ideas and debates familiar to Anglophone reviewers and readers” (p. 33). Invariably to succeed in the epistemic community one is employed in, Jöns (2018a) stresses the importance of adapting to that system’s publication and research culture. Through these adaptation practices, “specific epistemic communities” are reproduced (Beaverstock 2017: 235), enhancing the careers of those who assimilate into them.

From a practical perspective, the study’s empirics also revealed best practices of utilising the diverse experiences and approaches of migrant academics, for example, accreditation to learned societies:

I think my experience from other countries has probably informed sort of the teaching meetings, so the teaching discussion we had. So, for example, when I arrived, our MSc programme wasn’t accredited by the RTPI, Royal Town Planning Institute. And when we built, and when we created this programme, I was saying that ‘OK, we need to push this, we need to push that’.

Lecturer, Female, PhD from France

For one interviewee, changing university regulations with regards to exam transparency constitutes as one of their greatest career successes, as the following quotation explicitly demonstrates:

Interviewee: My greatest triumph, which I want to be highlighted in your dissertation…!

NT: OK.

Interviewee: Is, so everywhere in the world, you know, it’s standard practice, if the student has sat an exam and it, if it has been marked, that the student can then see the paper and see what’s happened to it. Not so in England. In England, the exam paper is explicitly confidential to the university and the department, and the student, after having handed in his [sic] paper, is no longer allowed to see it. And I have changed that!
(laughs) So now in [case-study university], in [the] computer science department all students can see all their exam papers after the marking! That’s been the battle of my life, it took two years! (laughs) […] the university had to add a paragraph to its regulations to allow that in computer science. As far as I know, no other department does it, although there were some attempts but they haven’t been able to do it properly. Other computer science departments in the country have heard about it because of accreditation and they have adopted it.

Professor, Male, PhD from Germany

This could be read as a political act, whereby the migrant academic is effecting meaningful but time-conscious change at the case-study university. Strategies employed by migrant academic staff to transfer and adapt international ideas and concepts in their teaching and learning practice is most striking below, where an interviewee discusses pedagogical innovations:

There’s a couple of main things, and importantly these innovations are not necessarily just like translating something that I was used to doing in Australia, let’s say, or abroad in here, they were thought through and they were tailored on the needs and the contexts where I was obviously working. So for instance, in one of my modules that I have re-written from scratch, that wasn’t even existing before in the offer, I have decided to shape it in terms of learning objectives, around the expectations for a key industry role that matches that specific topic. So it’s a brand management course, and so I’ve looked at you know what are the skills and characteristics that the brand manager needs to have in the industry for the students to be actually you know employable afterwards, which is something that really matters to students, even more so in this UK culture of like it’s all about you know getting a degree afterwards, it’s all about giving to students what they actually really want. So I’ve used that to try to re-shape my teaching offer, what I was expecting for them, and then I re-tailored all of my teaching and assessment in line with the construction of a portfolio for them, like if it were a training for the industry. And we’ve done that leveraging quite a lot on technology, so they had a lot of online resources that it could leverage on, and plan use of technology in terms of learning resources, capture of the lecture, online forums, this kind of thing. So it’s not as forward-thinking as it would be probably in the context of Australia, where even when I started in 2009 it was already the default to have a lot of things online and to have it set up in that way like it was just the norm for the students. I’ve not just like translated that or trying to replicate it, I actually tried to think in terms of like who are my students here, what is actually happening in the environment, what are the dynamics that characterise the current status of the relationship between higher education and the learners? How can I sort of like feed in and try to do something new without you know going against the whole context?

Lecturer, Female, PhD from Australia
The interview extracts in this section aptly showcase the transformative force that overseas expertise, skills, competencies, and knowledges can have on British higher education. The last quotation, in particular, illustrates the complexity of how best to conceptualise transnational flows of knowledge in the context of higher education teaching and learning, as either knowledge transfer, creation, or translation.

5.3 Conclusion
There is a widespread belief that migrant academics contribute to the diversification of university campuses, bringing with them new forms of pedagogy and different approaches to research and enterprise (Alberts 2008; Foote et al., 2008; Luxon and Peelo 2009; Hsieh 2012; Pherali 2012; Thomson 2014; Lee and Lim 2017). While this chapter optimistically foregrounds this finding, on the whole, the contribution of sampled participants to the internationalisation of the case-study universities was highly varied and subjective. For policymakers and university managers pursuing an internationalisation agenda, this is a problematic outcome. This finding takes on added significance at a time of tense political uncertainty for British higher education following the Brexit referendum and provokes challenging questions around internationalisation activities ‘at home’. Simply hiring international faculty as a strategy to incorporate a global and intercultural dimension into the content of the curriculum is insufficient (Brewer and Leask 2012; Chapter 8). Leung (2013), for example, writing about circular mobility of Chinese scholars to Germany, notes “the possibility [for migrant academics] to recognise, adopt, translate and transfer tangible and intangible elements of the various academic fields cannot be taken for granted” (p. 322). I argue strongly, therefore, that international knowledge transfer in the context of teaching and learning needs to be engineered by both the migrant academic and the higher education provider (Chapter 8).

Despite this, we can see that migrant academic staff can effectively trade on their double-beingness to incorporate an “international, intercultural, and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods, and support services of a program of study” (Leask 2015: 9). In so doing, the chapter points to the rich experiences such individuals bring to UK higher education and their contribution to internationalisation strategies ‘at home’. Based on this, contributions to knowledge include a new conceptualisation – double-being, double-thinking (developed after Thomson 2014:
no pagination) – that emphasises the disparate knowledge environments that migrant academics astride but also lends itself as a complementary body of work to Latour’s (1987: 2015) “centres of calculation”, in the sense that as academics move from one knowledge environment to another they accumulate resources (gather experiences, expertise, different knowledges as well as develop networks).

Quotes selected for thesis inclusion capture the power imbalances between interviewees’ overseas experiences and British higher education culture, with its specific codes, customs, and traditions. Expected challenges (language, adjustment to a new university environment, grading expectations) and deeply embedded dispositions (migrant subjectivities) shine a spotlight on the multiple themes that can influence, limit and restrict opportunities for synergistic teaching and learning best practice. Though some participants tended to view their approach to pedagogical instruction, to borrow a phrase from Pimlott-Wilson (2011: 115), as “simply a carbon copy of what has occurred before” or a manifestation of their teacher training at a British higher education institution, it is important to be mindful of the distinctive social and cultural capital through which differentiated pedagogical and academic practices can be leveraged “as a valuable resource to be mined for teaching” (Luxon and Peelo 2009: 656). Indeed, the ideas and approaches transferred and adapted to the case-study universities are global in scope, composed of different typologies of knowledge.

By focusing on the differentiated perspectives of migrant academic members of staff, this chapter has captured the awkward geographies of knowledge transfer (including my own engagement with the study) and drew attention to the different ways in which migrant academic staff’s “agency in transforming the institutions and environments in which they are placed” (Madge et al., 2015: 687, emphasis in original) vary. In this regard, to understand knowledge transfer within a UK context of higher education teaching and learning; first, it is important to examine the differentiated perspectives of the migrant academic. This is important because the case-study university contexts and the academic staff’s previous international experiences are highly heterogeneous (national, institutional, and discipline-specific). Second, the double-being, double-thinking of the migrant academic requires integration strategies from the case-study university (Chapters 7 and 8). Third, the need for migrant academic staff to adapt to the epistemic community in which they
are employed might potentially hinder contributions to internationalising the curriculum, but this may vary depending on the type of knowledge in question.
Chapter 6

Diversity as an asset: creating global subjects ‘at home’?

An internationalised curriculum will engage students with internationally informed research and cultural and linguistic diversity. It will purposefully develop their international and intercultural perspectives as global professionals and citizens (Leask 2009: 209).

6.1 Introduction

Having mapped the contours of knowledge transfer from the differentiated perspective of migrant academic staff (Chapters 4 and 5), this chapter will explore how UK students perceive and experience such knowledge transfer. By UK student, I mean undergraduate domiciled students studying at the case-study university in their second, third, and fourth year. First-year students were excluded from the study because when the survey was electronically sent out in November 2015, they had only just started their university degree and might not have encountered migrant academics (see Chapter 3 for a discussion on study limitations and methodological reflections). In contrast, non-UK academics are defined as those who were employed in the case-study university at the time of survey, held citizenship from a country other than the UK and had received all of their university education overseas, from first degree to doctoral award, but excluding short-term visits to the UK as part of their studies (see Chapter 3 for Methodology).

Student Learning Experience Survey

Definition: Non-UK academic staff

Non-UK academic staff are defined in this study as those who received their university education abroad and whose country of citizenship is outside of the UK.

The survey consists of 22 questions. To progress through the survey click on the Next button at the bottom of each page.

Figure 6.1 Defining migrant academic members of staff, screenshot from the online student questionnaire.

* Source: Own online survey.
Building upon these definitions, the chapter investigates two thematical research questions:

a) What are the perceived benefits and challenges of being taught by international academic staff from a UK undergraduate perspective?

b) How has teaching by migrant academic staff shaped the international outlook and intercultural understanding of UK students?

My particular interest when answering these research questions lies in a systematic comparison between students with international experience and those without such exposure before attending the case-study university. At the centre of the analysis is a focus on whether survey participants were taught by non-UK teachers at school. Against this backdrop, the chapter highlights the importance of UK students (at school and at university) of being socialised into a diverse educational setting. This exposure to international experience is significant and, as this chapter will illustrate, students taught by non-UK teachers are more positively inclined towards migrant academic staff at university than those without such encounters. I will also examine how students’ perceptions and experiences of migrant academic staff vary by gender, age, year of study, ethnicity, academic subject and the number of non-UK academics they have been taught by at the case-study university. Findings suggest that non-UK teachers (at school) and non-UK academics (at university) help to equip UK students with more intercultural respect, understanding, and tolerance towards cultural difference and diversity. This sheds a more positive light on pertinent immigration debates following the Brexit referendum because migrant academics expose immobile students to international experiences, thereby potentially creating ‘global subjects’ (Bayart 2007) ‘at home’ and preparing them for an increasingly globalising job market within the UK and abroad (Campbell 2010).

The chapter is divided into four sections. First, I discuss the literature on internationalising the curriculum and situate these contributions within the study’s conceptual framework of constructing global subjects. Second, I illustrate, first, how students identify migrant academic members of staff, followed, then, by an analysis of learning experiences, international outlook, and intercultural understanding. Third, I discuss the limitations of the quantitative survey approach. In conclusion, I reflect on
the chapter's findings and the policy-relevant implications for the case-study university.

6.2 Surveying student perspectives
Notions of internationalising the curriculum are often associated with the construction of global citizens (Deardorff et al., 2012; Leask 2015). As a concept, definitions of global citizenship are varied and contested (e.g., Heater 2004; Yarwood 2013; also see section 6.2.5). In this study, I adhere to the term responsible global citizenship: persons who are “committed to action locally and globally in the interests of others and across social, environmental, and political dimensions. [An] awareness of self and others, of one’s surroundings, and of the wider world coupled with responsibility for one’s actions” (Leask 2015: 60, emphasis in original). This moral disposition is consistent with the chapter’s research questions but also the institutional values of the case-study university: in particular, a commitment to behave in a socially responsible manner, respect for one another, inclusivity and a celebration of diversity. Such a specific definition acknowledges the ‘ideal global graduate’ referred to by Lilley et al., (2015: 228) as someone with “a moral and transformative cosmopolitan” mindset. With this framing, the tendency to focus on employability as the primary outcome of higher education appears to be too narrow, for Rizvi and Lingard (2010) point out, “human beings are social and cultural beings as well as economic ones” (p. 201).

In their work on internationalising the curriculum, Jones and Killick (2013: 165) focus on these various ‘beings’ which they argue are mutually constitutive and “form a cohesive construct for graduate development”. This consciousness of linking global relevance (technical or disciplinary knowledge) with intercultural dimensions and international contexts is in keeping with Leask’s (2015) conceptualisation of internationalising the curriculum. As Rizvi and Lingard (2010: 200) argue, linking graduate capabilities to internationalisation will re-orient the university environment imaginary and transform education policy through an emphasis on “the importance of learning new ways of engaging with and responding to global interconnectivity and

---

23 To recap, internationalising the curriculum is defined as “the incorporation of international, intercultural, and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods, and support services of a program of study” (Leask 2015: 9).
interdependence”. This statement underscores the cosmopolitan narrative and, in this wider context, Rizvi (2009: 266) proposes cosmopolitan learning, which “demands a new way of learning about other cultures and intercultural exchange”. This ‘new imaginary’ is an alternative approach to the neoliberal endeavour of education.

Drawing on survey data ($n = 185$) conducted at a research-intensive English university (during 2015-2016), this chapter examines the complex relationship between internationalising the curriculum (through migrant academics) and the construction of ‘globally ready citizens’ (Hunter et al., 2006). In what I believe is the first-ever study of British students’ consumption of “foreignness as a teaching resource” (Alberts 2008: 198), the survey offers a unique insight into UK students’ tolerance towards academic diversity and statistically correlates that to a range of biographical factors (for example, intercultural capital, social class, education). The extent to which intercultural understandings, skills, and qualities are embedded within British students are discussed in the analysis that follows, where I draw upon a mixture of qualitative and quantitative questionnaire results. Focusing on students’ international exposure, by asking the question “Were you taught by non-UK teachers before attending this university?”, provides a unique opportunity to examine binary opposites in terms of international educational experience, as well as other axes of intersectionality. In this study, intersectionality is understood as ‘the interaction of multiple identities and experiences of exclusion and subordination” (Davis 2008: 67). Given intersectionality’s attentiveness to social inequalities and power relations (Collins 2015), and the chapter’s focus on gender and ethnicity, it is particularly suited for this study.

In response to the aforementioned question, students could select four answers and were asked to tick all options that apply: ‘Yes, in the UK’; ‘Yes, overseas’; ‘No’; ‘Not sure’ (Table 6.1). Henceforth categories are clustered as the ‘Yes’ and the ‘No/not sure’ sub-samples (categories were reduced in order to achieve the minimum cell count required for SPSS analysis). The former sample refers to those taught by non-UK teachers, the latter with no international teaching exposure. The distinction between these two student groups is important and, as this chapter will illustrate, students taught by non-UK teachers prior to attending the case-study university tend to be more tolerant towards migrant academics and more accepting of difference and diversity.
Table 6.1 The share of survey participants by gender, ethnicity and whether they were taught by non-UK teachers prior to attending the case-study university (in the percentage of participating students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender***</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ethnicity.ns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, in the UK</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, overseas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, both in the UK and overseas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Yes' sample</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'No/Not sure' sample</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both answers</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Statistically significant: ns = not on 95% level; * = on 95% level; ** = on 99% level; *** = on 99.9% level.
*b Abbreviations: White; Asian/Asian British; Black/African/Caribbean/Black British; Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups.
*c Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).
One of the original contributions this research offers is demonstrating how geographical and “not necessarily self-evidently geographical” aspects of a student’s identity (Holloway et al., 2010: 588) prior to attending the case-study university matter in negotiating relationships with migrant academics. To date, evidence suggests such scholarship remains scarce thus this chapter builds upon King et al., (2011) and Findlay et al’s (2017: 193) work examining “the influential role of family and social networks in shaping students’ life plans” and decision-making processes on studying abroad. A focus upon immobile UK students provides a nuanced framework for understanding internationalisation ‘at home’ through migrant academics, challenging the idea that social and cultural capital accumulation is the preserve of internationally mobile students. And yet, writing in the context of TNE Waters and Leung (2012) draw attention to the disadvantages associated with acquiring in-situ academic credentials, suggesting there is often “less cultural capital and social capital on which to draw” (p. 1).

Just under half (48%) of participants were taught by non-UK teachers prior to attending the case-study university, of which 5% were taught in an overseas educational setting. This finding is most interesting, raising important questions about the links between non-UK academics and home students’ perception of foreignness. Strikingly, the difference between male and female students in regards to the question ‘Were you taught by non-UK teachers before attending this university?’ is statistically highly significant on the 99.9% level (Pearson Chi-Square: .002; women: 35%; men: 57%; Table 6.1). This indicates that these male students have engaged more with diverse perspectives, dialogues, and accents within a classroom setting prior to attending the case-study university than their female peers, thus they should be well placed to appreciate academic difference and diversity compared to those without such exposure because of the accumulation of intercultural capital via these learning experiences. However, it is difficult to determine how meaningful these interactions were without conducting focus group discussions and/or qualitative interviews with undergraduate students (see section 6.3 and Chapter 8 for future study recommendations). The under-representation of women taught by non-UK teachers may reflect an important link between elite education and discipline-specific gender imbalances, for example, all boys or international schools.24 In 2015-16, 20%

24 In the comment section of the survey, a male UK student disclosed that they had attended an international school prior to attending the case-study university.
of the case-study university students were privately educated (The Guardian 2018).\textsuperscript{25} Certainly, an interesting question arising from this empirical data is how gender and ethnicity relations have a bearing on a student’s experience of being taught by migrant academics (see sections 6.2.2 and 6.2.3).

Gender-related disparities among the survey participants’ wider international educational experience (women 43%; men: 57%) can be attributed to the university’s gender mix; student enrolment for 2016-17 was asymmetric, 40% and 60% respectively (HESA 2018c).\textsuperscript{26} The difference may also be linked to higher participation rates of male students in the engineering sciences, compared to the share of female students (Figure 6.2). This pronounced gender disparity testifies to the continuing under-representation of women in STEM. Such inequalities manifest themselves in recent university leaver statistics: for example, in the United Kingdom women represented 24% of core STEM graduates in 2017, a decrease of 1% from the previous year (WISE Campaign 2018). At the European Union level, the latest She Figures publication – the fifth edition in a series of reports highlighting gender parity in science and research – concluded that “despite progress, […] gender differences and inequalities persist” across the 28 EU Member States (European Commission 2016: 1).

\textsuperscript{25} To maintain the anonymity of the case-study university, numbers have been rounded to the nearest multiple of five.

\textsuperscript{26} To maintain the anonymity of the case-study university, numbers have been rounded to the nearest multiple of five.
Figure 6.2 Gender differences by academic discipline (in the percentage of participating students)
a Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).

The reasons for the gender difference can be explained along the axes of ethnicity. Through this intersectional lens, attention can be drawn to the student’s identity, social class and different spaces of learning in order to understand the variations in social, cultural and international experiences and encounters prior to attending the case-study university. In contradiction to Table 6.1 which exposes the gender disparities, Table 6.2 illustrates that ethnicity is a key proxy to being taught by non-UK teachers (see section 6.2.2 for a discussion on how participants identify migrant academic members of staff). In this frame of analysis, the share of female students of colour taught by non-UK teachers amounted to 60%, compared to 32% of women who identified as white (white men: 55%; non-white men: 70%). This ethnicity difference might be linked to a range of diverse informal learning spaces which “occupy an important place in civil society as part of young people’s leisure activities, learning and wider socialisation” (Mills and Kraftl 2014: 1): for example, youth clubs, religious institutions, charities, and voluntary organisations. Indeed, geographical scholarship has contributed to studying the informal learning spaces of Sunday schools (Harvey et al., 2007), voluntary uniformed youth organisations (Mills 2016), state-funded youth programmes (Mills and Waite 2017) and faith-based organisations (Mills 2015).
Table 6.2 The share of survey participants by gender, ethnicity and whether they were taught by non-UK teachers prior to attending the case-study university (in the percentage of participating students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Yes’ sample</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘No/not sure’ sample</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Yes’ sample</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘No/not sure’ sample</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Statistically significant: ns = not on 95% level; * = on 95% level; ** = on 99% level; *** = on 99.9% level.

b Abbreviations: White; Non-White: Asian/Asian British; Black/African/Caribbean/Black British; Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups.

c Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).

An acknowledgement of ‘beyond school’ education spaces chimes with Holloway et al., (2010: 595), who argued:

we need to expand our interpretation of what count as spaces of education […], we must […] pay greater attention to the home, pre-school provision, neighbourhood spaces and after-school care, as well as thinking more deeply about the ways in which people learn in subsistence agriculture, family businesses, paid-work and so on.

From an ethnicity perspective, the extremely uneven ethnic composition of survey participants is striking, revealing a white-dominated study population (Table 6.1). This raises political questions about social mobility in higher education (see, for example, The Casey Review 2016; Wyness 2017) but also observations about the case-study university as an inclusive and ethnically diverse campus. These inequalities are unrepresentative of the ethnic make-up in cities local to the institution but are an expression of the argument that BME students are a minority within British higher education (Desai 2017). While student enrolments by non-white students continue to rise (5.9% increase in 2016-17 compared to the previous year; HESA 2018a), ethnicity relations constitute an important frame of policy relevance for higher education (see; Esson et al., 2017; Noxolo 2017; Radcliffe 2017; Esson 2018).
If we focus specifically on academic discipline, we see greater concentrations of ethnic minority participants in the humanities (Table 6.3) – twice as many non-white students compared to the case-study university as a whole. Contrary to this finding, Gamsu and Donnelly (2017) note that academic subjects allied to engineering and computer sciences tend to be more diverse, suggesting "strategic choosing" on behalf of the student, “as well as highlighting the considerable segregation between different courses” (no pagination). In seeking to understand this discordant finding, it could be suggested that those wishing to pursue an engineering course apply to higher ranked institutions than the case-study university, for example, Cambridge, Oxford, Glasgow, St Andrew’s and Imperial College London.
Table 6.3 The share of survey participants by academic subject, gender and ethnicity (in the percentage of participating students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-white</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Statistically significant: ns = not on 95% level; * = on 95% level; ** = on 99% level; *** = on 99.9% level.

*b Abbreviations: white; non-white: Asian/Asian British; Black/African/Caribbean/Black British; Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups.

*c Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).

Among the survey respondents, 15% had lived outside of the UK for more than three consecutive months (long-term stays) prior to attending the case-study university (Pearson Chi-Square: .039; Table 6.4). Most strikingly, participants of colour were twice as likely to have lived overseas than white students (30% versus 13%). In this context, the presence of the global reflects wider debates about the construction of young people’s cosmopolitan and transnational identities as an outcome of globalisation processes (Nayak 2003). This interplay of ethnicity and international experiences (living abroad and/or being taught by non-UK teachers) has a profound
impact on UK students’ attitude towards educational difference and diversity. Indeed, the chapter’s empirics demonstrate how UK students with an ethnically diverse, non-white background are more positively inclined towards migrant academics than white UK students. The key argument is that diversity accepts diversity (Ahmed 2012) more than the homogeneous white population. One of the upshots of disseminating research findings is the opportunity for political and practical change at the case-study university, which I will discuss in the subsequent sections (see also Chapter 8).

Table 6.4 Survey participants who have lived outside of the UK for more than three consecutive months prior to attending the case-study university by gender and ethnicity (in the percentage of participating students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female&lt;sup&gt;ns&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant: ns = not on 95% level; * = on 95% level; ** = on 99% level; *** = on 99.9% level.

<sup>b</sup> Abbreviations: white; non-white: Asian/Asian British; Black/African/Caribbean/Black British; Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups.

<sup>c</sup> Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).

Interestingly, intersectional inflexions were explicit between UK and non-UK survey participants. While undergraduate international EU and international non-EU students were absent from the study’s analysis (see Chapter 3 for explanation), one particular response warrants further attention. In the final survey question ‘Do you have any other comments?’ an undergraduate international EU participant reflected:

The outcome of this study may be skewed because international people may be more interested and therefore inclined in completing this survey than local/UK students. Hopefully the researcher(s) have considered this.
Chapter 6: Diversity as an asset

This example precipitates stereotypes and assumptions about the UK higher education learner as being provincially-minded, an observation conceived by the international student’s positionality, their political affiliation, cultural experiences, and geographical context. However, there were similar anecdotes from migrant academic staff interviewed for this study, for example:

There might be a more general reluctance or fear dare I say among British students to go abroad and mix with other cultures and other languages. It is notable how difficult it is to get British students to take up Erasmus places for example. Whereas international students, I mean European student’s other European students I should say (laughs) are fighting to get Erasmus, to get on an Erasmus programme. British students are a bit shy; I don't know why that is but anyway.

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from Australia*

I do see them [British students] very parochial. It might have to do with the age, too young. It might be not a specific case of Britain, it might be again an age, generational issue which is across different countries. But again, thinking of myself and my peers when I was at their age sitting on university benches, I don’t think we were the same so parochial although we were living in a parochial country. […] we were much more open and knowledgeable about what was happening in the world compared to them.

*Lecturer, Male, PhD from the United States of America*

These quotations clearly suggest that UK students tend to be inward-looking, which was widely articulated in my interviews with migrant academics. However, I would also argue that these vignettes point to an incongruence between the personal opinions and experiences of international academic members of staff, who tend to regard British undergraduate students as provincially-minded, and the underlying ideology of higher education of bringing together “national and international flows of knowledge and people” (Goddard and Vallance 2013: 2) and the creation of ‘globally ready citizens’ (Hunter et al., 2006). This incongruence unwittingly obfuscates the intersectionality of student (im)mobility.

6.2.1 Identifying migrant academic members of staff

From the outset of this research, migrant academic members of staff were conceptualised as someone who held citizenship from a country other than the United Kingdom and who had received all of their university education overseas (see introduction, this chapter), an empirical lens through which to differentiate “scholars
socialised in other knowledge environments” (Meusburger 2015: 267) from UK academic members of staff. But the way in which British undergraduate students read non-UK academics embodied ‘strangeness’. An out of place name, accent or “look” perceived as being ‘foreign’ or ‘different’ to their ‘normal’ (to clarify, ‘name’ and ‘accent’ were closed-ended responses, while “look” was an open-ended response).

In this process of delineating academic members of staff, the student sees a “difference between familiar and strange others [...] on the basis of how they appear” (Ahmed 2000: 24). This (mis)recognition of migrant academics also bypasses non-UK nationals who may have been educated in the United Kingdom; indeed, such individuals would not have met the inclusion criteria for this study (see Chapter 3 for Methodology). The manner in which survey participants identify non-UK academics is thus problematic, reproducing divisions between the domesticated ‘we’ and the international ‘them’ and therefore brings into dialogue colonial discourses and its continued relevance in contemporary debates.

As I mentioned in the chapter’s introduction, at the centre of the analysis is a focus upon whether survey participants were taught by non-UK teachers prior to attending the case-study university. This resonates with geographical scholarship on the geographies of encounter. In urban studies, for example, encounters celebrate “the potential for the forging of new hybrid cultures and ways of living together with difference” (Valentine 2008: 324). However, Valentine (2008) is wary of literature that romanticises encounter critiquing the “potentially naïve assumption that contact with ‘others’ necessarily translates into respect for difference” (p. 325). While I agree with this statement, the chapter’s empirics illustrate a particular argument that I am endeavouring to make, that is, contact with non-UK teachers may reduce prejudices (Vertovec 2006; see also Cranston 2016 for a discussion about migrant encounters). Certainly, those students who are more positively inclined to non-UK academics can be traced to the ‘Yes’ sub-sample who encountered non-UK teachers prior to attending the case-study university (Table 6.7 and Figure 6.3). This finding suggests that in-person encounters are a prerequisite for constructing global subjects. Of course, other factors shape a student’s imagination of, and experience with, migrant academic members of staff (see subsequent sections). Particularly significant is ethnicity, which provides an interesting point of juncture for further examination because students of colour who were not taught by non-UK teachers tended to be less critical of non-UK academics compared to both white students without such
exposure and the ‘Yes’ sub-sample (see, for example, Table 6.6). Here, Ahmed (2000) reminds us of the power relations inherent in encounters: “to talk about the importance of encounters to identity is to remind ourselves of the processes that are already at stake in the coming together of (at least) two subjects” (p. 7). The focus on non-UK teachers is unique and offers an analytical lens through which to examine the emergence of tolerant and interculturally-competent young adults.

The bricolage of distinctions through which UK undergraduate students employ to identify migrant academic staff are more complex than the quantitative survey findings suggest and, therefore, further examination through qualitative methodologies would be necessary. At the same time, the chapter demonstrates that British students understanding of international academic members of staff denotes differences in terms of accent, name, race, teaching ability, communication skills and the development of intercultural respect and understanding. In part, these binary divisions are reinforced by the survey design (see section 6.3 for discussion on survey limitations). However, in order to unravel student perceptions of being taught by migrant academic members of staff, the chapter’s analysis engages with Jöns’ (2018b) research agenda calling for more triadic thought in mobilities studies and social theory by differentiating the ‘No/not sure’ sample into a white and non-white sub-sample to compare these groups of students by international teaching experience and ethnicity.

6.2.2 International learning experiences

In the previous chapter, the objective was to bring to the fore migrant academics’ experiences of incorporating international ideas and concepts into a UK context of higher teaching and learning. In this chapter, when viewed from the perspective of undergraduate students, there were no statistically significant differences in the perception of overall teaching style. However, 34% of those who were taught by non-UK teachers prior to attending the case-study university disagreed or strongly disagreed that the teaching style of migrant academic members of staff was different from UK academics, compared to 22% of students who were not taught by non-UK teachers (Table 6.5). The same statistically insignificant trend can be observed in regards to lecture and seminar structure, academic staff-student interaction, the effective communication of course content, the use of case-study examples, coursework and assignment instructions, feedback on coursework and assignments,
and pastoral and personal support. For those students with international teaching experience, differences between UK and non-UK academic staff mattered less than for their peers.

While below the statistically significant 95% threshold, it remains possible to conclude that non-UK teachers have an active involvement in the development of internationally-oriented and interculturally-educated young adults through the bridging of cultures, knowledges and preparing them for ‘conviviality’ – a concern for human togetherness (Nowicka and Vertovec 2014). Within this frame of analysis, in which the ‘Yes’ sub-sample tend to be more complimentary towards migrant academics, survey findings suggest that a student’s socialisation into a diverse learning environment may provide a basis for shaping an international mindset (Paige and Mestenhauser 1999) and developing an intercultural skillset (Bennett and Bennett 2004).

Table 6.5 Students who think migrant academic staff’s overall teaching style is different from UK staff’s overall teaching style (in the percentage of participating students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘Yes’ sample</th>
<th>‘No/Not sure’ sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Overall teaching stylens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Statistically significant: ns = not on 95% level; * = on 95% level; ** = on 99% level; *** = on 99.9% level.
*b Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).

Rhoads and Hu (2012) have recently argued that pedagogy across different educational contexts is becoming increasingly aligned (see Chapter 6 for a detailed discussion about the transfer of pedagogies and discipline-specific content between different knowledge environments). For example, in their study examining the impact of internationalisation at a Chinese university, they highlight the influence of Western teaching styles on traditional Chinese pedagogy. However, one survey participant did acknowledge the difference in migrant academics’ teaching style:
Sometimes there is a noticeable difference in lecturing styles due to culture. Having lived abroad for 15 years, I can say the culture in UK education is very different to that abroad. (In Africa for example) Whilst UK lecturers are more like to create rapport with their lecture audience, pretty much all the International lecturers I've had come in, give the lecture and leave. All very serious and no time for jokes. There is an expectation of respect that you don't quite get from UK lecturers. Having been in both type of education systems, I believe this is because classrooms in the UK are conservative with discipline whilst outside, (Africa, Asia), they are huge on it. Students at university almost read this from their lecturers and know who will be more easy to rapport with and who wants a formal structure. And it so happens to be the international ones want things structured and disciplined. This coupled with the fact that sometimes you can't understand what they're saying can cause them to not endeavour [sic] themselves much to the students.

_Male, non-white, Engineering Sciences, Year 4, ‘Yes’ sample_

Taking this analysis further and decentring the ‘no/not sure’ sub-sample by axes of ethnicity, an alternative picture emerges (Table 6.6). With this detailed breakdown of participant responses, the significance of ethnicity is stressed. Although the SPSS analysis is invalid (as the minimum cell count is not achieved), what we have is a (not valid but) statistically significant result on the 95% level (Pearson Chi-Square: .045) which demonstrates that UK students with an ethnically diverse, non-white background are more positively inclined towards migrant academics than white UK students. In positioning this analysis along ethnic lines, differences are exposed to how UK students view migrant academics. Given the sensitivity of race and ethnicity in British higher education and the timeliness of these debates in recent geographical literature (e.g., Desai 2017; Esson et al., 2017; Noxolo 2017; Radcliffe 2017), future research could usefully explore at depth the connection between race, ethnicity and UK students’ tolerance towards migrant academic members of staff and the internationalisation of higher education.
Table 6.6 Students evaluation that the overall teaching style of non-UK academics is different from UK academics (in the percentage of participating students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘Yes’ sample</th>
<th>‘No/Not sure’ sample</th>
<th>‘No/Not sure’ sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>white</td>
<td>non-white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Overall teaching style*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Statistically significant: ns = not on 95% level; * = on 95% level; ** = on 99% level; *** = on 99.9% level.

*b Abbreviations: white; non-white: Asian/Asian British; Black/African/Caribbean/Black British; Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups.

*c Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).

With the aim to deconstruct the relationship undergraduate students have with migrant academics, participants were asked which group of lecturers they favoured in regards to different aspects of their university experience (Table 6.7). The question ‘Which group of academic staff do you feel you have gained more from?’ sought to determine systematic differences in students’ perception between UK and non-UK academics. Three responses were possible: ‘non-UK academic’; ‘UK academic’; ‘Equal’. By comparing the differentiated emphasis placed on each indicator, findings reveal stark biases in students’ evaluations of migrant academics’ pedagogical performance, bringing into dialogue student subjectivities (Horton and Kraftl 2006) but also the construction of “marginal(ized) everyday geographies” (Parr 2001: 181) in the academy.
Table 6.7 The group of lecturer UK students favour in regards to different aspects of their university experience (in the percentage of participating students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>‘Yes’ sample</th>
<th>‘No/Not sure’ sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Overall learning experience&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK academic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK academic</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Understanding of subject-specific content&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK academic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK academic</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Career aspirations&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK academic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK academic</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Intercultural respect and understanding&lt;sup&gt;***&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK academic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK academic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Global outlook&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK academic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK academic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant: ns = not on 95% level; * = on 95% level; ** = on 99% level; *** = on 99.9% level.

<sup>b</sup> Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).

When asked to rate ‘overall learning experience’ and ‘understanding of subject-specific content’ the favouring of UK academics dominated responses (64% and 69% respectively). Taking the ‘Yes’ sample, the lower response patterns are noticeable when compared to the ‘No/not sure’ sample, attenuating the already marked differences between the two student groups illustrated in previous analyses. The overall message seems to suggest that undergraduate students unwittingly undervalue the voices and/or contributions of migrant academics in terms of teaching ability and communication skills because of subjective interpretations of the ‘other’. In view of such a statement, it is perhaps pertinent to think about how students’ responses are orientated towards an Anglophone imagination of higher education. Interestingly, but statistically invalid, a closer examination of the ‘No/not sure’ sub-sample by axes of ethnicity reveals non-white students who were not taught by non-UK teachers prior to attending the case-study university equally applauded UK and
non-UK academics in all indicators. This is an interesting finding illustrating that ethnicity shapes students’ experience of being taught by migrant academic members of staff, lending support for further enquiry in this area.

In contrast, non-UK academics were rated highly for ‘intercultural respect and understanding’ achieving statistical significance above the 99.9% level (Pearson Chi-Square: .004). This finding is consistent with Leask’s (2009) quotation with which I opened this chapter, indicating that migrant academics are appreciated because of the added value they bring to intercultural respect and global outlook. This is expressed in the following student comments, bringing into dialogue the notion of global citizenship by allowing students to “challenge previously held views and stereotypes” (Caruana 2011: 243):

I think it is important to have non-UK academic staff, especially for social sciences as they bring a broader range of cultural norms by which we can recognise our own strange customs, encouraging a more critical view of our world.

Male, white, Social Sciences, Year 3, ‘Yes’ sample

I enjoy the variety of nationalities and cultures we are taught by, and it [sic] have had no more or less problems with non UK staff than I have with UK staff (not many problems at all).

Female, white, Engineering Sciences, Year 2, ‘No/not sure’ sample

The same story unfolds for students who have lived outside of the UK for more than three consecutive months prior to attending the case-study university (Table 6.8). Two responses were possible: ‘Yes’; ‘No’. For this analysis, statistical significance was achieved for ‘intercultural respect and understanding’ (Pearson Chi-Square: .044) and ‘global outlook’ (Pearson Chi-Square: .019).
Table 6.8 Survey participants who have lived outside of the UK for more than three consecutive months prior to attending the case-study university and the group of lecturer they favour in regards to different aspects of their university experience (in the percentage of participating students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Overall learning experience</strong>&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK academic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK academic</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Understanding of subject-specific content</strong>&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK academic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK academic</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Career aspirations</strong>&lt;sup&gt;NS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK academic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK academic</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Intercultural respect and understanding</strong>&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK academic</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK academic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e. Global outlook</strong>&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK academic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK academic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Statistically significant: ns = not on 95% level; * = on 95% level; ** = on 99% level; *** = on 99.9% level.

<sup>b</sup> Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).

Tables 6.7 and 6.8 produced very consistent findings suggesting those with international exposure “display a cosmopolitan cultural competence that would appear to be shaped by the values of their global community” (Guerin and Green 2016: 10) – in this case, family, social networks and education. There were no differences between the number of migrant academic staff students were taught by; year of study; academic discipline; gender; age; ethnicity; and whether students participated in study, work or volunteering overseas for at least one academic semester during their university degree.

Provocatively, participants were asked ‘Which group of academic staff do you prefer to be taught by?’ The great majority favoured UK academics (68%) but twice
as many students who were taught by non-UK teachers have ‘no preference’ compared to white students who were not taught by non-UK teachers (Figure 6.3; ‘Yes’: 42%; ‘No/not sure’ white: 17%; ‘No/not sure’ non-white: 57%). In the ‘Yes’ and the ‘No/not sure non-white’ sub-samples, it could be read that these students’ negotiation of migrant academics is unproblematic. This tendency to downplay difference is intriguing but underlines Waters’ (2017: 283, emphasis in original) assertion that “learning occurs in diverse spaces” and, as Ahmed (2012) has argued, those who embody diversity (in this case, students of colour in a predominantly white university or encounters with non-UK teachers) are less likely to draw attention to difference.

Figure 6.3 The group of lecturer students prefer to be taught by (in the percentage of participating students).

Interestingly, those taught by fewer non-UK academics were twice as likely to have ‘no preference’ compared to those with a higher frequency of interaction (1-2: 52%; 3-4: 22%). This (invalid but) statistically significant correlation (Pearson Chi-Square: .001) might be interpreted as students perceiving migrant academic members of staff as a novelty. Older students, too, were twice as likely to have ‘no preference’ compared to their younger counterparts (18-21: 26.4%; 22-31: 40.5%; 32-41: 66.7%). This statistically insignificant trend lends support to the claim that linguistic difficulties “should not be placed exclusively on foreign-born instructors’ English skills, but also on students’ attitudes towards” migrant academics (Alberts
2008: 190). Nonetheless, symptomatic of the negative responses captured in the survey were challenges associated with English-language competency and accent, as demonstrated in the below student comments:

I only prefer UK academics because they're easier to understand.
   Male, white, Engineering Sciences, Year 2, ‘No/not sure’ sample

Most my classmates prefer having lecturers from England (UK is far too general), but prefer foreign lecturers for coursework and exams as they always give significantly higher marks.
   Male, white, Engineering Sciences, Year 3, ‘Yes’ sample

Given what is known about survey participants and the differentiation between the ‘Yes’ and the ‘No/not sure’ sub-samples, perhaps it is not surprising that students who were not taught by non-UK teachers prior to attending the case-study university were twice as likely to respond that their perception of being taught by migrant academics has negatively changed during their university degree, compared to those who were taught by non-UK teachers (51% versus 23%). This highly significant finding (Pearson Chi-Square: .001) signifies that non-UK teachers (in diverse learning spaces) endow the UK student with social and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986), producing individuals who are less likely to chastise migrant academics.

6.2.3 Linguistic challenges
The most emotive questions in the survey focused on migrant academics’ accent and linguistic capabilities. In response to the question ‘Do you think non-UK academic staff’s accent has had an impact on your overall learning experience?’, 46% of students in the ‘Yes’ sample responded that there was ‘no difference’ to their overall learning experience, compared to 24% in the ‘No/Not sure’ sample (Pearson Chi-Square: .019; Table 6.9). Notable is the higher proportion of ‘No/not sure’ students who responded ‘yes, negative’ (60% versus 44%). Statistically, there were no differences between the ‘Yes’ and the ‘No/not sure’ sub-samples when comparing effective communication of course content; coursework and assignment instructions; feedback on coursework and assignments; and pastoral and personal support.
Table 6.9 Students’ evaluation of non-UK academics staff’s accent in regards to different aspects of their learning experience (in the percentage of participating students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>‘Yes’ sample</th>
<th>‘No/not sure’ sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Overall learning experience*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, positive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, negative</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Academic staff-student interaction*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, positive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, negative</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Effective communication of course content ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, positive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, negative</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Coursework / assignment instructions ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, positive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, negative</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Feedback on coursework / assignments ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, positive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, negative</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Pastoral and personal support ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, positive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, negative</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Statistically significant: ns = not on 95% level; * = on 95% level; ** = on 99% level; *** = on 99.9% level.

*b Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).

In regards to all these aspects, the same statistically insignificant results are achieved when analysing the number of migrant academic members of staff students have been taught by; year of study; academic discipline; gender; age; ethnicity; and whether students have lived outside of the UK for more than three consecutive months prior to attending the case-study university.
Most interestingly, an invalid (as the minimum cell count is not achieved) but statistically significant finding hints that the more advanced students are in their degree, the more tolerant and less critical they are about the negative impact accent has on their overall learning experience (Figure 6.4). Based on this finding, it is possible that students who engage in study abroad or work placements as part of their university degree may view non-UK academics in a more positive light, compared to non-placement and study abroad students. Rawlings et al., (2005) study, for example, illustrates how final-year students with placement experience are distinguishable through their mature approach and attitude to studying, a point emphasised in interviews by some migrant academics.

Figure 6.4 Students perception of the impact non-UK academic staff's accent has had on their overall learning experience by year of study (in the percentage of participating students)

*a Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).

For one participant, the transition from school to university evoked an emotive response:

I struggled very much in my first year to understand what half the lecturers were saying which made it a very difficult transition from school to university.

*Female, white, Natural Sciences, Year 2, ‘Yes’ sample*

As Mulder and Clark (2002) point out, leaving home for university represents a pivotal moment in a young person’s life – independent living, the acquisition of adult
identities, “changing opinions and the creation of new ways of viewing the world” (p. 981). Of course, not all higher education entrants leave home (Holdsworth 2009). What is apparent, however, within the discourses of higher education is that university attendance has become synonymous with the accrual of human capital (Mulder and Clark 2002) and, as Mitchell (2003) has argued, is geared up to create individuated, mobile and cosmopolitan subjects. With the transition to university identified as a challenge for white UK students in terms of encounters with migrant academics, future research needs to take into account how schools create meaningful relationships between non-UK teachers and students, while also paying attention to promoting other axes of diversity and inclusivity (Mavroudi and Holt 2015).

Another participant articulated that communication was a temporary and short-term difficulty, suggesting students learn to adjust to different accents (Alberts 2008) through repeated exposure to migrant academic members of staff. In a related vein, Hutchison’s (2016: 254) work on cross-cultural teaching in the United States describes the emotive ways in which migrant academics respond to linguistic complaints, blaming the “nonunderstanding of the foreigner’s accent […] on the lazy hearer, as opposed to the careful listener”, as indicated in the student response below:

Lecturers with heavy accents were more difficult to learn from in the first couple of years but it seems easier now. This may be because I’m more interested in the subject they are teaching so am willing to put more effort into listening to what they say or might be because I’ve got used to the accents. On this note, I find long (>1hr) lectures much easier to maintain focus in if the lecturer has an easy to understand accent.

Male, white, Engineering Sciences, Year 4, ‘Yes’ sample

Survey findings reveal significant concerns were levied against the lecturer’s ability to effectively communicate course content. In both sample groups, the proportions replying ‘yes, negative’ were high (‘Yes’: 60%; ‘No/not sure’: 71%; Table 6.9), though there were variations in how students thought it influenced their learning and understanding. Some participants reported that an accent hindered their education, while another spoke of the “unfair” burden of having to self-teach modules because of communication issues (Female, white, Engineering Sciences, Year 2, ‘No/not sure’ sample’). Given my supervisory team consists of migrant academics, I found these
critical responses uncomfortable to discuss in progression meetings, a situation that required an astute reading of students’ concerns and mindful consideration not to reinforce and perpetuate stereotypes and prejudices. In the following comments, students articulate their hesitations about being taught by non-UK academics:

The issue I have with non UK academic staff is not that they are not from the UK, this is a non-issue. My problem is can they communicate the course content clearly and many times a thick accent has made that difficult. [The case-study university] needs a hiring policy that any lecturers must speak English fluently and clearly.

*Male, white, Natural Sciences, Year 2, ‘No/not sure’ sample*

My main, and probably only negative feelings when it comes to non-UK lecture[s] is when there language barrier is too strong. I appreciate lecturing in a second language is difficult however I believe there should be a benchmark on the level of ability the lecturer has. As in my university education, and my friends there have been lecturers we have struggled to understand, and even more so, the lecturer doesn't understand us, so when any questions on clarification were asked, they went unanswered. This is of course not the case for all non-UK staff.

*Female, white, Social Sciences, Year 4, ‘No/not sure’ sample*

The Chinese accent is hugely detrimental on learning, I don't care about how qualified they are, if I can't understand what they're saying in their lectures, they shouldn't be lecturing or even hired in the first place.

*Male, white, Engineering Sciences, Year 4, ‘Yes’ sample*

While students recognised the technical and disciplinary ability of migrant academics, the general consensus is one that endorses a hiring policy that assesses the language capabilities of overseas trained academics. Such tests have been implemented in the United States, triggered by a concern that students’ education was suffering because of international faculty (Clayton 2000; Finder 2005). However, there is a suspicion that underachieving students use linguistic differences as a “proxy to lambaste otherwise proficient” lecturers (Hutchison 2016: 253), particularly in scientific subjects where their technical counterparts are allied to a universal language (see Hsieh 2012; Śliwa and Johansson 2015). The narratives suggest, however, an unwillingness or an incapability to adjust to non-English accents and non-native speakers of English. Interestingly, an important consideration raised by one student was a disability:
My hearing impairment likely to have a greater effect on the ability to effectively absorb material delivered aurally. 

*Male, white, Engineering Sciences, Year 3, ‘No/not sure’ sample*

This student’s concern is being excluded from understanding course content because of hearing impairment. Similarly, students with phonological deficits and language weaknesses because of a specific learning difference such as dyslexia (Snowling 2001) may encounter greater challenges associated with the processing of language and phonics. However, I wish to stress that this is anecdotal evidence, rather than a finding expressed in the study’s empirics.

6.2.4 International outlook and intercultural understanding

Just under 10% of survey respondents reported that their university degree had ‘very much’ helped them to foster intercultural respect and understanding (students were required to respond using a five-point scale). However, it is unclear how these terms were interpreted by survey participants given the absence of interview and/or focus group discussions (see subsequent section and *Chapter 8* for study reflections and limitations). When disaggregating responses into the two sub-samples, similarly low figures were recorded (‘Yes’: 13%; ‘No/not sure’: 6%). The difference between these two student groups is statistically significant on the 99% level (Pearson Chi-Square: .005). Overall, there was a preponderance for students in the ‘Yes’ sample to positively link their learning experience to the development of intercultural competencies; this is illustrated in Figure 6.5. The difference was most distinct along axes of ethnicity (invalid but statistically significant Chi-Square test: .018; ‘very much’ response: ‘Yes’ 13%; ‘No/not sure’ white: 6%; ‘No/not sure’ non-white: 14%). The same (invalid but) statistically significant story unfolds for academic discipline. There were no statistically significant differences by the number of migrant academic members of staff students have been taught by; year of study; gender; age; if students have participated in study, work or volunteering overseas for at least one semester during their university degree; lived outside of the UK for more than three consecutive months prior to attending the case-study university; and ethnicity.
By encountering migrant academic members of staff and being exposed to a suite of diverse international ideas and concepts (although the questionnaire failed to adequately address this), some students were provoked into thinking about their mobility ambitions and career plans. It seems that being taught by a range of academic staff has encouraged some students to look beyond the United Kingdom “to pursue a ‘global’ as opposed to an ‘international’ career” (Findlay et al., 2017: 197). This is highlighted in the student vignettes below. Instead of fixating on a particular region or country, career aspirations are global in scope in what Gomes (2015: 46) terms a “sense of unlimited global mobility”:

it is a great experience and privilege to work with such talented people from across the globe. It opens up the doors to careers that can take us around the world.

Female, white, Engineering Sciences, Year 4, ‘No/not sure’ sample

in industry you are required to interact with people from all backgrounds, therefore it seems prudent to practice this at university.

Male, white, Engineering Sciences, Year 3, ‘Yes’ sample

By contrast, in response to the question ‘To what extent is your degree programme preparing you for the global job market?’ there were no statistically significant
differences between students who had encountered non-UK teachers prior to attending the case-study university and those who had not. In total, 18% of survey respondents agreed ‘very much’ that their degree programme was preparing them for the global job market. What we see, then, is that encounters with “strange others” (Ahmed 2000: 24) can be a precondition to producing the ‘ideal global graduate’ (Lilley et al., 2015: 228) in terms of fostering intercultural respect and understanding, but has less sway in the development of globally-oriented career aspirations. This is a compelling result but is consistent with earlier findings (see Tables 6.7 and 6.8) in which UK and non-UK academic members of staff are equally evaluated in their careers advice. This might reflect the case-study university, an institution which has local, national, and global links to industry. A higher education provider with a smaller global reach and a focus on local and regional labour markets may generate a different outcome.

Surprisingly, final year students tended to give a lower score on the five-point scale in response to whether their degree programme was preparing them for the global job market (Table 6.10).

Table 6.10 Students who thought their degree programme was preparing them for the global job market by year of study and gender (in the percentage of participating students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female\textsuperscript{ns}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male\textsuperscript{ns}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total\textsuperscript{**}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Statistically significant: ns = not on 95% level; * = on 95% level; ** = on 99% level; *** = on 99.9% level.
\textsuperscript{b} Source: Own online survey, 2015-2016 (n = 185).
This is significant, given a desirable outcome for higher education institutions is to produce “employable ‘global’ graduates” (Campbell 2010: 487). Interestingly, interviews with non-UK academics at the case-study university revealed that they share with their student's information about international doctoral and job opportunities. Why, then, do final year students feel ill-equipped for the global job market? Perhaps these students are panicking that they have not done enough to be ‘global players’, for example, study or work placement year abroad or learning a new language. It may also be due to second-year students being less critical about their university experience. However, this finding illustrates a need for further research on the university’s internationalisation activities, to think more widely about infusing work-placed learning opportunities into the curriculum and perhaps re-evaluating syllabi core skills and attributes.

6.2.5 Encounters and global citizenship
As described by Wilson (2017: 459) in a recent review article, “encounters are joyful, fearful, anxious, uncanny, enchanting and hopeful”. Indeed, from the analysis in this chapter, a student's encounter with otherness – whether that be different pedagogic approaches, linguistic differences or international faculty are especially viewed in this way. Such observations provide a critical perspective on emergent geographies of encounter in spaces of education, suggesting that UK students’ exposure to migrant academic staff can result in developing a different mindset toward other perspectives. This assertion draws upon literature that looks at the relationship between youth mobility and global citizenship (e.g., Lough and McBride 2014) and whether encounter results in a reinforcement or changing of values (Valentine 2008; Wilson 2017). What I want to underscore here is although encounters can reinforce prejudice – for example, Lobo’s (2013) study which examines embodied encounters with Aboriginal people and asylum seekers in Darwin, Australia, illustrating how the presence of racialised bodies can aggravate existing power relations and conflicts, as McCormack (2003) points out, encounters also have transformative potential.
Exemplary here is the work of Spijkers and Loopmans (2018), who explore “intercultural contact as a moment of intersubjective learning” (p. 1). Their research, which draws on public pedagogy theory, demonstrates how meaningful encounters with different others can generate opportunities for citizenship learning. When understood in these terms, student accounts of shock, surprise, rage and rupture at
being taught by international faculty are, I posit, momentary destabilisations in their teaching and learning experience. In this vein, findings suggest that respondents were more likely to exhibit greater levels of tolerance towards migrant academic members of staff at the end of their degree programme than at the beginning (for example, see Figure 6.4). While strong correlations indicate a positive transformation in student attitude, I cannot accept this outcome as fact given the study’s self-selected and biased participation and low respondent rates. However, survey responses provide support for the notion that being taught by migrant academic staff may drive change in UK undergraduate learners through developing intercultural respect, stimulating open-mindedness, expanding horizons, and promoting tolerance of otherness.

Interest in the geographical imaginaries of global citizenship are increasingly proliferous (e.g., Rye 2013; Lough and McBride 2014; Klein and Wikan 2019). Within this body of work, however, disjunctures exist. For example, there is a discordant relationship in the literature regarding terminology. Explicit here is the concept’s ubiquitous usage, in which definitions vary “from a vague sense of belonging to a global community to a more specific global polity that collectively enforces legal and human rights and responsibilities” (Ibrahim 2005: 178). More recently, scholarship on global citizenship has subscribed to a socio-political construct, understood as a diminished sense of attachment to a particular nation-state, with a greater sense of moral solidarity and obligation to persons in other countries (Lough and McBride 2014). Cross-cutting these definitions are global citizen attributes, commonly presented through the dimensions of global awareness (Merryfield 2008), justice and the environment (Tarrant 2010), and equality, fairness and sustainable action (Oxfam 2018).

When discussing higher education, research on international student mobility has attempted to measure a learner’s global citizenship as an outcome of study abroad, with the much-cited work of Morais and Ogden (2011) cementing the idea that global citizenship development can be quantitatively measured by calculating three interrelated dimensions: social responsibility, global competence, and global civic activism – attributes commonly referred to as being core constituents of global citizenship (Schattle 2008). For those students who do not gain international experience through study, work or volunteering abroad, curriculum internationalisation has become increasingly visible in academic literature, policy
debates, and education discourses. Notwithstanding this shift in higher education policy and practice, scholarship demonstrating the causation between internationalisation of the curriculum and the development of students as global citizens remains relatively nascent (Jones and Killick 2013). As a way forward, Lilley et al., (2015) focus on students’ international mobility experience to better understand the process of ‘becoming’ a global citizen, but also to inform pedagogy around global citizenship learning, exploring how comparable on-campus learning experiences might be replicated for educating immobile domestic students in the development of global citizenship dispositions. Their research uncovers evidence that encounters with otherness can facilitate change in fostering a global mindset. It is here that inspiration might be taken for my own study, to critically examine how contact with international faculty can improve students’ internationalisation experience ‘at home’.

To expand, Lilley et al., (2015) reveal that ‘out of the comfort zone’ experiences are necessary for transformative change, in order to “activate the student mind-set for thinking differently” (p. 238). In their study, students emphasised how disorienting situations that create a sense of discomfort or uncertainty, for example, differences in pedagogic approaches or engaging with different others, forced them to confront interpersonal conflicts. In so doing, students questioned pre-existing assumptions by engaging in self-reflection. Indeed, in this thesis, such moments did elicit a certain degree of contemplation, facilitating personal and intellectual growth. For example, one participant spoke about how their initial encounter with linguistic otherness enhanced negative perceptions of international faculty. It was only during their degree programme that the student challenged this prejudice by admitting their inattention in the classroom. Whether this is a moment of transformative thinking akin to global citizenship outlined above or merely a maturing student in a reflexive action, requires further investigation. Other accounts, however, were less favourable, reinforcing Valentine’s (2008: 325) assertion that “contact with difference leaves attitudes and values unmoved, […] even hardened”. By this, I mean strengthened nationalist viewpoints, in contrast to constructs of world-mindedness and interconnectedness. This is illustrated by a white UK student who remarked, ‘most [of] my classmates prefer having lecturers from England (UK is far too general)’. This nationalistic consensus is evident in Lough and McBride’s (2014) analysis of international volunteering. The authors note that rather than developing a sense of global citizenship, mobility actually reinforced patriotic attachments.
Out of the comfort zone experiences is but one part of Lilley et al’s (2015) facilitators of change. Equally important they argue is the ‘cosmopolitan role model’ – namely, an inspiring academic who challenges the student’s thinking and frames of reference. Among my sample, there are examples of the ways in which an academic’s global experience widened students’ future imaginings. Some discussed careers beyond the United Kingdom, suggesting students emerge as more confident individuals as an outcome of encounter (Parr and Chan 2015), while others expressed the heightened importance of developing an understanding and appreciation toward other cultures (Klein and Wikan 2019). The idea of a cosmopolitan role model lends itself to Sanderson’s (2011: 661) “notion of an ‘ideal’ and authentic teacher”, which encourages academics to integrate aspects of their intercultural profile, cosmopolitan knowledge, and international experience into their teaching practice. Vital here is higher-level support (Dewey and Duff 2009; Sanderson 2011), yet it is evident that major lacunae remain concerning “openness to difference and diversity in […] knowledge production processes” (Noxolo 2017: 317), and what types of knowledge are seen as different or desirable to the epistemic community in which the migrant academic is employed (see Chapters 5 and 7). In summary, the student survey has provided a lens for mapping the terrain of student encounters with migrant academic staff and how this exposure can result in the reinforcement or shifting of mindsets. We see clearly how undergraduate students dismantled a lecturer’s identity in favour of being taught by a UK academic. This can be seen in relation to perceived language capabilities, whereby students tended to lambaste proficient migrant academic members of staff because of linguistic otherness. In so doing, findings shine a light on viscerally-present institutional racism (Desai 2017; Esson 2018). However, as this chapter has also revealed, students of colour and those with international experience prior to attending the case-study university were less likely to draw attention to otherness. In this vein, thesis findings provide an extension to Spijkers and Loopmans (2018) work, who reported that “particular experiences are related to the embodied experience of earlier encounters carried across sites and time” (p. 17). The meaning of student encounters with international faculty thus points to the importance of weaving together a diversity of exposures, including the analysis of biographical narratives (Valentine and Sadgrove 2014) to better understand UK undergraduate students’ diverse experiences of being taught by migrant academic members of staff.
6.3 Limitations of the quantitative survey approach

A scale from 1-5 to accurately [convey] my thoughts on all academic staff is not enough. For example some of the non-UK academic staff have very clear accents and they seem to make a lot of effort to be understood whilst the same cannot [sic] be said for others, including UK academic staff.

Male, white, Social Sciences, Year 3, ‘Yes’ sample

To speak of research limitations “implies that a ‘perfect’ project could exist” (Browne 2002: 323). However, there are potent criticisms of the quantitative survey despite careful methodological planning. Critical reflections underlie, first, the use of checklist questions. As Hoggart et al., (2002) point out, checklist prompts exaggerate responses and “cannot be relied on to give accurate, absolute values” (p. 197). Quite feasibly, the availability of answer choices could have steered respondents to interpret questions in a particular manner (Dillman et al., 2009). Certainly, prompts such as ‘accent’ would have influenced responses and, as this choice appeared in the second question of the survey, may have biased questionnaire answers overall. This shortcoming could explain the bounty of comments in the final question of the survey, ‘Do you have any other comments?’ Here, the student could elaborate on the confined closed-ended questions, as evidenced in the vignette above.

Second, the wording of questions can cause interpretative problems (McGuirk and O’Neill 2010) and bias responses (Hoggart et al., 2002). For example, the question ‘Do you think non-UK academic staff’s accent has had an impact on your learning experience?’ explicitly implies that there is a problem, thus potentially distorting responses. On reflection, questions should have been asked in a more respectful and sensitive tone; for example, what makes a good lecturer? What are the benefits of being taught by a diverse range of academic staff? In doing so, ‘othering’ is minimised.

Third, while the Likert Scales allowed students to respond to a range of answers (McLafferty 2003), it was observed that the middle categories tended to have a higher frequency of responses, suggesting ‘neutral’ or ‘don’t know’ views (Hoggart et al., 2002). Fourth, the small homogenously white sample is problematic, although this is difficult to mitigate given the university’s asymmetric student population. While Bortz (1999) notes that a minimum sample of 1-5% of the population is sufficient to infer reliable and representative findings (if the sample size
is at least \( n = 100 \), the study's completion responses bias self-selected participants (Hoggart et al., 2002). Consequently, I am unable to affirm survey responses as being representative of the case-study university. For example, students may have ‘opted in’ as an indicator of their cosmopolitan cultural capital or a measure of their disapproval.

The final critique centres on the complexity in assessing knowledge transfer from the perspective of undergraduate students. While the previous chapter brought to the fore migrant academics’ experiences of incorporating international ideas and concepts into a UK context of higher teaching and learning, the questionnaire survey, instead, seemed to provide an opportunity for students to lambaste academic members of staff. However, it is mindful to acknowledge that the feedback survey was originally conceived as a methodological tool to recruit students for qualitative focus group discussions (see methodology chapter). Undoubtedly, student vignettes enlivened this chapter’s analysis.

Despite these limitations, this chapter makes a valuable contribution to the literature on the geographies of higher education and internationalisation ‘at home’, opening up exciting avenues to explore the intersection between student subjectivities and “the impact of foreignness as a teaching resource” (Albert 2008: 198).

6.4 Conclusion

When I talk to students at [the case-study university], they see themselves as global citizens. [...] young people today predominately don’t see them[elves] bounded or constrained by the boundaries of the British Isles.

Senior Manager with a strategic role in teaching

The conception of an integrated European Higher Education Area (EHEA) is based on the aim that by 2020, at least 20% of university graduates should have gained international experience through study, work or volunteering overseas (Leuven/Louvain-La-Neuve Communiqué 2009). Some countries reached this mobility aim by 2015, as exemplified by Germany, where a quarter of all university graduates experienced study or training abroad for three or more months at least once (DAAD and DZHW 2016), which corresponds to an annual share of outgoing students of 6.2% (DAAD and DZHW 2015). In the UK, the latest figures suggest 2% of all UK undergraduate students embarked on a period of mobility in 2015-16.
(Universities UK International 2017b). At the case-study university, a very different picture emerges. Survey findings reveal 10% of respondents had experienced overseas activities for at least one semester during their university degree.

This chapter has furthered debate on the internationalisation of higher education and presented animated accounts of UK domiciled undergraduate students taught by migrant academic members of staff at one English higher education institution. Focusing on students’ international exposure, by asking the question “Were you taught by non-UK teachers before attending this university?” provided the opportunity to examine the “impact of foreignness as a teaching resource” (Alberts 2008: 198) by investigating binary opposites as well as other axes of intersectionality. In doing so, the chapter engages with Jöns’s (2018b) research agenda calling for more triadic thought in mobilities studies. By thinking beyond two categories (‘Yes’ and ‘No/not sure’) and disaggregating these binary opposites along axes of ethnicity (‘Yes’; ‘No/not sure white’; ‘No/not sure non-white’, also ‘UK academic’; ‘non-UK academic’; ‘no preference’), the chapter highlights the value of exploring students’ intercultural capital, subjectivities, and geographies of encounter. Overall, two points can be summarised.

First, the chapter’s empirics demonstrate how UK students with an ethnically diverse, non-white background are more positively inclined towards migrant academic members of staff than white UK students. The key argument is that diversity accepts diversity (Ahmed 2012) more than the homogeneous white population. Further, through a geographies of encounter framework, the manner in which British undergraduate students read non-UK academics embodied ‘strangeness’, an out of place name, accent or “look” perceived as being ‘foreign’ to British higher education. In doing so, UK students tended to view “difference as [a] danger” (Cranston 2016: 667) in terms of their learning experience; for example, an unfamiliar accent was in particular perceived as being a threat to understanding discipline-specific content.

Second, the chapter has demonstrated that encounters with “strange others” (Ahmed 2000: 24) can be a precondition to producing the ‘ideal global graduate’ (Lilley et al., 2015: 228) in terms of fostering intercultural respect and understanding, but has less sway in the development of globally-oriented career aspirations. This sheds a more positive light on pertinent immigration debates following the Brexit referendum because migrant academics expose immobile students to international
experiences, thereby potentially creating ‘global subjects’ (Bayart 2007) ‘at home’ and preparing them for an increasingly globalising job market within the UK and abroad (Campbell 2010). However, there is a caveat. The positive presence of non-UK academics in a higher learning setting is felt most acutely by students of colour and those who were taught by non-UK teachers prior to attending the case-study university. Encounters then become a way for British undergraduate students to negotiate ‘unfamiliar’ migrant academic members of staff, but as the chapter’s empirics illustrate the difference is also overcome through the spaces, places, and identities in which the students were socialised (see also Cranston 2016). Through this, the empirics have highlighted some important connections between ethnicity and a student’s encounter of academic diversity. This relationship requires further attention, I would, therefore, suggest the detailed examination of race, ethnicity, religion and UK students’ tolerance towards migrant academic members of staff as well as the internationalisation of higher education. A focus on international, state and public schools could also be of particular relevance. It could look at the ways in which students encounter non-UK teachers at school and how this provides a positive springboard to being taught by migrant academic staff at a university.

Clearly, knowledge transfer from the perspective of UK undergraduate students was an absent theme in the chapter’s empirics, and therefore warrants further attention. Moving forward, workshops, focus group discussions and/or interviews may be a fruitful avenue through which to understand student’s negotiation of international ideas and concepts in their teaching and learning. With regards to the case-study university, more could be done to mediate students’ concerns about linguistic issues. At the same time, a professional staff member at the case-study university commented:

student feedback […] needs interpreting very carefully when staff and their linguistic abilities are being questioned. Because […] actually some of the students who had commented ‘oh lecturer’s English was poor’ were actually the students who did admit afterwards they haven’t actually done a lot of work and this seemed an awfully good way of explaining their poor grades. Now that is not fair. But it happens.

*Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching,*  
emphasis in original
In conclusion, the key finding is that migrant academic staff do internationalise UK undergraduate students because of the development of intercultural respect and understanding.
Chapter 7

The view from the senior managers’ office

At [University A] we have for some time had a very high percentage of international students and indeed staff but I think even in that context that agenda has come increasingly to the fore in the sense of rather than just accepting that as a descriptive fact that we celebrate or work around or whatever we do with it but actually kind of saying ‘well what does that mean for us, how can we make the most of it?’ So looking at internationalising the curriculum, going a little bit deeper and not just having a kind of multicultural sea of faces in any given classroom but okay what do we do with that?

Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching

There’s a lot of talk about integrating international students and all that kind of stuff and you know and integrating international staff and so yeah, okay. But there’s also you know there’s also the question of maximising their value [laughs] in terms of the insights they bring us about education, about research and everything else.

Senior Manager with a strategic role in teaching

We’ve got a sort of project on the books to look at the contribution that international staff make to the institution. Because we’re very, I think we’re aware that they do make a very significant contribution to student learning and we want to benefit from that. So we’re not imperialist at all, we’re quite the opposite. […] So I think our view is that the institution knows that it benefits. What I think we don’t do on a systematic, institution-wide basis is gather that together and look for the what you might describe as the generic features of that.

Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching

7.1 Introduction

At the Higher Education Academy’s (HEA) Annual Conference 2014, the learned society launched its Internationalising Higher Education Framework. Its purpose is to “inspire and assist in the process of internationalising HE: preparing 21st century graduates to live in and contribute responsibly to a globally connected society” (HEA 2014: no pagination). Intended to work at three different levels – organisations (the collective level), people (the individual level) and curriculum (the content level) – these interconnected pillars of activity are aspirational in focus, guiding the reader “to recognise, build on, and enhance the quality and variety of internationalisation policy and practice in HE” (HEA 2014: no pagination). Figure 7.1 summarises its key tenets. Exemplary of the framework is its case-study exemplars to internationalising the curriculum from across the natural and social sciences and humanities. With its three
pillars, the framework’s tripartite structure represents this study’s research population. The multiple voices, contrasting perspectives and diverse positionalities captured within the pages of this thesis help to elucidate knowledge transfer through the lens of migrant academic members of staff (people-curriculum; Chapters 4 and 5), British undergraduate students (people-curriculum; Chapter 6), and senior management and professional development staff (organisations-people-curriculum; this Chapter).

![Internationalising Higher Education Framework](HEA_2014_no_pagination)

Figure 7.1 Internationalising Higher Education Framework
*Source: (HEA 2014: no pagination).
Within higher education discourse, internationalisation is often depicted “as an inherent good” (Huisman 2010: 6), a transformative agenda leading to positive institutional change (Robson 2011; see Chapters 4, 5 and 6). However, while empirically rich scholarship has underlined the significant contribution migrant academics can make to the diversification of university campuses (e.g., Alberts 2008; Foote et al., 2008; Hsieh 2012; Luxon and Peelo 2009; Pherali 2012; Thomson 2014; Lee and Lim 2017), relatively few studies have referenced institutional attempts in harnessing academics’ international knowledge and experiences as a valuable enabler in the development of internationalisation initiatives (Willis and Hammond 2014). There are some notable exceptions, for example, Minocha et al’s (2018) insightful work which examines “the role of international academic staff in UK HE as a resource of internationally-informed and innovative pedagogic practice” (p. 13).

What is missing from this important study is triadic thought, the intricate nexus between educator-learner-institutional leadership. Indeed, Meusburger (2015) asserts: “We cannot study scientific creativity by isolating scholars and their works from the social and historical milieu in which their actions are carried out” (p. 265).

Additionally, the insights provided by migrant academics, support staff and senior management at the three different case-study universities capture the convergences and divergences of institutional perspectives, thus displaying the diversity in which internationalisation is interpreted, adopted and practised.

This chapter aims to contribute to the geographies of higher education literature by critically analysing how UK universities mobilise and support international best practices of migrant academic members of staff. The analysis in Chapter 5 brought to the fore contextualised examples of knowledge transfer from the differentiated perspective of international academics. Though there were few specific instances of integrating innovative pedagogies into a UK context of higher teaching and learning, echoing the research findings of Minocha et al., (2018:10) who concluded that few “examples of staff using alternative approaches to teaching were identified”, which they attributed to the mandatory PG Cert (see Chapter 4).

Nevertheless, the narratives of interviewees in this dissertation sketched out the contours of knowledge transfer from a Commonwealth, European, and rest of world geographical imagination by illustrating the underlying “political, cultural and linguistic boundaries” (Jöns and Freytag 2016: 3) through which they travel (Chapter 4). Chapter 6 also shone a spotlight on the empowering impact migrant academics can
have on students in British higher education in terms of fostering a greater global outlook, intercultural respect, and international career aspirations. Strikingly, one of the most important findings emerging from this thesis concerns the way in which the case-study universities utilise migrant academics’ international knowledge.

In a provocative statement, I argue that the individual universities only cursorily (at the time of interview) capitalise on migrant academics’ insights about research, teaching, enterprise and other knowledge environments (as evidenced in the interview vignettes with which I opened this chapter). This is a stark omission, not least because of the recent rise in the number of international academics in the United Kingdom (Universities UK International 2017a), which has led some key commentators to talk of a potential “de-nationalization of the profession” (Kim 2009: 398). It is important, however, to highlight that a consensus emerged within the case-study universities that called for a deeper understanding of the benefits migrant academics can bring to UK higher education. We, therefore, see an unfolding of institutional practices, witnessed by a relatively nascent investment of university resources to identify and share international best practice formally.

Drawing on qualitative semi-structured interviews undertaken with senior management and professional development staff at the case-study universities (see Chapter 3 for Methodology), this chapter’s analysis is guided by two research questions:

a) To what extent do UK universities actively seek to utilise the international teaching approaches of international academic staff?
b) What strategies do senior management and professional development staff employ to mobilise and support international best practices of non-UK academic staff?

It is hoped that this chapter is a springboard to further discussions in thinking about the role of non-UK academics to internationalisation processes ‘at home’ (Trahar and Hyland 2011). Certainly, findings will be of high policy relevance, providing input into the development of more suitable institutional strategies to draw on international academic staff as a key resource for improving immobile students’ international experience.
The chapter is divided into four sections. In what follows I, first, position this chapter within the literature on internationalising the curriculum and internationalisation ‘at home’. It then reveals how the case-study universities utilise the diverse intercultural experiences and approaches of international academic staff for teaching and learning. I then discuss the positive, policy-changing impact this HEA-funded doctoral project has exerted on one of the case-study institutions. In conclusion, I reflect on the chapter’s findings and policy recommendations.

7.2 The case-study universities

In July 2015, the European Parliament’s Committee on Culture and Education published *Internationalisation of Higher Education* (European Parliament 2015). In a series of policy recommendations, the publication proposed “pay more attention to the importance of ‘Internationalisation at home’, integrating international and intercultural learning outcomes into the curriculum for all students” (European Parliament 2015: 30). This clear focus on the curriculum brings into dialogue the 1996 OECD/CERI symposium and report entitled ‘Internationalisation of higher education’ which brought academic mobility and internationalisation of the curriculum onto the policy agenda (OECD 1996; see also van der Wende 1996a). Policymakers have identified the need to provide the majority of non-mobile students with international perspectives to prepare for an increasingly globalising job market (Wächter 2003). With this, there has been a proliferation of institutional strategies, for example, culturally inclusive and sensitive pedagogy (Robson and Turner 2007), overseas guest lecturers (Dewey and Duff 2009), virtual mobility (Leask 2015), international student enrolment and the recruitment of migrant academics (Brewer and Leask 2012), and the internationalisation of case-study methodologies (Piekkari and Welch 2011).

Across the participating universities, the institutions portrayed themselves as embedding an internationalised and global dimension into their mission and core values, though the manner in which these were defined and enacted varied considerably. While there were some synergies between policy and practice (within and between the institutions), data analysis revealed pockets of internationalisation excellence (*Chapter 5*), with evidence suggesting effective engagement and operationalisation is within individuals, “often disconnected from overall institutional strategies” (Kirk *et al.*, 2018: no pagination; see also Robson and Turner 2007). In
Dewey and Duff’s (2009) study focusing on internationalisation in a US higher education context, they concluded efforts to internationalise are often met with “low institutional commitment and a lack of incentives for faculty participation” (p. 499). Here, I wish to posit that while the case-study universities displayed long-term interest in driving internationalisation within classrooms and across their institutions, at the time of interview the universities realised only then that there is a need to act and capitalise on the expertise of the migrant academic staff. In Chapter 8, therefore, I propose a series of policy recommendations to recognise and actively harness international best practice. There is also a need for closer working relationships between leadership committees and academic members of staff. These mismatched relations are captured most acutely in the two interview extracts below, pointing to incongruence between the personal opinions and experiences of international academic members of staff and institutional leaders.

I think I bring something unique in terms of like these kind of pedagogical insights from other places.

*Lecturer, Female, PhD from Canada*

We tend to be alert to change; you know innovative practice. So we’ve got systems in place for you know monitoring and you know helping develop and foster it. But as I say it’s not specifically focused on trying to identify what international colleagues are doing, are bringing. […] This is going to sound very arrogant but also in lots of areas I think the UK is ahead of the game. Now people from America, people from Australia and other Anglophone countries, particularly the Australians I mean they’ve got a very strong pedagogy record. They’ve got some really good ideas in developments and certainly, you know we would make use of them from going to conferences and things like that and talking with them. But if I think for example sweeping generalisation so, for example, if you take computer science most of the international people from computer science are from eastern Europe and from Russia, and they have a very traditional approach to teaching which doesn’t quite fit with what we do and probably there isn’t a huge amount that we learn from the way they do things.

*Senior Manager with a strategic role in teaching*

In this context, internationalisation is steeped in colonial privileging and imperial power (Gilmartin 2013). On these terms, it could be argued that coloniality is reproduced “recentring non-Indigenous, white and otherwise privileged groups in the global architecture of knowledge production” (Esson et al., 2017: 385). To be clear, I
am not seeking to vilify the individual or the case-study institution. The senior manager is clearly devoted to engaging with transformative pedagogy, albeit practices that are situated within hierarchical knowledge structures and thus diluting the experiences of those who “struggle to maintain a presence within” (Esson et al., 2017: 386) British higher education.

While this senior manager’s quotation is not representative of the institutional leaders interviewed in this study, it does highlight fissures within the academy endorsing Noxolo’s (2017) claims of reticence towards “difference and diversity in its knowledge production processes” (p. 317). More specifically, the senior manager’s comment starkly exposes their approach to internationalisation. This is reflected in their preference for Anglo-American-Australian research practices and pedagogies. However, these discourses tended to be rationalised based on the individual’s technical and laboratory-based background, rather than academic disciplines allied to the social sciences and humanities.

7.2.1 Institutional agendas
What unites the case-study institutions is their research excellence and ranking hierarchy. The most striking overlapping feature is their aspirational intent, to be recognised as an internationally-oriented ‘world-class’ university. Across the case institutions, all of them were in pursuit of global excellence. For example,

[the university's vision is to become] top 50 in the world university rankings.

Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching

The market for academic talent is global and it’s essential to our profile to be able to recruit the best staff from within that market. The key to doing so is our attractiveness in terms of our reputation and of the environment, facilities and collegiality we can offer to potential recruits. That’s our aspiration.

Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching

[the case-study institution] is an internationally facing university, we have partners with universities around the world.

Senior Manager with a strategic role in teaching

From the interview extracts, a number of key observations can be made. Perhaps most significant is neoliberalism and the global competitiveness of higher education.
Illustrative of this is performance metrics, world university rankings which “can be regarded as the latest manifestation of the neoliberal corporatization of higher education, in which market forces increasingly govern research and teaching” (Jöns and Hoyler 2013: 47). Additionally, competitive advantage is sought through collaboration with preferred partners (Cochrane and Williams 2013). In the case of the third quotation, institutional leaders are responsive to pursuing tactical bilateral collaborations. Returning benefits include student exchanges, mutual learning, leading academics, and knowledge creation and dissemination as a means to consolidate their status within the higher education sector, both nationally and globally (see Harrison et al., 2015). In other words, a mutually beneficial relationship in which both actors are dependent on each other to achieve their individual initiatives. The senior manager goes on to explain this in the interview quotation below:

Now [our partner institution] is currently one of the top three universities in the world. Why on earth would they want to partner with [case-study university] or why on earth would we want to partner with them? Well forget where they are in the world rankings, it is because of what we can offer each other.

**Senior Manager with a strategic role in teaching**

In the above comment, the knowledge economy is unequivocally highlighted. This was marked by explicit internationalisation strategies most notably targeted alliances with institutions recognised for their scholarly and scientific excellence, the recruitment of leading international academics and promising students, and internationalisation of the curriculum (Knight 2003). In their policy document entitled Talent Wars, Universities UK (2007) drew attention to the increased competition for academic staff, writing: “a highly qualified and highly skilled higher education workforce underpins a nationally and globally competitive higher education system” (p. 3). In other work, Jöns and Hoyler (2013) examined world university rankings. Their analysis revealed the inextricable link between league tables, institutional reputation, and academic mobility (Chapter 5), further highlighting the uneven and disparate geographies that are characteristic of global higher education (Marginson 2006).

There are important differences between the case-study universities too. With regards to institutional governance and management, what was striking was the
absence of a Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Internationalisation. This notable absentee from Leadership Teams is intriguing, but perhaps marks an evolution in the participating universities' life-course; not least because this thesis captures a step change that witnessed strategic plans being altered, rewritten, and restructured. In all of them, internationalisation was identified as being integral to the institution’s strategic plans, although the depth at which it was embedded and communicated varied considerably. For example, at one of the case-study universities, a newly appointed Vice-Chancellor provided the catalyst for change, shifting internationalisation from being a peripheral policy topic to front and centre. For the first time, the university was seeking to hire a Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Internationalisation). As a senior manager explains, this appointment focuses on capacity building:

I've been very keen that we have a portfolio area called internationalisation and I think that noun’s very important because a PVC International is a somewhat different thing I think from a PVC Internationalisation. As you’re essentially in the second one saying there is a project called internationalisation, there is a transformation that needs to take place called internationalisation. Rather than what could be seen as a more passive kind of international, which is basically go out and do international things. What I think we're really keen to emphasise is that the role of that PVC is to internationalise the university, and that of course also means significant internal change, not just external partnerships and things like that.

Senior Manager with a strategic role in teaching

This institutional direction may have been prompted by the university’s ‘global initiative’, to develop strategic alliances with international collaborators. As a press release attests, the institution will have an international campus in partnership with a leading Chinese university. This activity is indicative of China’s growing influence within global higher education (e.g., CBI 2017; Burnett 2018), which is a testament to the Chinese Ministry of Education in promoting their academic institutions as attractive venues for international students and strategic partnerships (Bhardwa 2018).

Allied to the above case-study university, the institution’s Leadership Team approved its first Internationalisation Plan, a supplementary document to the university’s strategic plan. Its genesis is the outcome of significant internal change, for example:
What I have in front of me is the first international strategy we’ve ever had, there has been no strategy. Not because I didn’t want one but because our previous Vice-Chancellor felt that there was no need for a separate international strategy that it should be embedded into the overall institutional strategy.

Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching

This quotation is clearly suggestive of the professional staff member’s personal view in the value of having a separate internationalisation policy. In discussing the contents of the document, which at the time of the interview was not available to the public, the individual goes on to describe its key aims:

What we’ve looked at is not looking at internationalisation in its narrowest sense, we’ve looked at it across research and enterprise, teaching, capacity building and recruitment of course. And we’ve obviously looked at where we came from, trying to characterise where the university is now and also what opportunities. So, to sort of say what the main points are, which I can. So the first, we had six aims. The first one is about promoting an integrated international perspective across all aspects of our work – its teaching, research and enterprise. And that’s about acknowledging why it’s important to the university, absolutely integrating it into the plans at all different levels whether it’s departmental, college, institutional. However, we look at it. We want then secondly to embed an international dimension into the student experience at [the case-study university], so that you know using some of the jargon is about the global citizenship but let’s call it the knowledge experience and the skills that you need if you’re going to get a job in today’s, in the world. And the third one was about attracting, supporting and valuing a high-quality international staff and student body with an emphasis on diversity and inclusivity. So that’s the one that probably interests you. That’s the one that’s closest because it does actually talk about actively seeking staff as well as students.

Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching

For this HEI, the embedding of global citizenship as a central tenet to the student experience is perhaps unsurprising, given the institution’s capacity building activities outlined above. Notions of internationalising the curriculum are often associated with the construction of global citizens (Deardorff et al., 2012; Leask 2013, 2015; see also Chapter 6). This latitude to “produce students who are globally ready or “global citizens”, duly prepared for the global workplace and our multicultural society” (Hunter et al., 2006: 270) is, Fielden (2007) argues, an attractive attribute to prospective graduate employers. Indeed, from the perspective of the case institution,
the university makes a bold statement that they will produce “employable ‘global’ graduates” (Campbell 2010: 487). This, in policy terms, means skills development:

They’ve [the students, have] got to be able to operate in a very much more globally diverse work environment, culturally sensitive, culturally adaptable. Language skills that would be nice, but you can’t have everything.

*Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching*

In the most obvious sense, this quote captures imaginations about constructing a ‘good’ citizen (Mills 2013). Persons who have “an awareness of self and others, of one’s surroundings, and of the wider world coupled with responsibility for one’s actions” (Leask 2015: 60). Such a specific definition acknowledges the ‘ideal global graduate’ referred to by Lilley *et al.*, (2015: 228) as someone with “a moral and transformative cosmopolitan” mindset. With this framing, the tendency to focus on employability as the primary outcome of higher education appears to be too narrow, for Rizvi and Lingard (2010: 201) point out, “human beings are social and cultural beings as well as economic ones”.

For another case-study university, the drive to internationalise its curriculum and embed citizenship as a vital component within its institutional strategy is in response to market forces:

It’s that wider cultural shift in terms of the notion of global citizenship coming to the fore in the kind of, in the employability agenda for example. And you know and nationally there’s been a lot of chatter about the fact that our students typically, or sort of home students let me rephrase that, disambiguate, aren’t as perhaps linguistically sort of diverse and flexible as perhaps some of their international counterparts.

*Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching*

The importance of non-English language skills is emphasised in the interview extracts above. In 2017 the CBI reported that 47% of employers were not satisfied with graduates’ foreign language skills (CBI 2017). Moreover, in a post-Brexit landscape, how will universities frame global citizenship? It is worth reflecting on this, in particular on subject-disciplinary differences and the relevance of internationalising the curriculum to course objectives and learning outcomes. In this instance, as a future line of inquiry, I would suggest a detailed examination of module handbooks across academic disciplines at one of the case institutions. Through this analysis, it
would highlight which academic subjects engage with and are receptive to internationalisation, and those who reference it merely as an obligation to institutional policy (see Kirk et al’s 2018 examination of course material at an English university). This methodological approach could be useful in furthering our understanding of how internationalisation is interpreted, adopted, valued, and practised across academic disciplines. As the previous chapter highlighted, final year students felt ill-equipped for the global job market; further critical enquiry is therefore needed to interrogate the connections between curriculum, global citizenship, and preparedness for the international job market.

A somewhat different approach was witnessed at the final case-study university. A senior manager, who in the interview enthusiastically spoke about internationalisation and the circumstances in which it had become integrated into the institutional strategy, appeared dismissive when questioned if staff and students were aware of the university’s internationalisation plan:

What I wouldn’t want to do, whether it was for internationalisation or anything else is ram something down people’s throats where we say here’s our international strategy, you’ll be tested on it a week on Thursday. So in that regard, the answer to your question is will they, will the majority of staff or students here know that we have an international strategy? I suspect even if they said they did and you then, you said to them well so what is it? They wouldn’t be able to articulate that. I think what is however important is that we have a set of values that recognises the plurality of our community and where an element of that is played out by the people that we have here and how they contribute and the opportunities that we give to people to go somewhere else. I think what I’m saying, is what I would much rather do is play that out in a way where it sort of begins to become part of the natural fabric of the place, rather than it being something where you, the minute you sort of begin to explicitly push something in my experience it tends to sort of result on a bit of pushback on occasion. Whereas if you just you know quietly begin to bring it together, people just see it gradually you know pervading and they feel more comfortable with it, do you know I mean?

Senior Manager with a strategic role in teaching

What we can take from this quotation is deliberate steering away from rigid internationalisation operationalisations. Instead, the senior manager points to an organic approach to engagement and management. There is an implication to this approach, for Knight (1994: no pagination) argues that the integration of “an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service
functions of the institution” require staff awareness and commitment, clear planning and annual reviews. There is evidence that internationalisation of the curriculum was not very well understood in my interviews with migrant academics at this university, with narrow interpretations focusing solely on the recruitment of international students. The extent to which UK academics might similarly embody weak understandings also requires further investigation.

7.2.2 Mobilising international best practice

According to one professional staff member:

I think it’s very difficult to say that they [migrant academic staff] can influence the curriculum very much unless they’re introducing their own new courses. So if they’ve got particular research interests that may influence it, so you might have I don’t know people with a background in international relations and politics or international law something like that who come from a different background so we’ll use that. But very often the curriculum is on the whole gonna be quite UK focused and modules are designed with on the whole a UK market in mind. Where you see the difference is at postgraduate level, where you’ve actually got the dominance in most departments of international students. But what you don’t see is as much influence as you might expect.

*Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching*

Inevitably, an individual’s knowledge of curricular developments and its international components will always be partial, often contradicting other committee and leadership team members (see next section). Certainly, as my analysis shows, migrant academics contribute to the diversification of the case institutions, bringing with them new forms of pedagogy, discipline-specific knowledges and different approaches to research and enterprise (*Chapters 4 and 5*). What the quotation above exhibits is a disconnection between top-down strategic managers and academic staff’s internationalising activities. It could be argued that this disjuncture was inevitable, as institutional processes (at the time of interview) were not in place to utilise the resources of migrant academics better and, equally, of UK staff who have spent time abroad on sabbaticals. The case-study universities did acknowledge this (as evidenced in the interview vignettes with which I opened this chapter) but provided no strategies on how to tackle this, other than fleeting remarks from “we’ve got a sort of project on the books to look at the contribution that international staff make to the institution”. This ambivalence towards diversity and difference is
reflected in the quotation below, specifically the use of international academic’s overseas experiences to internationalising the curriculum:

I think to date that’s not been driven top down to be fair. That’s not something that the university has taken a position […]. We’ve always had a very strong international staff profile, but it’s not been actively driven by or exploited to the ends of I think the education objectives historically, that’s been more of a reflection of the research drives to be honest. […] As I say at the moment, I think it’s fair to say that’s not something that’s been strategically kind of pushed from, as a kind of management directive.

Professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching

As discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, this reticence is acutely felt by some migrant academics.

7.3 Accidental impact
Impact has taken on an added significance in recent years, rapidly becoming “institutionalized within the UK higher education sector’s ever-evolving culture of audit and corporatisation” (Rogers et al., 2014: 2). And yet, like Kneale (2014: 43), “I was still surprised to be accidentally […] impactful” when a senior manager informed me during an interview that:

One of the outcomes I think of your study for us […] is a project around international staff. […] there’s a lot of talk about integrating international students and all that kind of stuff and integrating international staff and so yeah okay, but there’s also […] the question of maximising their value in terms of the insights they bring us about education, about research and everything else. And I think, you know I’ve kind of put into our strategic plan that one of the things we’re going to do, […] probably you can cite this as impact, is a project around harnessing, capturing the value of our international staff not to just what we do, but how we think about what we do in the future.

Senior Manager with a strategic role in teaching emphasis added

From one perspective, the case-study university has recognised the study’s practical and policy relevance, and from another, this unexpected engagement is surprising given the university had classified my research as policy-relevant before I had delivered research-based evidence. It is telling, then, that the senior manager is a non-UK academic with the capabilities of making connections to wider educational contexts. The accidental impact can be claimed elsewhere, too. For instance, a non-
UK academic requested permission to use the study’s participant information sheet as a teaching resource, as an example of good research practice. Such engagement may lack impactful value as defined by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), yet fortuitously my research is shaping the learning experiences of university students. Indeed, this unexpected impact was most striking in the community being researched. As one non-UK academic said, when reflecting on the interview experience:

> It did make me think a lot and actually, yeah, that I maybe should value a bit more these [differences] instead of feeling something that is more like a handicap in a way that I have to struggle about.

*Senior Lecturer, Female, PhD from Belgium*

7.4 Conclusion
The objective of this chapter was to assess to what extent UK universities recognise and support migrant academic staff as a valuable resource for teaching and learning. The chapter’s empirics illustrate that the case-study universities did not (at the time of the research) actively seek to utilise the international teaching approaches of non-UK academics, nor did senior management point to institutional strategies on how best they mobilise and support international best practice. Rather, research findings reveal “low institutional commitment and a lack of incentives” to capitalise on academics’ overseas experiences, resonating with the work of Dewey and Duff (2009: 499). There were some encouraging signs that the case-study universities were beginning to think about maximising the value of international staff. Indeed, contributions to practice were demonstrated through the development of a new project at one of the participating institutions to capture and harness international best practice. While I am unable to assess the specific impact of this commissioned study as follow-up interviews were not conducted, what it does illustrate, however, is institutional buy-in and an appetite to benefit from different insights about research, teaching, and enterprise. This absence of capitalising on different practices, concepts and innovations are productive, as it provides a platform for the universities to start thinking about how best to utilise the skills of migrant academic staff to internationalisation processes ‘at home’.
Chapter 8

Conclusions: transnational migration, knowledge transfer, and higher education

8.1 Introduction

This dissertation has provided a critical analysis of knowledge transfer in higher education teaching and learning in three research-intensive English universities. What the analysis unequivocally shows is that this educational-geographical study is important, underscored by relatively nascent scholarship in this area and heightened political attention currently to questions of nationalism, immigration, and citizenship. In other ways, too, this highly original and innovative research matters to the UK higher education sector and beyond, as fewer than 2% of UK-domiciled undergraduate students studied, worked or volunteered overseas as part of their university degree in 2015-16 (University UK International 2017b). Thus, for those students who do not undertake corporeal mobility, campus-based internationalisation strategies aim to integrate an intercultural and international dimension into the content of the curriculum (Knight 2012). In looking at migrant academic staff as a conduit through which to internationalise higher education, this research opens up a new research pathway around the mobility of pedagogy and ideas (Williams 2006, 2007a) in higher education teaching and learning. In so doing, it contributes to contemporary debates within higher education and beyond concerning academic mobility, global citizenship, youth, emotions, and encounter. It also opens out significant pathways for impact – both in terms of teaching and learning practices within the UK higher education sector, and in considering the implications of internationalisation ‘at home’ for society and the economy, for example, skills acquisition linked to personal attributes such as intercultural competencies and foreign-language skills (see CBI 2018, for a discussion about the informal qualifications employers are commanding from university graduates). In a related vein, the dissertation speaks to wider societal issues, such as Noxolo’s (2017) work on decolonising geographical knowledge and Tolia-Kelly’s (2017) narrative representation of being female and black in the academy. These debates are aired throughout this study, antagonistically coalescing in the preceding empirical chapters. To this end, I have produced three independent yet interwoven accounts concerning
the role of migrant academic staff in improving students’ on-campus internationalisation experience.

Within the literature on British higher education, there is surprisingly little research examining transnational knowledge transfer through international faculty. This dissertation thus contributes in important ways to discussions on geographies of higher education and migration studies, presenting novel empirical, conceptual and policy conclusions that help fill this salient lacuna. In what follows, I draw the arguments of the different sections together. In so doing, I reflect on how these nuanced insights can inform more expansive understandings of internationalising higher education. The chapter then introduces eight policy recommendations, followed by two proposals for future research.

8.2 Main findings and contributions
In seeking to advance our understanding of transnational migration, knowledge transfer, and higher education, the study has worked towards three overarching research objectives (outlined fully in Chapter 1).

1. To analyse the experiences of migrant academic staff in the UK with regard to the transfer and adaptation of international ideas and concepts in their teaching and learning practice.
2. To examine the impact of “foreignness as a teaching resource” (Alberts 2008: 198) on UK students taught by international academic staff.
3. To assess to what extent UK universities, recognise and support non-UK academic staff as a valuable resource in teaching and learning.

Framed by conceptual ideas of travelling theory (Said 1983) and centres of calculation (Latour 1987), the theoretical starting point for this dissertation has been Blackler’s (1995) typologies of knowledge; for Williams and Baláž (2008: 59) have argued that the “approach is particularly useful in examining knowledge transfer via international migration” (Chapter 2). In considering the transferability of teaching materials and pedagogic practices across different higher education contexts, the study has raised important questions concerning what types of knowledge are seen as different or desirable to the epistemic community in which the migrant academic is employed (Chapter 5). This speaks to distinctive place-specific (educational setting)
pedagogical features and alternative ways of knowing (Song 2016) which can pose instructional challenges for the UK undergraduate student (Chapter 6).

The global flows of scientists and scholars have become deeply embedded in career mobility, for example, it has habitually been regarded as a necessary practice for early career researches to promote career progression (Jöns 2011). Established academics, too, whose research careers are seen to have stalled can benefit from secondments to overseas campuses (Salt and Wood 2014). As universities internationalise, mobility for conference attendance (Derudder and Liu 2016), knowledge building (Raghuram 2013), and social networks (Jöns 2008) have become increasingly important for scholars “to create and maintain a networked professional life outside their own institution” (Storme et al., 2017: 405). However, it is important to acknowledge mobility’s ambiguous relationship with professional development (Dickmann and Harris 2005) and continuing gender bias (Parker and Weik 2014). These mobility outputs – the rewards and the drawbacks – are evident in this thesis (Chapters 4 and 5). Indeed, the study has revealed significant contextual differences between international faculty, in respect to the differentiated contours of knowledge transfer from a Commonwealth, European, and rest of world geographical imagination; gender; academic discipline; institution, reflexive capabilities; and linguistic communication. These implications require further investigation and differentiation through the study of international faculty and UK academics with international experience in other research-intensive and teaching-focused institutions. Such inclusive thinking would allow for a more unbounded and diverse sharing of international best practice that would advance academic debates on internationalising higher education. This assumption implies a direct relationship between academic mobility, knowledge transfer, and internationalisation. However, as the study has indicated, a consensus has emerged highlighting that this is not entirely true.

Drawing upon qualitative interviews with tenured academics on secure, full-time salaried contracts, the dissertation, first, sought to conceptualise how migrant academics transfer discipline-specific knowledge(s) and international ideas acquired in non-UK pedagogic environments to students at UK universities (Objective 1). Empirically, I have shown how academic staff sampled from different career stages (lecturer to professor) valorise British higher education as an elite cadre, chief among them Russell Group institutions revered for their attractive qualities, competitiveness,
and scientific reputation (*Chapter 4*). These imaginative geographies illustrate the persistence of certain university hierarchies and academic hegemonies in the production of knowledge and, in so doing, entrench institutional differences in relation to lower-ranked, less elite higher education providers. Pertinent context to this discussion is policy discourse associated with conceptual models of brain gain, drain, train (Knight 2012), circulation (Cao 1996), and diaspora (Hugo 2006). Brain gain applies especially to universities in the global north; Europe and North America the current ‘winners’ in terms of importing highly skilled academic talent (Scott 2015) despite some gradual shifts towards Asia-Pacific (Jöns and Hoyler 2013; Jöns 2015). As Meyer *et al.*, (2001) point out, “flows seem to always go from the less developed to the more competitive places in the world knowledge-based economy” (p. 309). However, if we focus specifically on international faculty in this study, we see dominant inflows of academics from Australia, Canada, continental Europe, and the United States, specialising in academic disciplines ranging from computer science, engineering and technology, business and economics, and social and political studies (*Chapter 3*). For respondents in this study reported that precarious labour markets in their home or PhD country (Hoyler and Jöns 2008b; Jöns and Deakin 2014) forced their global mobility (Ackers 2008). Such insecurity is a feature of contemporary higher education, increasingly shaped by the neoliberalisation and corporatisation of the university (Castree and Sparke 2000). As a result, the propensity to move may be a requirement for academics in the early stages of their career (especially) to secure a permanent position within the system (Purcell 2007). For example, 33% of *wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiter* in Germany report spending long periods on fixed-term contracts prior to becoming tenure track scholars (Bennion and Locke 2010). This data may reflect the relatively high share of German-born academics (10%) in the UK higher education system in 2012-13 (HESA 2014).

Biographical linkages, traumatic experiences in home country or partner ties to Europe provided additional motivation for mobility and location decision-making (*Chapter 4*). Interestingly, the study revealed inherently different geographies of scale (Amin 2002) in the search for career development opportunities depending on the academic’s biographical history and language capabilities. For example, migrant academics with national ties to Europe tended to look, first, to continental Europe, then second, to the UK. This is in contrast to North American, Australian and New Zealand-born colleagues who were primarily attracted to Britain. These ties resulting
from birth, partnerships, family relations, and language skills have relevance for theorising transnational mobility and knowledge transfer. Jöns et al., (2015) study, for example, which examines a specific knowledge diaspora in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), illustrates the potential of investigating “emotional ties that link people, places, communities of practice and epistemic cultures together, thus shaping career trajectories and the global circulation of knowledge” (p. 125). Non-UK European-born academics were also more likely to have participated in cumulative processes of academic mobility than their Anglophone counterparts prior to taking up an academic position in the country. Latour’s (1987) centres of calculation thus remains an important model in conceptualising international migration, not least in helping to identify the varying spatial relations of academic mobility. In other words, how multifold mobilisation processes can produce “different geographies in different disciplines and types of research work” (Jöns 2007: 111, emphasis in original). As interviewees were sampled from across all academic disciplines and scientific practices, an explanation for the different corporeal trajectories between anglophone and non-anglophone academics thus requires further investigation.

Conceptually, I have proposed the notion double-being, double-thinking (developed after Thomson 2014) to advance academic debates in geographies of higher education and mobility studies. This original contribution engages with Latour’s (1987) network-building approach, usefully conceptualising academic mobility, the cumulative stockpiling of resources (e.g., new ways of thinking), and transnational networks (also see Jöns 2007, 2009, 2015). The double-being, double-thinking binary represents a strategy for conceptualising the disparate knowledge environments that migrant academics astride, outlining a new research perspective with which to categorise highly-skilled boundary-spanning individuals. The two conceptual categories sketch the migrant academics past and present educational settings, understood in the widest possible sense as UK and non-UK pedagogic environments. While the twofold argument may seem restrictive, the non-UK dyad is theorised as multidimensional, constituted by Jöns’s (2003) triadic understanding of academic mobility (especially important given interviewees’ differentiated mobilisation processes). This double-beingness – of being here and there – is useful for theorising the internationalisation of UK students through international faculty (and UK academics with international experience), for Scott (2015: S68) writes: “mobile academic staff […] are key carriers of scientific values, interpreters between different
cultures”. However, as Chapter 5 details the movement of knowledge for the purpose of higher education teaching and learning is fraught with contextual difficulties.

In practice, migrant academics face barriers to utilising and transferring overseas acquired pedagogic approaches and discipline-specific knowledge(s). Obstacles abound. Particularly apparent is inadequate reflexive capacities (Williams 2007a), this is accompanied by concerted efforts to disguise (Green and Myatt 2011), “camouflage” (Clifford and Henderson 2011: 115) or “overlook” (Jiang et al., 2010: 166) academic otherness. In considering these obstacles Jöns’s (2018) biographical paper demonstrating tensions between epistemic communities and knowledge transfer is exemplary in this regard, highlighting some of the factors which obstruct the integration of culturally-inflected learning behaviours, contexts, and topics. The proliferation of Anglophone audit cultures has created inequalities for those operating in languages other than English (Garcia-Roman 2003); as a consequence, the geographies of knowledge production are shaped along Anglo-American publication cultures, characterised by ongoing internationalisation and market-driven operations (Paasi 2005). These debates chime with a number of recent scholarly interventions that speak to the continued reticence towards “difference and diversity in […] knowledge production processes” (Noxolo 2017: 317; also see Esson et al., 2017; Radcliffe 2017; Esson 2018). However, bearing in mind these constraints, the thesis has shone a light on how some migrant academic staff were able to incorporate different ways of thinking into their teaching and learning practice, with a small number of examples highlighting innovative methodologies and changes to exam proforma (Chapter 5).

Analysing the incorporation of international ideas and concepts in teaching and learning practice is the focus of Chapter 6, to examine the impact of “foreignness as a teaching resource” (Alberts 2008: 198) on UK students taught by international faculty (Objective 2). Steered by my own transformative experiences of being taught by non-UK teachers and university lecturers – from primary school to postgraduate study – the narratives of undergraduate students in this dissertation run (largely) counter to my own. By interrogating some of the categories through which UK students measured their exposure to different others, an unsettling hue of viscerally-present institutional racism (Desai 2017) was captured. This unexpected discrimination leans towards perceived language capabilities rather than the use of different ways of thinking (because the student survey did not adequately deal with
this line of enquiry). However, I have also suggested that there are some sensitive parameters to this perspective that need to be unpacked, not least intersectional axes along ethnic lines that have impacted research findings in fruitful ways (especially in relation to past encounters and the ripple effect this can have on present encounters). First, Chapter 6 demonstrated how UK students with an ethnically diverse, non-white background are more positively inclined towards international faculty than white UK students. The key argument being that diversity accepts diversity (Ahmed 2012) more than the homogeneous white population. Second, students taught by non-UK teachers at school tended to be more tolerant of migrant academics at university, suggesting encounters with different others results in a changing of mindset (Wilson 2017). Third, survey responses provide support for the notion that being taught by international faculty may drive change in certain UK undergraduate learners through developing intercultural respect, stimulating open-mindedness, expanding horizons, and promoting tolerance of otherness. Here, the concept of (in-person) encounter is deemed integral to internationalising UK students through migrant academic staff. The study also points to the significant effects of an individual’s school type (state, independent or international) upon their encounter with non-UK faculty, underscoring a potentially useful avenue for future research on critical debates surrounding academic mobility and global citizenship (see Cranston forthcoming, for a discussion on how school type can influence student constructions around global citizenship).

By examining students’ internationalisation experience, we see a continuously evolving relationship between UK undergraduate students and their migrant lecturers. This is particularly evident in the context of the student’s university life-course, as research findings indicate respondents were more likely to exhibit greater levels of tolerance towards international faculty at the end of their degree programme than at the beginning. However, there are limitations to the transformative thesis outlined above, with evidence suggesting that exposure to migrant academic staff can also reinforce negative stereotypes and perspectives.

The third objective of the dissertation sought to assess to what extent UK universities recognise and support international faculty as a valuable resource in teaching and learning (Chapter 7). The analysis of seven qualitative interviews, which were conducted with eight senior management and professional development staff, brought sharply into focus the neoliberal corporatisation of the university (Castree
and Sparke 2000). The recruitment of non-British academics (and international students) underpin the competitive objectives of the case-study institutions (doubtless linked to the Research Excellence Framework and knowledge economy). Such competitive ordering placed greater emphasis on economic imperatives rather than the internationalisation agenda, positively presented here as developing interculturally sensitive practices and innovative pedagogies (Robson 2011). This is a stark omission, not least because of the recent (and continuing) rise in the number of migrant academics (Universities UK International 2017a; Marini 2018) and the proliferation of policy discourses valorising internationalisation ‘at home’ (e.g., European Commission 2013a; Higher Education Academy 2014; Nuffic 2014). At the time of the interviews, the case-study universities only cursorily capitalised on migrant academics’ pedagogical approaches and intercultural experiences and therefore points to the need for further progressive debates about how best to mobilise and support international best practice (Willis and Hammond 2014).

Exclusionary urges expressed towards non-UK pedagogic acquired ideas and knowledge(s) raises crucial questions about inclusivity and whose knowledge counts. Indeed, throughout this thesis, I, too, have perpetuated binary divisions between ‘UK academics’ and ‘non-UK academics’. In truth, both groups can serve as a “resource of internationally-informed and innovative pedagogic practice” (Minocha et al., 2018:13), whether that is through graduate education abroad, sabbatical at overseas campuses, conference attendance or guest lectures. Vital here too is Scott’s (2015) spectrum understanding of academic mobility, for he states “all academics are now both ‘local’ and ‘global’” (p. S68).

In light of this, I return to the classification used to categorise international faculty and the constraints this criterion has had on research findings. By narrowing the focus of study to tenured academics on secure, full-time salaried contracts, the dissertation reflects a partial and partisan representation of academic mobility, knowledge transfer, and internationalisation. The study is over-reliant on white, male academics; further, the voices of faculty members on teaching, part-time and/or precarious contracts are silenced. Nor does the study offer a comprehensive survey of every migrant academic in the participating institutions. The dissertation is partisan, in that it is shaped by my own positive encounters with migrant academics, the ideas and influences of my supervisory committee (both migrants), and the research participants who chose to opt-in. Despite these caveats, the dissertation
contributes in important ways to geographies of higher education and migration studies. The use of travelling theory (Said 1983) and centres of calculation (Latour 1987) to frame the thesis has offered purchase on questions of postcolonialism, romanticism, and knowledge transfer; specifically, how continued patterns of inequality and prejudice characterise the experiences of non-UK academics in contemporary British higher education. Here, I have illustrated that whilst imagined as a space for career progression - the realities of working in research-intensive UK institutions are more complex, with respondents citing gender, age, epistemic communities, language skills, and different styles of thought as barriers to participating in institutional academic discourses. This highlights some of the challenges of internationalising UK students through migrant academic staff. Despite this, I argue strongly that international faculty are well-placed to improve students’ internationalisation experience and thus the need for policymakers to interrogate these connections is pressing.

8.3 Policy recommendations
Informed by such findings, I propose eight policy recommendations for the attention of senior management and professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching. As a set of policy initiatives, these empirically-based suggestions may be of use to British higher education more generally. However, bearing in mind these findings are anchored to research-intensive universities, recommendations might not reflect the specific needs of teaching-centred institutions. Effective dissemination would involve working collaboratively with the Teaching Centre and the Students’ Union. Team-working with professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching will provide an opportunity to explore how research findings align with current institutional policy and practice and, most importantly, how best to convert empirical evidence into actionable outputs. Where appropriate, a knowledge café (Gurteen WWW) could be organised to encourage productive discussions around the capturing, innovating and sharing of best academic practice at all institutional levels (academics, professional development staff, and senior management). Knowledge cafés can bring together different ways of thinking and may stimulate inclusive conversations about ‘living with difference’ (Valentine 2008). A key feature of these

27 To recap, the Teaching Centre is an assumed department to safeguard the anonymity of the participating institutions.
collaborative relationships are the dual efforts of both leadership committees and academic staff. In this way, institutions with a strategic interest in internationalisation would be better placed to capitalise on the international perspectives of a diverse academic workforce.

**Recommendation 1: Harnessing international best practices**

What this thesis has unequivocally highlighted is the pressing need for closer working relationships between professional development staff with a strategic role in teaching and academic members of staff. Given the case-study universities' cursory attempts to capitalise on migrant academics' overseas experiences, this much-needed recommendation has four components:

1. To convene a process that gathers together the diverse contribution that international staff make to the institution and, where appropriate, post and regularly update this information via the local intranet or disseminate at in-house Teaching Centre conferences.

2. Explore the role of doctoral candidates in internationalising the curriculum.

3. Establish pedagogical seminars, to sit alongside existing weekly research seminars. Visiting academics, in particular, can provide an opportunity to stimulate exciting conversations about different academic perspectives.

4. Encourage all academic staff to inform the Teaching Centre of overseas sabbaticals, so that any new concepts, practices, and innovations can be collated and shared across the university. On the staff members return, and if applicable, organise a workshop or seminar to capture and harness this new knowledge. Whilst overseas, and where appropriate, use information technology to link knowledge environments to encourage the sharing of best practice and to capitalise on the expertise of local academic staff.

**Recommendation 2: Support mechanisms**

One of the key outcomes of this study is a realisation by the case-study universities that there is a need to benefit from the different insights migrant academics can provide in terms of research, teaching, and enterprise. Much more than that, this dissertation has highlighted the emotional challenges associated with knowledge transfer and underscores the need for appropriate training or professional development for those unfamiliar with the idiosyncrasies of British higher education (*Chapter 4 and Chapter 5*; see also Pherali 2012; Rao and Hosein 2018). In light of this, I wish to suggest the following initiatives:
1. Develop links between the Teaching Centre and the institution’s International Staff support and well-being group, for example, convening bi-annual meetings to discuss appropriate career and/or training development courses sensitive to the needs of migrant academics.

2. Create space on Academic Senate for an International Staff Group committee member, any issues concerning the group can then be raised directly with senior management. This will enhance the diversity of leadership committees.

3. Applicable to all new starters, department heads and/or mentors should devise, in collaboration with their workforce, a personalised academic calendar. Here, important dates and marking deadlines are known and thus can be prepared for in advance, rather than having a “sequence of surprises” that may cause stress and anxiety.

4. Where appropriate, migrant academics should be assigned a non-academic mentor whose primary role is to provide guidance and support to those transitioning to life in another country. A thoughtfully chosen mentor can provide answers to questions such as how to convert a foreign driving licence; how and where to purchase a television licence; and where to shop for groceries (all of which were raised during my interviews with migrant academic members staff). Importantly, the mentor can be interdisciplinary, fostering relationships across university campuses.

8.4 Future research avenues
Avenues for future research have been posited throughout this thesis, not least in Chapter 6 where there is potential to interrogate further students’ consumption of international learning from a qualitative perspective. A focus on international, state and public schools could also be of particular relevance. For example, it could look at students’ encounter with otherness at school and the ripple effects this has at university. There is also scope to examine internationalisation ‘at home’ in different educational spaces, for example, at post-1992 and 2000s universities, as well as higher education colleges. In the following, two additional research directions are discussed.
Proposal 1: British higher education and Brexit

It’s going to have a huge impact [the Brexit referendum]. I mean my son is British now, my daughter is Spanish, my partner is German and I have a Spanish passport. I mean what are we going to do here? I mean they have to do something for the people who are already established here unless it will be a mess. But I don’t think they [the United Kingdom] can leave the EU.

Senior Lecturer, Female, PhD from Belgium
January 2015

While undertaking this research, the United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union.\(^{28}\) The vote to leave the European Union has “caused great consternation in higher education (HE) circles” (Mayhew 2017: S155). Looking to the future then, there is considerable scope for geographers to examine the referendum’s potential consequences, for example, migration and academic mobility; the knowledge economy; transnational family dynamics; institutional support mechanisms; as well as the re-imagined romanticism of working in British higher education.

Proposal 2: Academic mobility, knowledge transfer, and emotions

The concept of emotions emerged from interviews with migrant academic staff; it was not originally considered for integration into the research project. However, it provides a possible research avenue following Kenway and Fahey (2011; see also Jöns et al., 2015) in studying the relationship between globalisation, academic mobility, and emotions (specially, how emotions can shape knowledge transfer in higher education teaching and learning).

In conclusion, as higher education around the world becomes more internationalised, so the value of producing globally-ready graduates (Hunter et al., 2006) who can act as “agents of social good” (Bowden et al., 2000, cited in Hughes and Barrie 2010: 325) has increased. In its empirical and conceptual contributions, the dissertation has shown some of the ways in which knowledge transfer through migrant academic staff is problematised. I have particularly focused on the international parameters of education set within a UK context of higher learning; framing discussions around the mobility of international faculty and the assumed ‘immobility’ of undergraduate

\(^{28}\) Interviews were conducted in 2014-15 a minimum of 12 months prior to the EU referendum, which took place 23 June 2016.
students. By applying a mobilities perspective, fresh approaches to understanding international education have been posited (specifically, in relation to the role of migrant academic staff to internationalisation processes ‘at home’). For example, I have illustrated how the mobility of pedagogy and ideas (Williams 2006, 2007a) and institutional environments are inextricably linked components in internationalising higher education. The desirability of certain knowledges (Chapter 5) highlights the dominance of Anglo-American research cultures and draws upon continuing colonial and post-colonial scenarios of hierarchy and inequality. Here, I draw upon Raghuram’s (2013) recent intervention, which calls upon migration theorists to “take account of the spatialities of knowledge” (p. 138) as the basis for analysing the mobility and circulation of people. This research new perspective, therefore, may help foster a better understanding of the relationship between mobility, knowledge transfer, and internationalisation.
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Appendix A – Online student survey

Student Learning Experience Survey

Research into student perceptions of being taught by non-UK academic staff

You are invited to take part in a feedback survey examining student perceptions of being taught by non-UK academic staff. The survey is part of an ongoing doctoral project conducted by Natalie Tebbit in the Department of Geography.

Your responses will be kept completely confidential, treated anonymously and stored on a password protected computer. No identifiable data will be collected. The survey should take no longer than 10 minutes and is completely voluntary.

Information gained from the survey will be used to write Natalie’s PhD thesis, journal articles, book chapters and policy-relevant documents. By taking part in the survey, your involvement could provide the Higher education sector with valuable information for use in discussions on learning, teaching and the student experience.

If you have any questions regarding your involvement, please do not hesitate to contact Natalie on N.Tebbit@hboro.ac.uk

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Definition: Non-UK academic staff

Non-UK academic staff are defined in this study as those who received their university education abroad and whose country of citizenship is outside of the UK.

The survey consists of 22 questions. To progress through the survey click on the Next button at the bottom of each page.
### Section A: Identifying non-UK academic staff

1. Are you aware of any non-UK academic staff in your department? (please tick one option)
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Not sure

2. How would you identify non-UK academic staff in your department / School? (please tick all options that apply)
   - [ ] Academic staff's name
   - [ ] Academic staff's accent
   - [ ] Information received from academic staff themselves
   - [ ] Information received from other academic staff
   - [ ] Information received from other students
   - [ ] Other

2a. If you selected Other, please specify:

```markdown

```
3. How many non-UK academic staff have taught you during your time at this university? (please tick one option)

- 0
- 1-2
- 3-4
- 4+
- Not sure

4. Were you taught by non-UK teachers before attending this university? (please tick all options that apply)

- Yes, in the UK
- Yes, overseas
- No
- Not sure

Section B: Learning experience at this university

5. Is the teaching style of non-UK academic staff different from UK academic staff in regards to the following aspects of your learning experience? (please tick one option per line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall teaching style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture / seminar structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff-student interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication of course content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturing style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of case study examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework / assignment instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on coursework / assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral and personal support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Do you think non-UK academic staff's accent has had an impact on the following aspects of your learning experience? (Please tick one option per line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes, positive</th>
<th>No difference</th>
<th>Yes, negative</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall learning experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff-student interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication of course content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework / assignment instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on coursework / assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral and personal support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Which group of academic staff do you feel you have gained more from in regards to the following aspects? (Please tick one option per line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-UK academic staff</th>
<th>UK academic staff</th>
<th>Equal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall learning experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of subject-specific content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural respect and understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global outlook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section C: Global outlook and intercultural understanding

10. Please indicate on the scale below to what extent your degree programme is preparing you for the global job market: (please tick one option, ranging from 5 [very much] to 1 [not at all])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Which group of academic staff do you prefer to be taught by? (please tick one option)

- Non-UK academic staff
- UK academic staff
- No preference

9. Has your perception of being taught by non-UK academic staff changed during your time at this university? (please tick one option)

- Yes, it has positively changed
- Yes, it has negatively changed
- No, it has not changed
- Not sure
11. Please indicate on the scale below to what extent your degree programme has helped you develop intercultural respect and understanding: (please tick one option, ranging from 5 [very much] to 1 [not at all])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Please rate on the scale below how your department / School / university encourages you to network with staff and students from other cultural and national contexts: (please tick one option, ranging from 5 [very much] to 1 [not at all])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Section D: Personal Details

13. What is your current year of study? (please tick one option)

- 2
- 3
- 4

14. Which University School are you attached to? (please select one option)

15. What academic department are you in? (optional)
16. **What is your gender?** (please tick one option)
- Female
- Male

17. **Age** (please select one option)

18. **What is your student status?** (please tick one option)
- UK student
- International EU student
- International non-EU student
19. During your time at this university, have you participated in any of the following activities for at least one semester? (please tick all options that apply)

- Yes, Erasmus study abroad
- Yes, Erasmus work experience placement abroad
- Yes, other international study abroad
- Yes, other international work experience placement abroad
- Yes, work experience placement in the UK
- Yes, volunteering overseas
- Yes, volunteering in the UK
- No

20. Have you lived outside of the UK for more than three consecutive months prior to attending this university? (please tick one option)

- Yes
- No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Please state what you consider your ethnic origin to be (please tick one option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Asian British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African/Caribbean/Black British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed/multiple ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.a</td>
<td>If you selected Other, please specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Blank space]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Do you have any other comments?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey completed

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey.

Key for selection options

14 - Which University School are you attached to? (please select one option)

School names have been removed to protect the identity of the case-study university

17 - Age (please select one option)
18-21
22-31
32-41
42-51
52-61
62+
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