



Exploring Internationalisation and EDI: an open conversation

Journal:	<i>Equality, diversity and inclusion: An international journal</i>
Manuscript ID	EDI-11-2024-0545.R1
Manuscript Type:	Professional Insights
Keywords:	Internationalization, Higher education
Methodologies:	Critical

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Authors:

Giuliana Ferri, Maria Tsouroufli, Karolina Lendák-Kabók, Charikleia Tzanakou, Ramzi Merabet

Exploring Internationalisation and EDI: an open conversation

Introduction

This special issue creates a space for dialogue to critically examine unproblematised notions of internationalisation, mobility, global citizenship, and equity in higher education. Although seemingly neutral and innocuous, these notions operate to position international students and international academics within politicized binaries of indigeneity/alienation, nativism/foreign, natural/unnatural, local/global, instantiating them as inherently pathological subjects and subjects in the making. Far from being fixed, these binaries are always shifting, negotiated and contested in the daily experiences of transnational and intercultural lives and their associated projects of belonging and othering within and beyond the seemingly diverse spaces of higher education institutions. In this concluding piece, we created an open forum and invited three of the contributors to the special issue to share their unique insights on two key questions, the first relating to their experiences of internationalisation and the second dedicated to the most pressing issues in the field. Through these inquiries, we aimed to provide a platform for these three contributors to further elaborate on their own voices and experiences in the field from their perspectives as international academics. The three contributors are Karolina Lendák-Kabók, Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad, Serbia; Charikleia Charoula Tzanakou, Reader in Human Resource Management (with a focus on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion) at Oxford Brookes University, UK; Ramzi Merabet, Lecturer in EAP and Intercultural Studies at University of Leeds, UK.

- 1. What draws you to research in internationalisation from an intercultural and EDI perspective? How does your international/migrant academic standpoint inform your exploration of this field?**

Karolina

I see it as an opportunity to explore how different cultural and social dynamics intersect and impact the experiences of individuals in diverse educational and social settings. I am particularly interested in understanding how intercultural communication and EDI principles shape the policies, practices, and lived realities within institutions, especially in the context of migration and internationalisation in higher education. From my standpoint as an international academic, my experiences have been shaped by navigating different cultural contexts, educational systems, and academic environments. This personal journey has provided me with a unique lens to explore how EDI and interculturality influence the integration, representation, and success of migrants and other minority groups in various settings.

My work aims to bridge theoretical insights with practical applications, contributing to more inclusive and equitable environments where diverse voices are valued and empowered. Being an academic from a region with complex ethnic and cultural dynamics, such as Vojvodina, Serbia, has further shaped my perspective. It has led me to focus on how ethnic diversity, identity, and gender intersect with social inequalities and integration challenges. This background enables me to bring a nuanced understanding of how global EDI frameworks can be adapted to local contexts, addressing both the challenges and potentials of diversity.

Charikleia

Having been a migrant myself, coming from Greece initially to pursue postgraduate studies and subsequently an academic career, and having worked abroad in two highly internationalised working places in the European University Association in Brussels and UK academic institutions, I think my experience has undoubtedly led to research questions around internationalisation from an intercultural perspective initially and subsequently EDI

1
2
3 perspective. From a personal development perspective, working in international
4
5 environments has been an enriching experience, prompting me to critically reflect on my
6
7 own assumptions and beliefs, as well as to gain a deeper understanding of my positionality
8
9 as a researcher. Moreover, my standpoint as a migrant academic has further fuelled my
10
11 research curiosity, particularly in examining how internationalisation research can contribute
12
13 to a more nuanced understanding of the discourses and practices that may perpetuate
14
15 inequalities. By critically engaging with these issues, I aim to explore how such efforts can
16
17 challenge stereotypes and power dynamics, ultimately promoting a more inclusive approach
18
19 to internationalisation.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Ramzi**

27
28 My interest in researching internationalisation and interculturality is mainly influenced by the
29
30 desire to make higher education a more sustainable and fair space for everyone.
31
32

33 Unfortunately, research in the aforementioned areas is ripe with assumptions about what
34
35 makes a space international, who is responsible for that, and how the international subject,
36
37 who is mostly objectified in research and practice, should be looked at, framed, researched,
38
39 etc. This, I argue, creates an ossified space, where the other is always international,
40
41 eventually reinforcing a problematic domestic/foreign, or home/international binary. Instead
42
43 of taking this binary for granted and pursuing research that allegedly claims to look into
44
45 'international students' belonging, adaptation, integration, and several other themes that
46
47 assume that these individuals are in need of special treatment, support, or 'saving' at times, I
48
49 decided to question the taken-for-granted assumption that students are 'international'. What if
50
51 we think for a moment that students are labelled international, that the label is imposed on
52
53 them without any potential to challenge what the label assumes or indicates? Suddenly we
54
55 can realise that a substantial amount of current research has not even taken this assumption
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 into account, sometimes resulting in research that accommodates researchers' and their
4
5 respective institutions' objectives, without even critically exploring what one actually is.
6
7
8
9

10 Another important point to highlight, as also demonstrated throughout my paper, is the hardly
11
12 disputed fact that the label facilitates a plethora of forms of neoliberal exploitation, whereby
13
14 one's presumed, and mostly imagined, difference is mobilised to exploit them financially. If
15
16 we look at the way UK Higher Education Institutions generate income, we will notice a
17
18 worrying and increasingly normalised trend to use students labelled international to
19
20 compensate for any financial deficit, with some institutions' annual income showing a 50%
21
22 reliance on international student tuition. The label justifies the exploitative approach that we
23
24 adopt when dictating tuition fees. The impact of this neoliberal rationality is pervasive and
25
26 leads to the normalisation of neoliberalism in a HE setting. In fact, researchers themselves,
27
28 who are supposedly expected to approach this matter critically sometimes end up mobilising
29
30 a neoliberal mindset when referring to individuals' experiences. For example, I am currently
31
32 working on a paper that investigates belonging in HE and I was shocked to come across a
33
34 peer-reviewed paper that openly links the need to foster institutional belonging owing to the
35
36 financial benefits resulting from that.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Now, when does interculturality come into play in all of this? Interculturality is both the
46
47 cardinal sin and the only way forward in redefining our HE spaces and how they operate.
48
49 Assumptions that stem from a positivist understanding of interculturality and intercultural
50
51 competence have for decades framed otherness as a construct that exists beyond the national
52
53 border. This resulted in false assumptions about difference (who is different/alien/foreign,
54
55 etc.) and provided a ground for justifying differential treatment within and beyond HE
56
57 contexts. You can walk around any university campus in the UK to realise that leaflets,
58
59
60

1
2
3 posters, promotional materials, website contents, student union events, university strategies,
4
5 casual lunch discussions, and several other settings mobilise students/staff nationality as a
6
7 marker of an inherent difference, eventually neglecting the very obvious fact that difference
8
9 resides within and beyond the self, regardless of nationality, ethnicity, religion, gender, etc.
10
11 At this point, some readers would be arguing *'yes, but there are big differences that*
12
13 *distinguish individuals from different nationalities'*. The short response here is indeed, there
14
15 are big differences at the national level, but those are hardly useful means to understand the
16
17 complex trajectories of individual students. If I find it inappropriate, and indeed insulting, to
18
19 ask ChatGPT *'what are the Brits like?'* and then use that to paint every person I assume to be
20
21 British, then why is it difficult for key actors in HE spaces to part ways with this obsolete
22
23 mindset?
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Since interculturality is a double bind I believe we can mobilise it to reshape our HE spaces.
32
33 The keyword here, which I am currently researching, is 'space'. Who owns HE spaces? Are
34
35 we owners, equal owners? Who decides how the space operates? What's the purpose and the
36
37 long-term goal? Who is benefitting from this space? Does the space accommodate a
38
39 multiplicity of epistemological stances? Can we engage in fair and sustainable 'knowledging'
40
41 within this space? What do we assume about the inhabitants of this space? Are they
42
43 temporary visitors? Equal shareholders? Only when we are ready to question our assumptions
44
45 about our immediate HE spaces that we can fully understand how 'international' and other
46
47 labels are inhibiting one's choices and beings.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **2. What are the most pressing issues in exploring internationalisation and** 55 56 **intercultural communication in terms of research and/or EDI practice?**

57
58 **Karolina**
59
60

1
2
3 Exploring internationalisation and intercultural communication presents several pressing
4
5 issues in both research and EDI practice. These issues stem from the complex interplay of
6
7 cultural dynamics, power structures, and institutional frameworks that shape interactions in
8
9 international and multicultural settings. In my opinion the most challenging issues are the
10
11 following:
12
13

- 14
15
16
17 1. Understanding Power Dynamics and Cultural Hegemony: Research in
18
19 internationalisation and intercultural communication must critically examine the power
20
21 imbalances inherent in global interactions. This includes addressing how Western-
22
23 centric norms and values often dominate academic discourse and organizational
24
25 practices, which can marginalize non-Western perspectives. A more inclusive approach
26
27 requires deconstructing these hegemonic structures and fostering equitable dialogues
28
29 that genuinely integrate diverse voices.
30
31
32
- 33
34
35 2. Addressing Language Barriers and Inequities: Language plays a critical role in
36
37 intercultural communication. In academic settings, for instance, the predominance of
38
39 English as the lingua franca can create inequities, where non-native speakers face
40
41 additional challenges in expressing their ideas and gaining recognition. Research
42
43 needs to explore strategies for multilingual inclusion and the impacts of linguistic
44
45 hierarchies on knowledge production and dissemination.
46
47
48
- 49
50
51 3. Navigating Intersectionality in EDI Practice: Effective EDI practice requires an
52
53 intersectional approach that considers how race/ethnicity, gender, class, nationality, and
54
55 other identities intersect to shape individuals' experiences in international and
56
57 intercultural contexts. There is a need for research that highlights these complexities
58
59
60

1
2
3 and provides practical frameworks for organizations to develop policies that recognize
4
5 and address these intersecting identities.
6
7
8
9

- 10
11 4. Promoting Cultural Competence and Sensitivity: Research and practice must focus on
12 developing cultural competence and sensitivity among individuals and organizations.
13 This involves not only acquiring knowledge about different cultures but also
14 understanding the socio-historical contexts that shape intercultural interactions. EDI
15 initiatives should prioritize training programs that go beyond surface-level cultural
16 awareness to foster deeper empathy and understanding.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 5. Measuring the Impact of Internationalisation and EDI Initiatives: One of the key
27 challenges in both research and practice is developing robust metrics to assess the
28 effectiveness of internationalisation and EDI initiatives. This requires moving beyond
29 quantitative measures of diversity (e.g., the number of international students or
30 employees) to more qualitative assessments that capture the lived experiences of
31 diverse groups and the depth of intercultural engagement.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 6. Responding to Global Mobility and Changing Demographics: The increasing mobility
43 of people across borders due to globalization, migration, and international education
44 requires research that keeps pace with these demographic changes. This includes
45 understanding the evolving needs and challenges faced by international students,
46 scholars, and workers, as well as developing policies that support their integration and
47 success.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 7. Addressing Resistance and Backlash: Implementing intercultural and
4
5 internationalisation strategies often encounters resistance, both at the institutional
6
7 level and among individuals. Research should explore the roots of this resistance,
8
9 whether they are cultural, political, or economic, and develop strategies to overcome
10
11 them in a way that promotes constructive dialogue and mutual understanding.
12
13
14
15
16

17 Overall, advancing research and EDI practice in internationalisation and intercultural
18
19 communication demands a nuanced, intersectional, and context-sensitive approach that
20
21 addresses these pressing issues to foster truly inclusive and equitable environments.
22
23
24
25

26 **Charikleia**

27
28 One of the most critical areas for further exploration is the complexity of internationalisation
29
30 and its multifaceted impact on individuals, institutions, and the systems of knowledge
31
32 production in higher education and research. A deeper understanding is required of the
33
34 tensions and frictions that arise from discourses and experiences of internationalisation and
35
36 intercultural communication. Much of the existing discourse presents internationalisation in a
37
38 simplistic and idealised manner, often framed as a universal good where all participants are
39
40 presumed to benefit. However, this narrative obscures the fact that the operationalisation of
41
42 internationalisation, particularly through mechanisms such as mobility schemes and
43
44 international collaborations, often reinforces existing inequalities or generates new ones. For
45
46 instance, in a special issue (Tzanakou & Henderson, 2021), we problematised the binary of
47
48 academic mobility versus immobility, illustrating how international mobility is frequently
49
50 promoted as essential for career progression, networking, and knowledge exchange, without
51
52 adequately addressing issues of access or the hidden, ambivalent experiences and adverse
53
54 outcomes faced by mobile academics. Similarly, international collaborations, which are
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 incentivised by research funding structures, often perpetuate assumptions about knowledge
4
5 hierarchies between the Global North and South. These collaborations, far from challenging
6
7 entrenched power dynamics, can instead reinforce colonial legacies by imposing Westernised
8
9 norms and practices—such as approaches to equity, diversity, and inclusion, as discussed in
10
11 our paper in this special issue of EDI- on 'less advanced' higher education institutions. In
12
13 doing so, they fail to disrupt the existing hierarchies in knowledge production, thereby
14
15 sustaining the status quo.
16
17
18
19
20

21 Tzanakou, C., Henderson, E.F. Stuck and sticky in mobile academia: reconfiguring the
22
23 im/mobility binary. *High Educ* **82**, 685–693 (2021). [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00710-x)
24
25 00710-x
26
27
28
29

30 **Ramzi**

31
32
33 The main issue that comes to my mind when thinking about research and practices that focus
34
35 on internationalisation and interculturality is the lack of rigorous theoretical engagement with
36
37 the underpinnings of the terminologies, word choices, stances, and methodological
38
39 approaches used to research internationalisation and interculturality, and the type of research
40
41 that results from that. For example, a significant number of papers I read in contexts where
42
43 international students and their experiences are researched take the notions of culture and
44
45 interculturality at face value or make use of widely contested Hofstedian frameworks to link
46
47 one's nationality to their presumed culture and expected behaviours. This essentialist framing
48
49 ignores the complex and rich trajectories of individuals within an international setting and
50
51 organises their presumed differences, which serves to justify deficit narratives, imposed
52
53 homogenisations, and stereotypes.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Due to the afore highlighted doxas, EDI discourses and practices within institutional settings
4 are framed around narratives of difference. Instead of disrupting the formation of
5
6 homogenising categories and labels, research and practices end up reinforcing them while
7
8 assuming to have achieved some form of social or institutional justice. This is what I perceive
9
10 to be a common and increasingly pressing issue that needs to be addressed.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Conclusion**

18 **Giuliana and Maria**

19
20
21 In our editorial, we have highlighted social justice as one of the most pressing issues facing
22
23 internationalisation in HE. This seems to align with the reflections of three of the contributors
24
25 to this special issue. It is interesting that internationally mobile academics have answered the
26
27 call to publish their work in this special issue, and that their experiences seem to point at the
28
29 intersections of inequality that affect both students and academics in neoliberal, globalised
30
31 academia. From our perspective, the axes of inequality affecting students and academics
32
33 highlighted in the individual papers and in the reflections in this open forum, form the basis
34
35 for future research in the topic of internationalisation, interculturality and EDI. In particular,
36
37 we think that a broader discussion is needed that involves voices from wider geo-political
38
39 contexts, including Africa and Asia, in order to further explore and problematise the
40
41 implications of internationalisation in an increasingly fractured and unequal world. As a way
42
43 of concluding this special issue and this open forum, we would invite readers to engage with
44
45 the papers from a perspective that questions taken for granted assumptions on mobility and
46
47 equality, diversity and inclusion.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60