



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Caldwell, Elizabeth F. and Gregory, Jodi

Internationalizing the Art School: What part does the studio have to play?

Original Citation

Caldwell, Elizabeth F. and Gregory, Jodi (2016) Internationalizing the Art School: What part does the studio have to play? *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education*. ISSN 1474-273X (In Press)

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/27365/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

Internationalizing the Art School: What part does the studio have to play?

Abstract

Art, Design and Architecture (ADA) education has a number of distinctive features, including the use of the studio as a locus for an interactive approach to teaching and learning. This article explores the concept of 'internationalization' and uses it as a basis to explore the pedagogies found in ADA from an intercultural perspective. The study involved staff and international students participating in focus groups and workshop events to share their experiences of teaching and learning in ADA. We found that ADA pedagogies provide a number of specific opportunities and challenges for internationalization. Positive aspects include the social nature of the studio facilitating the development of independent learning and critical skills. However, issues raised were the lack of value placed on the development of IT/technical skills and language proficiency. We suggest that there is much that ADA pedagogies have to offer the debate on internationalization.

Key Words: internationalization, international students, pedagogy, Art, Design, Architecture

Introduction

As 'internationalization' has become a persistent word in higher education, it has also become a significant area of research. Brown (2000) described internationalization as a 'wooly concept' and still, over a decade later, it appears that internationalization is understood differently amongst those working in higher education (Jones & De Wit, 2012). Nilsson (2003:36) presented an 'internationalization at home' agenda, arguing that all staff and students ought to develop their 'international and intercultural competence', and also emphasized the importance of analyzing the curriculum and taking 'action-oriented measures'. In relation to the content of taught courses, Leask (2009: 209) describes internationalization of the curriculum as: 'The incorporation of an international and intercultural dimension into the content of the curriculum as well as the teaching and learning arrangements and support services of a programme of study.'

Harrison and Peacock (2010:878) describe two significant hurdles in implementing an agenda for internationalization at home: 'the integration of international students and the intercultural development of home students'. They further suggest that the intercultural development of staff is a priority along with practising intercultural communication and cultivating a sense of responsibility amongst staff and students to become more globally aware. According to Chen and Starosta (1988:30), intercultural awareness is about understanding, from our own cultural perspective that we are 'cultural beings, and to use this understanding as a foundation to further figure out the distinct characteristics of other cultures in order to effectively interpret the behaviour of others in intercultural interactions'. As such, it has been suggested that the collaborative fostering of intercultural awareness is the necessary first step towards developing an internationalized curriculum (Leask, 2013).

According to Stohl (2007:368) 'if we want to internationalize the university, we have to internationalize the faculty'. Yet as Leask (2013:104) points out, many academics are unclear

about what internationalization means ‘and/or do not think it has anything to do with them’. In some disciplines, this is due to a lack of contact with international viewpoints (Bartell 2003) and, so far, few international students. In other cases, staff do not feel that their curriculum needs internationalizing as they view it to be culturally neutral (Clifford, 2009). Clifford (2009:133) found that academics from ‘hard pure’ disciplines, such as science were resistant to engaging with the concept of internationalization, whereas staff from the Arts ‘recognized the effects of the contextualization of knowledge and the need to consider the future multi-cultural work environments of their students’. However, Barham (2010) found considerable resistance to internationalization among staff at one art school.

Compared to other subject areas, there is as yet only a small amount of literature surrounding the general concept of internationalization within the disciplines of art, design and architecture. This is despite the fact that according to the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA 2015), 40% of all students enrolled on courses in the UK studying ‘Creative Arts & Design’ and ‘Architecture, Building & Planning’ in the year 2013-14 were international students, which amounts to an increase of 50% in the past ten years. Watt and Mandhar (2008:3) highlight the need for architecture graduates to have ‘cross-cultural skills, attitudes and competencies’ in order to compete in a global architectural arena. Sovic and Blythman (2006:1) point out that this can be developed through ‘work with home students to raise awareness that they too are joining a global world of employment’. This builds on the previous work of Trathen (2004) who points out that by drawing on the cultural heritage of international students, domestic architecture students can start to explore what it means to be a global citizen. Sovic (2008) conducted a large scale study of first year, international students on a variety of Art and Design courses and found that they expressed surprise at the emphasis on process rather than product, and were challenged by the demands for originality and independent learning.

Interestingly, Sovic (2008)’s study, like many studies of international students, involved first year students and there are few studies that go beyond a focus on adjusting to the initial phase of university life, to explore how students go on to successfully operate within UKHE. Literature on adapting to living abroad often denotes a number of stages of the transition, that occur between leaving the home country and being able to successfully navigate and survive in the culture of the new place (Bridges, 2003). Nortier (1995) argues that this process is unique to the individual, and so the time that it takes also varies from person to person. For students adjusting to studying in the UK, there is an additional consideration in that is often difficult to tell the level at which they are performing across the course until the end academic year, when all the assessments have been marked. As such, there is likely to be a difference between the attitudes and experiences that first year students report, and those of students further along their courses, who have had more time to adapt, acclimatise and reflect on the transition.

In this article, rather than focusing on globalizing our ‘home’ students, we have used the concepts of internationalization and intercultural awareness to help us to reflect on our curriculum and pedagogies, from the perspectives of international students. This stems from a wish to better support international students to succeed in UK Art Schools as well as to investigate the extent to which our academic traditions are appropriate in the globalized world of the 21st century.

Pedagogies in Art, Design and Architecture

In order to assess the potential for internationalization in ADA, it is necessary to examine some of the key features of its distinctive mode of delivery. For the purposes of this discussion, we are considering the pedagogies of ADA together to enable us to form a picture of the common features of these disciplines, as compared to the 'lecture and reading list' model of higher education traditionally found in many other disciplines (Smith and Webster 1997). Sims and Shreeve (2012) outline the key features of the signature pedagogies in Art and Design as being located in the environment of the studio, where learning, dialogue and critique occurs both formally and informally between teacher and students. To guide the learning activities, the students are presented with briefs and, particularly in the UK, tutors require the student to make explicit the process of developing their ideas to answer the brief, through discussion and documentation (for example in a sketchbook or research file) (Sovic 2008).

Art and design pedagogies have been described as 'pedagogies of ambiguity' as the creative process is individual and so teachers cannot provide direct instructions to students about what they should do (Austerlitz et al 2008). As Sims and Shreeve (2012: 59) describe: 'the outcome is unique to the person creating the work, and the teacher is trying to bring this creativity forth from the student, enabling rather than instructing'. As such the art and design signature pedagogies have been described as student-centred, where the student is an active agent in the learning environment, co-producing and co-constructing the curriculum (Orr, Yorke and Blair, 2014).

At first glance, encapsulated within these pedagogies are a number of areas which could pose problems for international students. Dineen and Collins (2005:46) suggest that the teaching of the creative arts in the UK aims to 'encourage student responsibility through ownership, trust and low levels of authoritarianism... and [provide] opportunities for independent learning'. However, as Frimodig (cited in Richards and Finnigan 2015:12) points out, international students, 'do not automatically connect with a western, and especially Anglo-centric, individualistic intellectual heritage', as their previous education may have emphasized and rewarded different behaviours, such as rote-learning and high degrees of respect for authority (Scudamore 2013). Interestingly, proficiency in English or coming from a highly individualistic culture does not remove the challenges as there is significant adjustment to studying in the UK in academic terms for both native and near native speakers of English, such as those from USA and some African countries (Sovic 2008, Hyams-Ssekasi et al 2014).

Much of the literature exposing the issues international students, have with adjusting to studying in the UK, would predict that the emphasis on the individual creative process and the 'pedagogies of ambiguity' found in art and design, would be problematic for international students, as they are often said to prefer clear, unambiguous directions, and for assumptions to be made explicit (Carroll 2002, Carroll and Ryan 2005). However, the number of international students studying art and design in the UK are increasing year on year and home students are also 'initially bewildered' (Orr, Yorke and Blair 2014: 34) and puzzled by the lack of formal methods for teaching art and design (Akalin and Sezal 2009:20). So if, as Sims and Shreeve (2012: 57) argue, 'the most significant issue for undergraduates in art and design is the need to

cope with uncertainty, ambiguity, and the unknown', what is enabling both home and international students to do this?

According to Archer et al (2010), one of the key aspects of the academic experience that international students frequently report dissatisfaction with is the ability to get time with academic staff when they need it. In contrast to the experience of students on courses delivered primarily through the lecture and reading list model, the delivery model in ADA, via the studio, provides 'individual attention...[and] narrow[s] the gap between the teacher and the learner' (Dineen and Collins 2005:46). Harley et al (2008: 168) argue that to internationalize the curriculum in higher education, there is a need for a "'Third Space": a generative, incorporative, dynamic, experimental space of mutuality and exchange'. The studio is an inherently social space where 'students learn to communicate, to critique and to respond to criticism, and to collaborate' (Akalin and Sezal 2009:16), and we suggest that this environment supports the development of students as they grapple with the uncertainty integral to their courses.

The studio model is not without its critics, at least in part for the large demands it places on universities for space and staff time (Dineen and Collins 2005, Swann 1986, Roberts 2005). In addition, Richards and Finnigan (2015) have raised issues for disabled students in terms of accessing to studios and equipment, and Roberts (2005) has pointed out that the physical demands of the long hours and 'all-nighters' that students sometimes spend in the studio are not possible for all students. It is also true that a studio learning experience is about more than the physical space and that the tutor's skill as a facilitator has a great influence of the degree of learning that goes on there (Roberts 2005, Orr, Yorke, Blair 2014). As a student in Sovic's (2008:21) study describes, discrimination can also occur 'His/her treatment toward students is different [...] for British students, he/she often approaches them and looks at their works and speaks to them, whereas for Asian students, he/she just walks past us without any words.'

Through the use of the studio as a learning space and project based learning, Richards and Finnigan (2015: 4) suggest that art and design 'already caters for difference' and has many of the hallmarks of an inclusive pedagogy. However, in practice certain cultures and classes hold more cultural capital than others, and this is reflected in tastes and in responses to students' art and design work (Burke & McManus 2009). Harley et al (2008) detail a case study on a Ghanaian fashion student designing a range of funeral wear, an unusual and unprofitable choice for a product range from a European perspective, but for which there is a viable market in Ghana. As Harley (2008: 178) points out:

With an international student, perceptions of design and cognitive skills can often be seen negatively, in that it does not appear to directly relate to the European skill set. Difference is often perceived as weakness i.e. a lack of ... skills, or perceived familiarity with our ways of 'doing things'.

Sovic (2008: 14) also found that students who have 'little knowledge of European history and cultural movements feel particularly disadvantaged' and one student in her study commented about the tutors that: 'Some of them may find our ideas are really odd since they don't really understand our cultural background and therefore may not accept what we have done'.

It seems that, in theory, the signature pedagogies of ADA that are located in the studio provide a number of opportunities as well as challenges for international students. This study aims to assess the extent to which the ADA signature pedagogies in practice aid or hinder international students in adjusting to university study. As such, in this article we consider the current practice of, and potential for, internationalization in a School of Art, Design and Architecture, from the perspectives of both staff and students.

Methodology

The starting point for this study was to explore the scope for internationalization by creating spaces where intercultural dialogue could take place (Nilsson, 2003; Harrison & Peacock, 2010; Leask, 2013). We wanted to hear from staff and students about their experiences of learning and teaching art, design and architecture from different cultural perspectives, in order to discover common themes that could help or hinder internationalization. This project sought to not only collect information from the participants, but also to provide a meaningful and transformative experience for those that took part. We hoped not to merely study our students and colleagues, but to provide a forum for an exchange of ideas, opinions and experiences which would make us all think more deeply about the cultural mix in which we find ourselves on campus (see Holliday 1999).

In total 21 staff and 14 students participated in the project. Whilst the total number of participants for the project was modest, the cultural mix of the school was reflected in the selection and there were representatives from all departmental areas (Art, Fashion and Textiles, 3D design and Architecture). All the participants were confident communicators in spoken English and language was not a significant barrier to communication in any of the phases of the project. As we were interested in intercultural awareness, for the purposes of this project we used a very broad definition of international student, to include any student who had spent the majority of their pre-university education outside of the UK. This included three students from EU countries, who are not be classified as international students by the institution (see Merrick 2012), and one student who qualified as a 'home' student, although they identified themselves more closely with other 'international' students of the same nationality, rather than British students.

All the students who took part were either in their second or final year of undergraduate studies, or postgraduate students, and were all under 25. We did not intend to only collect data from students who were not first years, but it is possible that our recruitment strategy for the project appealed to students who had been here longer, as we targeted students active in International Societies in the Students' Union as well as leaving promotional material in spaces that ADA students often use for project work. At the time that we were recruiting for the project, students new to the university may not have had time to engage in either of these activities, and so would not have been inclined to volunteer to take part.

We acknowledge that the small scale of our study does not allow for dividing up our participants, other than into staff and students. One other consideration we had in writing about the project was the need to protect the anonymity of participants. In contrast to other parts of the university, which have large cohorts of international students from the same country, in our school we have

a large number of cultures represented, but often only small numbers of international students in a class. As such, revealing additional detail about the courses that respondents were studying, would potentially leave them identifiable. A similar situation applies to the international staff who took part in the project, and for this reason we have not provided details of the country of origin for staff members.

The project was divided into three phases, and the first stage involved four focus groups with students and staff in order to discover the cultural issues surrounding teaching and learning within art, design and architecture curricula. Invites to the focus groups were sent out by email to international students who had previously engaged with Academic support, and also to staff who had experience of working with international students (See Table 1). The recordings of the focus groups were transcribed and then analyzed by identifying the recurrent themes that emerged.

< insert Table 1 here >

Table 1: Positions and home countries of participants in the project.

For the second phase of the project, a staff development session was designed around the most significant issues for teaching and learning that arose from the focus groups. All staff in the School were invited to attend, and of those that did participate all except one, had not taken part in the focus groups. Academic and technical staff worked in groups to discuss the themes from the focus groups and to share their related experiences. The discussions enabled further clarification and understanding of the areas raised in the focus groups, from the point of view of a wider pool of staff in the school.

Phase three involved a workshop event to bring staff and students together to engage in intercultural dialogue. The workshop involved nine staff and ten students, from different cultural backgrounds and different disciplines within the school (See Table 1). It is worth noting that although three academic staff attended the workshop, they were not responsible for teaching any of the students that were present. Clifford (2009) points out that it is important to highlight the importance of the holistic student experience in staff development sessions. We based our workshop on Gregory's (2014) holistic model of the student sojourn, which is divided into four domains: Adjustment, Interaction, Achievement and Exit (see Figure 1). This model was developed after reviewing recent literature about international students and aims to encapsulate key aspects of the student experience of studying abroad. Although the focus of the model is on students, the domains also involve input from, or interaction with, university staff. As such, we used the model as a framework for designing the range of activities for workshop participants and as a way to quickly illustrate the wider international student experience to staff that had less international experience.

<Insert Figure 1 here>

Figure 1: Gregory's (2014) Holistic Model of the Student Sojourn

Inspired by the 'World Café' framework (2009), the four domains of Gregory's (2014) model were made into separate 'stations' each with a number of discussion points and activities. At the

Adjustment station, participants responded to Oberg's (1960) model of culture shock through reflecting on a personal experience of relocating and drawing their own 'curve' to represent their emotional journey (see Figure 2). The interaction station involved participants sharing experiences of meeting people and making friends both inside and outside university. At the achievement section participants were asked about the different types of communication that occurred in class and they also had an intercultural group work scenario to discuss. The exit station activities involved reflecting on employability skills, considering future plans and discussing employment prospects in different countries.

<Insert Figure 2 here>

Figure 2: Group members' personal responses to models of culture shock at the 'adjustment' station (Oberg, 1960; Campbell, 2013)

In order to make sense of the information we had gathered from all the phases of the project, we reviewed all the material and identified the themes that arose. Although the study explored all four domains of Gregory's (2014) model, the area that provided the richest data was the discussions around teaching and learning, perhaps due to the number of staff that were involved in the project. Both the authors of this article have extensive experience of teaching and working with international students studying in a variety of different disciplines, and our early analysis showed that the ADA students were reporting relatively few difficulties with some areas of teaching and learning that are often cited as problematic for international students. Further analysis has allowed us to explore these unusual findings and this discussion is presented in the following section.

Opportunities for internationalization

As mentioned previously, we used the concept of internationalization as a basis for interrogating the ADA pedagogies from the perspective of international students. Several features of the current teaching and learning practices were found to have positive benefits for international students, as will be discussed in this section. These benefits included: the development of critical thinking skills, the studio environment facilitating communication between students and staff and the development of intellectual independence.

A dominant theme that emerged from the project was that the students recognized and valued the way that tutors interrogated their design decisions and encouraged them to critique their work and the work of others. Critical thinking is often an area that is cited as a problem for international students (Alexander, Argent & Spender 2008) and as one of our international lecturers explains: 'In China's culture you're not supposed to challenge the teacher's views' Despite this, the students in our study were comfortable with the concept of critical thinking and saw its value. In both the focus groups and the intercultural workshop, students recognized tutors' attempts to encourage asking questions and critiquing of each others' work. As one student describes:

It's not really challenging each other but when you saw someone having different [opinions] you will get a little bit of different knowledge from there [...] but if you want

every student to have your kind of concepts then everyone will do the same thing.
(Student 2)

Interestingly, Sovic (2008:13) found that the international students in her study did not appreciate the emphasis on this critical approach to design practice as she states: ‘What is clearly not coming across to these students is the specific pedagogical approach in the UK’. The students in our study are further along their academic careers than Sovic’s (2008) first year students and it could be argued that they have therefore had more time to absorb, reflect on and appreciate the critical approach demonstrated in the studio environment. In Sovic’s (2008) study, 141 first year international students were interviewed by co-national post-graduate students in their own language. In our small scale study all the students were second or final year undergraduate, or postgraduate, students and the focus groups and workshops were conducted in English by university staff. These differences in methods could go some way to explaining the contrasting findings, but we suggest that the fact that the students in our study seemed confident with critical thinking warrants further investigation. In many other disciplines final year, and even postgraduate, students are considered to have weak critical skills (Wallace and Wray 2006) and we suggest that what is different about the teaching and learning in ADA compared to other disciplines is the pedagogical approach of the ‘crit’, and the environment of the studio. These features foster critical thinking skills, by providing both a model where critique is explicit, and a safe space within which students can practise (Sims and Shreeve 2012). As one of our lecturers explains: ‘One thing that I think is really important [about critical thinking]...is talking out loud, thinking out loud, exploring arguments in a verbal way....’.

Not only does the studio provide a place for regular, verbal practice of critical thinking skills, it also provides an environment that students find supportive, and helps to break down barriers between staff and students (Richards and Finnigan 2015; Dineen and Collins, 2005). The staff in our study felt as though they had more opportunity to get to know their students than colleagues in other subject areas who teach through a lecture and reading list model (see Sipahioglu, 2012). The international students in the study described the atmosphere in the studio as “open” and that their teachers “feel like friends”. Although the students did acknowledge that for some the informality is strange at first, most soon felt that the staff were approachable: ‘...this year, we’re suddenly like ‘OK, just go and ask the tutor’, because we know, maybe no one [else]’s going to know the answer, just go and ask directly’ (Student 4). In this case, the studio environment is facilitating adaptation to the culture of UK higher education (UKHE) rather than fostering a diversity of cultural approaches to communication. However, it is also providing an avenue for students to be able to exploit the time they have with academic staff, which, as mentioned earlier, is a frequent area of dissatisfaction for international students (Archer et al 2010).

The students in our study also enjoyed the contrast to their own country’s education system and valued the independence that the UKHE system encourages. This independence is often articulated in the relatively open briefs that students are given, which allow them to interpret and explore aspects of their own choice creating a sense of agency (Orr, Yorke and Blair 2014). Student 2 commented: ‘I quite like the way that they teach because, like it’s far more free, but because you are not forced to do some work, you can do what you really like’ and another student pointed out that: ‘They’re actually asking what we want to do.’ (Student 7)

However, this can cause confusion for some students at the start of their courses. As one student explains:

In the first year we have 'Subjectivity' as our first project ever. So it just like, take something and then remake it, but you can take anything... it has so many different [possibilities] to that, and it is really confusing. (Student 1)

Sovic and Blythman (2006:1) suggest that: 'Arguably such privileging of ambiguity can be a particular issue for international students seeking anchors in a challenging and confusing world as they enter UK higher education... leading to a sense of anomie and other negative emotional responses.' Moreover, as mentioned earlier, it is not just international students that find the lack of formal teaching in design studios disorientating at first (Akalin and Sezal 2009; Orr, Yorke and Blair 2014).

Challenges for internationalization

The students had a range of issues relating to the culture of ADA education in the UK that they raised as challenging. The first of these points relates to aesthetic preferences in different countries. As one student explained, 'most of Hong Kong's famous designers and students are focus on Haute Couture and evening wear' (Student 14). This contrasts to the greater emphasis in the UK on retail fashion and every day wear. Sovic (2008) also found that fashion students in her study had to learn about UK trends and styles and that this was a challenging aspect of their studies. Another student in our study revealed the tension between an individual's creative style and producing an appropriate response to the local environment.

I design the buildings but my lecturer says they are 'International Style', you have to make localised, like UK kind of buildings. That was weird because I'm the one who designed it but you're trying to make your thinking into my building. (Student 2)

The Architecture lecturers in the staff development session pointed out that part of following the brief in architecture is responding to the local context. Similarly, Gross and Do (1997 p.2) describe:

Often [...] students imitate the style of fashionable architects without understanding the implications for users or the appropriateness for local context. And less experienced students view architectural design as an opportunity to express their inner creative urges, rather than as challenge to resolve a complex set of technical and social issues.

However, the student in our study clearly felt that he had internalised 'International Style' and that it had become part of his identity as a designer, rather than simply an approach that could be adopted at will. As such he felt a clash between his cultural heritage and what the tutors wanted and as such it could be said that his cultural capital had been delegitimised (Burke and McManus 2012: 21).

A number of students in our study felt that there was a lack of emphasis on their courses in developing technical skills: 'In our, ... culture, we have to learn the technical first, but in this

country we have to create it first' (Student 1). This difference in the relative importance of technical and IT skills could be argued to reflect the global division of labour between the technical skills found in parts of Asia and the conception and management of design projects in the USA (Tobesi 2001). Interestingly, the students in our study were all relatively young, and their opinions about the importance of technical skills had been gleaned from previous sub-degree level courses, and in some cases work experience. The students felt that they would like more emphasis on technical skills and were concerned about the impact that their absence would have on their employability. They also felt that the technical skills they developed in their own time, or in their own countries, were not valued:

Our lecturers emphasize on the hand drawing, because there's one of the lecturers saying 'Are you using computers to produce some work? It's not fair to the others'. But it's not fair to me as well because I know this kind of skill, I learnt it myself and then they say they say 'Oh you should use your hands to draw'. And I did use my hands to draw on the next assignment and I get better marks actually, if I use my hands to draw. (Student 2)

This is comparable to the international students in Sovic's (2008) study, who felt that the skills they brought to the course were undervalued. Interestingly, the academic staff in our study did recognize the technical skills of their international students, and one lecturer pointed out that, "Some of them are doing better digital art than UK students". However, the students clearly felt that their skills were not being acknowledged or recognized in the assessment process. This mismatch between the students' perception of the value of the skills they bring to their courses and what the course actually rewards is a challenge that can be addressed by being more explicit about the approach adopted in the UK. In addition, there may be potential to increase opportunities to gain industry recognized qualifications through the university, which could address the students concerns regarding employability.

Whilst many of the international students in our study had strong technical skills, many of them also cited language proficiency as issue which affected their studies and their ability to integrate with local students. As one student explains: 'The accent, I can't understand what they are saying sometimes'. Language was also inevitably a source of concern for the academic staff: 'English is not the supervisor's problem, or the subject area leader's problem. So whose problem is it?' Interestingly, the disciplines of ADA were found to use a large amount of discipline-specific jargon, both for teaching the practical and technical aspects of the courses such as pattern cutting and sewing, but also in terms of the more academic modules. One lecturer pointed out:

I think in art and design they're very concerned about not scaring off students when it comes to written/academic side of it, so they almost hide stuff. Like, there are a lot of dissertations that aren't called dissertations, there are a lot of essays that aren't called essays, they're called things like technical file and, you know, the technical module.

Similarly, a student in Sovic's (2008: 27) study mentions the language of assignment briefs as 'instead of being straight, is roundabout' and American students struggle with what tutors mean by 'design research' and 'journal'. A number of interventions could be used here to make the learning experience more transparent, such as providing a glossary of specialist terms, limiting the use of idiomatic language and being explicit in briefs (Valli et al., 2009). Whilst Architecture

and Fashion have a long tradition of attracting second language speakers, other subjects within in Art have relatively few international students. For staff with less international experience, there is clearly some development work and training needed to provide them with the skills to help them support these students. As Leask (2013) points out, even if staff do want to engage in internationalization, they may not have the knowledge, skills or experience to do so.

Conclusion

This study has used the concepts of internationalization and intercultural awareness as lenses with which to consider the pedagogies found in Art, Design and Architecture. By collecting the view of international students and current staff we have developed a picture of opportunities and challenges for internationalization within our current teaching and learning practices. The paucity of literature on internationalization in ADA also meant that we had to take a somewhat comparative stance by contrasting these disciplines to those more commonly considered in the context of internationalization. In doing so, we were able to perceive a number of important differences between the themes reported by our students and the often repeated stories that characterise so much of the discussion on teaching international students. It is often stated that international students struggle with the informality in UKHE as well as the emphasis on independence and critical thinking, but the students in our study had become comfortable with these aspects. However, our students did raise concerns about the lack of emphasis on technical and IT skills, and it is clear from discussions from both staff and students that, just as in any discipline, language difficulties are an important concern for all parties.

We suggest that a number of the most common issues that are cited for international students with adapting to the teaching in UK higher education are mitigated by the interactive nature of studio teaching. It is also worth noting that the studio can also provide a supportive environment for all students, and that its interactive nature has much potential for helping home students to increase their global awareness, which is an important goal of internationalization.

Whilst by no means a panacea, the studio environment has the potential to embody the characteristics of a 'Third Space', through the communicative, open dialogue that can take place there, and it certainly more easily engenders this than the constraints provided by a lecture theatre with stage, lectern and tiered, immovable seats for 200 students.

In tandem with the agenda for internationalization, is the drive for teaching larger numbers of students. As Swann (1986) points out, high levels of one-to-one teaching that often occur in studios is not sustainable in the face of rising student numbers. However, there is much that the studio can offer in terms of student centred, interactive, experiential and social learning which must be recognised before 'the pedagogic goose' is killed off (Dineen and Collins 2005: 42). Outside of ADA there is much discussion of the merits of the 'flipped classroom', where group work and problem based activities happen in the classroom, whereas curriculum content and theory is transmitted outside, for example through video lectures delivered online (Lage et al 2000). It could be argued that ADA pedagogies already embody the essential elements of this model and we would suggest that there is work to be done to analyse, and potentially rehabilitate, it in these terms. At the very least, the extensive experience in ADA of developing interactive education could be of interest to other disciplines.

Although our study was on a small scale, these findings at least give us some indication of where to look to explore in more detail how the ADA pedagogies may offer insights into internationalizing HE teaching and learning practices. Here, we have heard from international students and staff, but to cover the full range of aspects that internationalization entails, it would be useful to explore how the ADA pedagogies facilitate increasing the global and intercultural awareness of home students. Furthermore, we acknowledge that much of what we regard as positive about the ADA pedagogies in this study is related to facilitating the adjustment of international students to the culture of UKHE. However, there is scope for looking outside of our traditions in the UK and to consider whether there are practices that we may learn from in other cultures. For example, our international students raised the issue of the lack of emphasis on developing their technical expertise, and this is an area that could be looked at further, in light of the fact that our graduates will be competing in the global employment arena. Overall, we have found that there is much that ADA pedagogies have to offer the discussion of internationalizing our teaching and learning practices and we hope that further work in this area will deepen our understanding of the role that creative arts education plays in producing global citizens.

7551 words including references

References

Alexander, O., Argent, S. and Spencer, J. (2008), *EAP Essentials: A teacher's guide to principles and practice*. Reading: Garnet.

Akalin, A. & Sezal, I. (2009), 'The Importance of Conceptual and Concrete Modelling in Architectural Design Education', *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 28:1, pp. 14-24.

Archer, W. Jones, E. & Davison, J. (2010), *A UK Guide to Enhancing the International Student Experience*. UK Higher Education International Unit Research Series/6, https://www.academia.edu/2490093/A_UK_Guide_to_Enhancing_the_International_Student_Experience Accessed 4 May 2015.

Austerlitz, N., M. Blythman, Grive-White, A., Jones, B.A., Jones, C.A., Morgan, S, Orr, S., Shreeve, A. & Vaughn, S. (2008), 'Mind the Gap: expectations, ambiguity and pedagogy within art and design higher education', In L. Drew (Ed.) *The Student Experience in Art and Design: drivers for change*, Cambridge: GLAD/Jill Rogers Associates, pp. 125-48.

Barham, G. (2010), 'Blood in the easel: Reticence and resistance to internationalisation at a UK Art School', In, Centre for Curriculum Internationalisation, *Internationalisation of the curriculum for global citizenship: Policies, practices and pitfalls*. 17-18 June, Oxford Brookes University. https://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/cci/events/conf10/abstracts/gareth_barham.html Accessed 3 July 2015.

Bartell, M. (2003), 'Internationalisation of universities: A university culture-based framework', *Higher Education*, 45:1, pp. 43-70.

Bridges, W. (2003), *Managing transitions: Making the most of change* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press.

Brown, M. (2000), Do We Need a Strategic International Development Function in Universities? in Wisker (Ed.) *Good Practice Working with International Students* (Chapter 1) Birmingham: SEDA.

Burke, P. J. and McManus, J. (2009), *Art for a Few: Exclusion and Misrecognition in Art and Design HE Admissions*. London: National Arts Learning Network.

Campbell, Y. (2013), *The 4 Stages of Culture Shock* [Image]
<http://chroniclesofyoyo.com/2013/08/22/the-4-stages-of-culture-shock/> Accessed 07 March 2015.

Carroll, J. (2002). Suggestions for teaching international students more effectively, OCSLD, Oxford Brookes University,
http://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/ocsd/2_learnth/briefing_papers/international_students.pdf
Accessed 6 June 2015.

Carroll, J., and Ryan, J. (2005), *Teaching international students – Improving learning for all*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Chen, G. M., and Starosta, W. J. (1998), 'A review of the concept of intercultural awareness', *Human Communication*, 2, pp. 27-54.

Clifford, V. (2009), 'Engaging the disciplines in internationalising the curriculum'. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 14:2, pp. 133-143.

Dineen, R. & Collins, E. (2005), 'Killing the goose: conflicts between pedagogy and politics in the delivery of a creative education', *Journal of Art & Design Education*, 24:1, pp. 43–51.

Gregory, J. (2014), '*Towards a Holistic Model of the International Student Sojourn*'. MA Dissertation. Huddersfield: University of Huddersfield.

Gross, M.D. and Do, E.Y. (1997), 'The design studio approach: learning design in architecture education', In J. Kolodner & M. Guzdial (eds.) *Design Education Workshop*, Atlanta, September 8-9, EduTech/NSF, College of Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology,
depts.washington.edu/dmgftp/publications/pdfs/edutech97-eyd.pdf Accessed 11 September 2015.

Harley, A., James, S., Reid, E., Reid, S., Robinson, H. and Watson, Y. (2008), 'The Third Space: a paradigm for internationalization'. In L. Drew (ed) *The student experience in art and design higher education: drivers for change*. Cambridge: GLAD/Jill Rogers Associates, pp167-187.

Harrison, N. & Peacock, N. (2010) 'Cultural distance, mindfulness and passive xenophobia: using Integrated Threat Theory to explore home higher education students' perspectives on 'internationalisation at home' *British Educational Research Journal*, 36:6, pp. 877–902

Higher Education Statistics Agency (2015) *Non-UK domiciled undergraduate students by region of domicile 2013/14* www.hesa.ac.uk Accessed 16 July 2015.

Holliday, A. (1999), 'Small Cultures', *Applied Linguistics*, 20: 2, pp. 237-64.

Hyams-Ssekasi, D., Mushibwe, C. P. and Caldwell, E. F. (2014), 'International Education in the UK: The challenges of the Golden Opportunity for Black-African students'. *Sage Open*, 4: 4, pp. 1-13.

Jones, E. & de Wit, H. (2012) 'Globalization of internationalization: Thematic and regional reflections on a traditional concept', *AUDEM: The International Journal of Higher Education and Democracy*, 3, pp. 35-54.

Lage, M.J., Platt, G.J., & Treglia, M. (2000), 'Inverting the classroom: A gateway to creating an inclusive learning environment', *The Journal of Economic Education*, 31:1, pp. 30–43.

Leask, B. (2009) Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 13:2, pp. 205-21.

Leask, B. (2013) 'Internationalizing the Curriculum in the Disciplines—Imagining New Possibilities', *Journal of studies in International Education* , 17:2 pp. 103 - 118. DOI: 10.1177/1028315312475090

Merrick, B. (2012) 'Whose initiative? International student policy in the UK', in S. Sovic & M. Blythman (eds.), *International Students Negotiating Higher Education: Critical perspectives*, London: Routledge, pp. 28-38.

Nilsson, B. (2003) Internationalisation at Home From a Swedish Perspective: The Case of Malmö. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 7:1 27-40 DOI: 10.1177/1028315302250178

Nortier, F. (1995), 'A New angle on coping with change: Managing transition'. *Journal of Management Development*, 14: 4, pp. 32-46.

Oberg, K. (1960), 'Cultural Shock: Adjustment to New Environments', *Practical Anthropology*, 7, pp. 177-182.

Orr, S., Yorke, M. and Blair, B. (2014), "'The answer is brought about from within you": A Student Centred Perspective on Pedagogy in Art and Design', *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 33: 1, pp. 32-45.

Plymouth University (2012), *7 Steps to: Adopting Culturally Inclusive Teaching Practices*. <https://www.plymouth.ac.uk/your-university/teaching-and-learning/guidance-and-resources/7-step-series> Accessed 8 August 2015.

Richards, A. and Finnigan, T. (2015), *Embedding equality and diversity in the curriculum: an art and design practitioner's guide*. York: Higher Education Academy, <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/node/11103> Accessed 4 May 2015.

Roberts, A. (2005), 'Problem Based Learning in the design studio', *CEBE Transactions*, 1:2, pp. 1-3.

Scudamore, R. (2013), *Engaging home and international students: A guide for new lecturers*. York: Higher Education Academy, <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resource/engaging-home-and-international-students-guide-new-lecturers> Accessed 3 July 2015.

Sims, E. and Shreeve, A. (2012), 'Signature Pedagogies in Art and Design', In N. Chick, A. Haynie, and R. A. R. Gurung (eds) *Exploring More Signature Pedagogies: Approaches to Teaching Disciplinary Habits of Mind*. Stirling, Virginia: Stylus, pp. 55-67.

Sipahioglu, I. (2012), 'Opening the "black-box" of interior design education: The assessment of basic design project work', *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 51, pp. 420 – 426.

Sovic, S. (2008), *Lost in Transition? The International Students' Experience Project*, London: CLIP CETL <http://www.arts.ac.uk/clipcctl-internationalstudents.htm> Accessed 3 July 2015.

Sovic, S. & Blythman, M. (2006), *The International Students' Experience Project at UAL: Issues of Engagement for International Students in Art and Design*, York: Higher Education Academy, <http://www.adm.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/features/the-international-students2019-experience-project-at-ual-issues-of-engagement-for-international-students-in-art-and-design/> Accessed 6 July 2015.

Smith, A. & Webster, F. (1997), Conclusion: An Affirming Flame, in A. Smith, & F. Webster (eds) *The Postmodern University?* London : Society for Research into Higher Education, pp 99-113.

Stohl, M. (2007), 'We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade', *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, pp. 359-372.

Swann, C. (1986), 'Nellie is dead', *Designer*, 1:1, pp. 18–20.

Tobesi, P. (2001), 'A true south for design? The new international division of labour in architecture', *arg: architectural research quarterly*, 5:2, pp. 171 – 180.

Trathen, S (2004), 'Implementing internationalization into design education' In ACUADS (The Australian University of Art and Design Schools) *Art & design update: new policies – new opportunities*. Canberra, Australia, 23-25 September Australian National University, School of

Art, University of Canberra, Faculty of Design, Canberra Institute of Technology
acuads.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/trathen.pdf Accessed 3 July 2015.

Valli, Y., Brown, S., and Race, P. (2009), *Cultural Inclusivity: A Guide for Leeds Met Staff*.
Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University.
https://www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/publications/files/Cultural_inclusivity.pdf Accessed 3 July 2015.

Wallace, M. & A. Wray (2006) *Critical Reading and Writing for Postgraduates*. London: Sage.

Watt, K. & Mandhar, M. (2008) 'Internationisation of architectural education in the context of globalization', *Abacus* 3:1, pp. 1-16.

World Café. (2009). *Café Principles in Action* www.theworldcafe.com/know-how.htm Accessed 3 February 2015.