

# **Innovative Teaching and Learning in a Globalized Competitive Market**

Jamie P. Halsall and Michael Snowden

## **Abstract**

Higher education is a competitive market. Politicians of all political persuasions have diversified their views on higher education in recent years. Historically, universities have been perceived as knowledge exchange creators, producing graduates for the globalized economic world. During key social and economic crisis points in history, whether the financial crisis of 2008 or the COVID-19 pandemic, universities have played a pivotal role in providing support and innovation in a complex globalised world. Events such as these crises have forced universities to step up the quality of their research, teaching and learning. Students who attend universities today are customers who expect the highest levels of quality in teaching and learning. Students expect a clear, professional career development path into the job market. In response to the challenges presented by COVID-19, higher education requires educators to be responsive to the needs of the student community in an increasingly performance driven culture, ensuring that graduates of today have the skills and capabilities to respond to the challenges of tomorrow.

The authors of this chapter will critically explore the importance of higher education in a globalised world, examining the complexities of teaching and learning in a contemporary context. Throughout the chapter, the authors will present case-study evidence of teaching and learning in a virtual learning environment, and highlight best practice examples that can be used in the future. The authors will also illustrate how a distinct conceptual framework can enhance

and inform pedagogical practice that integrates society, the institution, and knowledge in order for higher education institutes to fulfil an effective role in delivering quality education that is fit for purpose. The discussions presented here foster earlier pedagogical research by the authors (see Snowden and Halsall, 2019; Halsall and Snowden, 2017).

### **Keywords**

Globalization, Higher Education, Marketization, Teaching and Learning, Quality, Virtual Learning Environment

### **Biographies**

**Jamie P. Halsall** is a Reader in Social Sciences in the School of Human and Health Sciences at the University of Huddersfield, UK. His research interests include communities, globalisation, higher education, social enterprise, public and social policy. Currently, Jamie is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts and a Chartered Geographer of the Royal Geographical Society, and was awarded Senior Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy in January 2017.

**Michael Snowden** is a senior lecturer in Mentoring Studies in the School of Human and Health Sciences at the University of Huddersfield. His research interests lie in the field of pedagogy, mentorship, social enterprise, curriculum enhancement, and learning. Michael is a regular speaker at national and international conferences concerned with the development of pedagogical strategies in various contexts.

## Introduction

“Universities have four vital contributions to make in helping the world deal with accelerating change and address the challenges that change creates.

They are the pillars of university impact in the modern world:

- Understanding and interpreting the process of change;
- Offering approaches that would harness the process of change for general benefit;
- Educating and training to high quality the specialist workers whose skills are necessary to address change properly;
- Creating a general intellectually engaging climate and culture across societies that promote the virtues of understanding and science.”

(Bryne and Clarke, 2020, p. 10)

As the above observation by Bryne and Clarke (2020) notes, higher education institutions are seen as contemporary establishments that move with the times. The university sector as a whole is innovative and multi-disciplinary, supporting many sectors across society. At the heart of a higher education establishment is the balance between: teaching, learning and research. This combination in its entirety develops knowledge exchange for society, as Murphy observes:

“Universities are defined by three great functions. One is to transmit knowledge in order to provide students with an understanding of the humanities, the sciences or the social sciences. The second function is to transmit knowledge in order to prepare students for a learned profession. The third and highest function of the

university is to create knowledge. The university thus is defined by the advancement as well as the transmission of knowledge.” (2015, p. 5)

With knowledge exchange there are various stakeholder complexities. In the higher education setting, there are many stakeholders who are involved, for example, students, academic staff, administrative staff and external agencies (e.g. private, public and third sector). This relationship compels close scrutiny of higher education and what can be offered to the learner. More than ever before, there are different metrics and variations of measuring in higher education institutions; this does differ from country to country, but there are globally recognised standards. Hence, this chapter is focused on why higher education, from a pedagogy perspective, is important in an ever competitive globalized world. The chapter is comprised into five parts. In part one, the authors critically appraise the way higher education has benefited from the processes of globalization. Moving on from the academic debates on globalization, part two provides an exploration of how higher education has become more flexible in the globalised market. Part three explores how universities have embraced online learning in the virtual world. In part four, the authors provide pedagogy best practice examples in teaching and learning in the COVID-19 environment. Finally, the author’s summaries the key points and suggest ways forward in post a COVID-19 world.

### **Internationalization of Higher Education**

When examining internationalization in higher education, globalization plays a central role. It is well documented that globalization has had a profound effect on higher education (see

Shahjahan and Edwards, 2021; Vaira, 2004; King et al, 2011; Chang 2006; Kwiek, 2001). Since the coming of the internet age, globalization has opened up higher education. From a theoretical perspective, there have been two distinct developments that have affected globalization: (1) Technology, and (2) Time-Space Compression. Evidently, technology, in the form of communications (i.e. computer, mobile phone, and tablet), has brought a new dimension to higher education. The ways students communicate can be virtually and online, and since the late 1990s, virtual learning environments have been embedded into curriculums in the higher education setting. Hence, this process has caused the world to shrink, meaning that, in other words “Time-Space Compression” has occurred (Leyshon, 1995). In this part of the chapter, the authors will examine the conceptualization of globalization, technology and higher education.

Understanding globalization is somewhat complex. Many scholars have acknowledged that there is no one clear definition (Xu and Halsall, 2018; de Sousa Santos, 2006; Kahler, 2004; Munck, 2002). However, at the centre of globalization there are four key aspects, which are: economic, political, cultural and social. One general definition of globalization is that the concept:

“refers to the growth of ties that span space. Since people can link up across wider spaces in many ways, that definition is generic. Businesses that sell their wares abroad, or missionaries eager to save souls, or migrants leaving home in search of opportunity are all globalizers. Globalization occurs in many fields, world society has many dimensions. The definitions therefore take a broad and inclusive view: globalization is not a single thing or force but rather a set of human actions that share a similar quality and point in the same direction.” (Lechner, 2009, p. 1)

Famous work by Held et al. (1999) notes that there are three schools of thought in globalization:

1. *The Hyperglobalist Thesis*

The view that “Globalization generally privileges an economic logic and, its neoliberal variant, celebrates the emergence of a single global market and the principles of global competitors as the harbingers of human progress.” (p. 3)

2. *The Sceptical Thesis*

The view that globalization “implies a perfect, integrated worldwide economy in which the ‘law of one price’ prevails, the historical evidence at best confirms only heightened levels of internationalization, that is, interactions between predominantly national economies.” (p. 5)

3. *The Transformationalist Thesis*

The transformationalist thesis: “is a conviction that, at the dawn of a new millennium, globalization is a central driving force behind the rapid social, political and economic changes that are reshaping modern societies and world order.” (p. 7)

In many respects, it would be true to say that the transformationalist thesis replicates the internationalization approach to higher education; this is because of the way both concepts embrace the new global agenda in higher education and how it has shaped social, political and economic changes. At the centre of these changes is education, as it mobilizes learning and thus creates knowledge and skills for the individual who is learning. Governments across the world

see education at primary, secondary, further and higher levels as a central process that can transform a country's economy in many industrial sectors. Here are two recent examples of this as an illustration from the UK and India:

*Government of the United Kingdom*

“Our reforms and investment in education and skills mean more children are leaving school better equipped for working life and there are more high quality apprenticeships. But there is much more to do to level up the skills of the entire nation. Not just to improve Britain's productivity, but to enable people to fulfil their potential.” (Conservative Party, p. 36)

*Government of India*

“Education plays a significant and remedial role in balancing the socio-economic fabric of the Country. Since citizens of India are its most valuable resource, our billion-strong nation needs the nurture and care in the form of basic education to achieve a better quality of life. This warrants an all-round development of our citizens, which can be achieved by building strong foundations in education.” (Ministry of Education, 2020)

Evidently, education as a whole, in policy terms, is a key driving force that configures and regenerates a country's economy much like the UK and India. Higher education establishments are seen to function in a way that contributes to the country's economic performance, as they open up potential in local, national and global contexts. Moreover, this

interwoven global education agenda has created a ‘global knowledge economy’, especially for higher education, and as de Wit and Altbach note:

“The global knowledge economy – the increasingly technology and science-based globalized set of economic relations that requires high levels of knowledge, skills, and sophisticated international relations – is the other development impacting tertiary education and internationalization this past half-century. Research-intensive universities play a particularly important part in the global knowledge economy. Not only do they educate top talent but, in most countries, they are also the main producers of basic research. Research universities are among the more internationally linked institutions. They have strong links with similar institutions around the globe, host international faculty and students, and in increasing numbers function in the global language of science and scholarship – English. Excellence initiatives to develop world-class universities are being implemented in countries all over the world”.

(2021, p. 31)

This global knowledge economy program stems from the higher education internationalization agenda. According to Soliman et al (2019), internationalization is a relatively new type of concept that has been around since the 1990s. Since then, there has been much academic debate on what internationalization means in the higher education sector (see Bamberger, 2019; Wihlborg and Robson, 2018). Overall, internationalization has been interpreted as an activity at a university level that encourages different stakeholders in the organization (i.e. Senior Managers, Academic Staff, Administrative Staff and Students) “to



develop connections with the world beyond their own country” (Yemini , 2015, p. 20). Hence, these internationalization connections can be established in different ways, such as:

1. By students having the opportunity to learn about other countries across the world in terms of being in a classroom or online. Technology has really enhanced this learning process using communication tools, such as computers, tablets and mobile phones. Institutions have invested in different virtual learning tools (e.g. Blackboard, Brightspace, Moodle, WebCT).
2. By the learner having the opportunity to undertake international field trips or study abroad, through which students can experience different types of learning and teaching approaches in the subject area they are studying.
3. Finally, from an institutional standpoint, global links can be established in international recruitment, whereby knowledge exchange can be developed in terms of academic research.

Having discussed the importance of internationalization in a globalization context, the chapter now moves on to examine how universities have embraced internationalization in higher education in terms of recruitment, research, and teaching and learning.

## **Opening Up the Higher Education Market**

The international agenda in higher education has created a new playing field (Altbach and Teichler, 2001). Universities have embraced internationalization, which is evident through their growth, partnerships and expansion. The growth side of higher education is best observed through the lens of recruitment at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. In the cases of Australia, Canada, the US and the UK, international recruitment is seen as having increased certain areas of income generation, as a result of international students paying international fees to pay to study outside their country of origin. Brown observes:

“there is a clear international trend towards introducing greater competition, including price competition, into the provision of student education and, as a quasi-market, into the supply of academic research” (2011, p. 20).

Furthermore, in line with the internationalized agenda, opportunities for students to apply for international scholarships are also increasingly available. These scholarships are funded through external agencies, such as: The British Council, Commonwealth Scholarship, ERASMUS, and universities offering student bursaries.

Moving on to partnerships, higher education institutions emphasizes on working together internationally across different countries. Institutions will arrange exchange programmes of staff and/or students from one institution to another. Before the exchange activity can occur, it is common for universities to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU is a

short, formal agreement among partners, presented in a document that expresses the relationship between the organizations, which indicates areas for development in terms of research, recruitment, exchanges, and teaching and learning. According to the University of Chicago:

“A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is a formal, written agreement between two or more parties that establishes a partnership. The University of Chicago has active MOUs with universities and institutions both in the United States and around the world. Each active MOU serves a specific purpose - visiting scholar exchanges, student exchanges, resource sharing, etc. - depending on the needs of the person or entity initiating the agreement. Please note that unless an MOU affirmatively states the parties do not intend to be legally bound by its terms, it will generally be considered a binding agreement.”

Other universities across the world have gone further than this by creating ‘offshore campuses’ or ‘overseas branch campuses’, which are located away from the institution’s main geographical base. The term which is commonly used is In countries such as Australia, the US and the UK, universities have set up new global campuses. A recent report by Kleibert et al, (2020) calculates that there are currently 487 offshore campuses; they are mainly situated in major urban cities across the world, such Dubai, which has 29 offshore campuses, Singapore (19), London and Doha (both at 12). Offshore campuses offer an “independent form of transnational education, which means that these offshore campuses have full control over campus development, curriculum, quality assurance and qualification” (Kleibert et al., 2020, p. 6). Students who want an international experience, but who cannot afford or do not want to travel

abroad due to personal circumstances, can study at these types of international hubs. This approach has two advantages. Firstly, the student can undergo an international experience, as many of the staff who teach them are from other countries across the world (Wilkins, 2020). Secondly, the learner can study at well-known higher education establishments and find employment in their country of residence (Kleibert et al., 2020). This phenomenon in higher education is an interesting one, which will further develop over time. Overall, the opening up of the higher education market at an international level has created new, diverse business opportunities for universities. As Foskett notes:

“Universities have been drawn into the global HE business through rising demand for international education and transnational education provision, and also through a view that all their students (home or overseas) should be exposed to an education that equips them as global citizens. Research increasingly addresses global issues (climate change, energy supply, international business) or seeks to develop technologies or products that impact on international markets, and universities actively seek international partners to prosecute these agendas. These dimensions of change have pushed universities towards a more entrepreneurial perspective in their operations, and have challenged the existing suite of skills of university leaders”.

(2011, p. 34)

As Forskett observes, universities have had to become more entrepreneurial. In many ways, the entrepreneurial perspective in higher education is driven by technological advances.

The chapter now moves on to explore the great importance of virtual learning in the internationalised global agenda.

### **Online Learning in the Global World**

Global education has been hit particularly hard by the COVID-19 pandemic. Data from UNESCO (2021) estimates that at the height of the pandemic 49.3% of the total globally enrolled learners (863 million) had lost learning and there were 114 country-wide closures of schools. Furthermore, Farnell et al. (2021) estimate in a recent report published on behalf of the European Commission that approximately 220 million registered university students globally have been affected due to the disruption caused by COVID-19. In an attempt to mitigate the adverse and disruptive effect on learning, educators across the globe have increasingly turned to on-line learning. Consequently, during the first two years of the COVID-19 pandemic, this mode of learning has seen an unprecedented rise in demand.

Singh and Thurman (2019) suggest that online learning is a multifarious concept characterized by ambiguity, confusion and lack of clarity when interpreting and applying the term in practice. This is in part due to the numerous and multifaceted approaches multifaceted approaches to online learning and its descriptors, with terms such as web-based learning, e-learning, blended learning, online education, online course, distance learning and MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) typically used interchangeably. For example, in a recent literature review exploring the term “on line” learning, Singh and Thurman (2019) identified 46 definitions. Consequently, students and scholars alike are becoming increasingly frustrated at

the confusion this lack of definition causes, when either applying appropriate pedagogy for curriculum design or, in the case of prospective students, seeking appropriate learning and education.

To ensure consistency and conceptual clarity, for the purpose of this chapter, the authors, drawing upon Singh and Thurman, propose that online learning is described as a learning experience that uses the internet in either a synchronous or asynchronous environment, where educators interact with students, and participation is not dependent on their presence within a physical space.

Online learning offers numerous benefits for students, such as accessibility, affordability, convenience and a potentially richer learning experience; it is well documented that these are key drivers that influence students decision-making when considering open learning. The motivation of attaining a degree that fits around family life, with reduced travel, accommodation costs, and being able to choose what and when to study are primary motivators for open learning study. Exploring motivation factors of students in the open learning context Simons et al. found that the key motivator for study is flexibility. Flexibility in the context of learning is best achieved when providers construct dynamic infrastructure, policies and practices that offer the broadest possible opportunities for successful student engagement and stakeholder belonging in higher education. (Davitt-Jones et al., 2017). Reflecting the findings of Simons et al. (2020), this flexibility is characterized by prioritising for what how, what, when and where they learn: the pace, place and mode of delivery. However, this requires a shift in power, challenging traditional higher education hierarchies (Snowden and Halsall, 2017) with a resultant balancing act of power

between higher education providers and students to ensure that preferences can be provided for in a way that is economically viable and appropriately manageable for all stakeholders.

A recent study by Simons and Snowden (2021) identifies that students studying with the Open University – the world’s largest provider of open learning – reported enhanced learning, working and personal gains; key benefits of open learning included enhanced study and transferrable skills that contributed to developing students’ confidence and ability to carry out their employment. Furthermore, the study demonstrates that self-esteem and the sense of achievement that result from their studies had a positive impact on the interviewees’ personal and working life. The increased self-esteem and sense of achievement suggest that open learning enhanced their sense of self. The study also reported that work colleagues and family members respected the students and viewed them as role models.

Whilst the advantages to the student are clear, and any electronic search, using Google, for example, readily presents the advantages, what is less clear are the disadvantages to the student. Online learning, as a consequence of having more flexibility, requires the student to have good discipline, time management and for them to be characteristically more independent in study (Celestino and Noronha, 2021). Furthermore, typically, more study time is required to complete online learning than traditional face-to-face campus based learning and requires active engagement in the learning process.

Engagement and a sense of isolation are the most significant of challenges presented by open learning (Celestino and Noronha, 2021). Open learning providers that develop and

implement strategies that address engagement and isolation are more likely provide a richer online learning experience. Dumford and Miller (2018) suggest that the major obstacle for providers is to offer opportunities that promote social engagement between learners. Croft et al. (2010) assert that lack of interaction, the physical separation of lecturer and learner, and between learners themselves generate feelings of isolation, enhanced stress and anxiety, which in turn diminishes the learning experience. A key feature of successful online learning, suggest Croft et al. (2010), is collaboration between all stake holders, underpinned by establishing a community of learners that engage with a programme that has student input in curriculum design, and points of learning that require collaboration. Encouraging, and using strategies that encourage active learning and engagement by establishing a clear learning community where the student feels part of a group, promotes reflective interaction and successful learning. In addition, encouraging the use of a number of social media tools for communication promotes collaboration and exemplifies, either indirectly or directly, the social notion of learning by encouraging interaction, (McBrien et al., 2009) thus mitigating the lack of physical interaction.

However, O' Shea et al. (2015) suggest that a broad strategy for social engagement should be avoided, as this fails to embrace the notion of flexibility a key motivator for students studying online, as mentioned earlier. O'Shea et al. (2015) suggest that there are a range of different types of relationship that learners wished to embrace. For example, whilst some students actively and purposively engaged with other students, others may perceive this as an additional burden to their studies. Students studying online courses in higher education often reflect an atypical demographic. For example, Simons et al. (2020) describe that the nature of students who choose to study through an online mode of learning with the Open University are



typically in the 30-49 age group, who have competing demands upon time in the forms of family, social, caring and employment commitments in addition to their studies. Thus, in terms of identity in comparison to traditional face-to-face on campus forms of learning, the student identity may not be dominant and, consequently, may impact upon engagement in group and social forms of learning activity.

The student identity of the participant in open learning is typically more heterogeneous than the traditional higher education student. Consequently, online curricula must reflect this. The classic androgical theorist Malcolm Knowles (1991) reinforces this view, proposing that adult learning needs to be rooted in real world learning experiences. Socio-cultural theories of learning, such as those posited by Bruner (1996), Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998), and advocated by Halsall et al. (2016), provide direction for educators in curriculum design, arguing that they provide a theoretical base where learning is presented as a collective process based on the context, or place of learning, that share common goals and practices. Online learning should, to be successful, draw upon collective and collaborative learning with focus upon the individual and group identity. Collis and Moonen (2002) describe a process of contribution-oriented pedagogy, which enables students to develop and contribute to teaching content that can be used not only by current students but, using an online learning repository, can be used and drawn upon by future students. They suggest that this approach provides a degree of authenticity and, in part, provides an opportunity for learners to be collaborative partners in the learning process.

The online learning environment must therefore adopt a learner centric approach, adopting a collaborative mode of learning that views the learner as a partner in learning rather than simply a passenger in the learning process. Traditionally, learning in higher education has been a binary process, dominated by the lecturers' or teachers' interests, role and curricula (Snowden and Halsall, 2016) with the fulcrum of power and influence firmly located within the lecturer and institution. Online learning requires educators to be creative and innovative, and curriculum designers not to simply replace face-to-face learning activities with recordings of lectures, pod/video casts and “tick box” type activities such as quizzes and reading. Simply regurgitating material used in face-to-face learning will result in failed knowledge, learning, intellectual and personal engagement. For online learning to be successful, it must embrace flexibility and requires resources to design curricula fit for the community and the unique identity of the student. Undoubtedly, online learning design is labour and resource intensive.

University education requires educators to be increasingly responsive to the needs of society and those participating in higher education. COVID-19 has reinforced the requirement for educators to be creative, innovative and resourceful. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, higher education was increasingly performance and consumerist driven; in the UK, the Introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework – where Higher Education Institutions are ranked on performance – in 2016 and the formation of the Office for Students (OFS) in 2018 (Office for Students, 2021a) has formalized this intensity.

COVID-19 has had a major impact on learning delivery globally. In the UK, it is estimated that there are in excess of 2 million students studying in UK Higher Education

Institutes (HEIs), and that the learning opportunities of each have been affected to varying degrees as a result of COVID-19 (Universities UK, 2021). UK HEIs closed their physical doors in March 2020, and many universities swiftly replaced face-to-face teaching with varying degrees of online delivery. Some small-scale surveys took place during 2020 to assess the impact on learning experience, with findings that were largely, given the media coverage, unsurprising. During the period October 2020-December 2020 the ONS (2021) conducted a student Covid insights survey exploring the impact of online learning, and student satisfaction since the start of the autumn term. The survey reports that approximately 60% of students' learning was mainly desk based (for example, self-studies, or online learning with a tutor or lecturer), with only approximately 25% of learning taking place in a face-to-face context on campus; these students were those studying professional, vocational and clinical courses such as medicine, nursing, health based courses and veterinary sciences. During December 2020, as a second wave of the pandemic began to rise, these figures began to shift: 65% reported having attended no hours of in-person teaching, while 21% reported having attended between one and five hours in person; half of the students reported having attended six or more hours of online learning. An observation that is surprising is that when students were asked if they felt prepared and equipped to deal with online learning 16% stated that they were not; this was almost nine months since the change in learning strategy and the move towards online learning. In response to a question about student fees, half of the students reported that they would be likely or extremely likely to request a refund for part or all of their fees if online learning remained in the Spring term. The survey identified that 29% of students were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their academic experience; two-thirds reported that this was because of the quality of learning and learning delivery. When asked about how satisfied they were with their social experience, over half

reported to be dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied; the main reasons were: limited opportunities for social or recreational activity (86%), limited opportunities to meet other students (84%) and limited access to sports and fitness facilities (52%).

These findings were reaffirmed by the 2021 National Student Survey (NSS) (OFS, 2021b) conducted by the OFS. This survey drew data from in excess of 330,000 students registered as final year undergraduates across all HEIs in the UK. This survey, the largest of its kind, illustrated the negative effect of COVID-19 on learning. Overall, 75% of all UK students agreed that they were satisfied with the quality of the learning experience on their course; this represents a significant decrease of eight percentage points from 2020 and nine percentage points from 2019. However, these figures mask the variation in satisfaction rates from various providers and courses. For example, in response to the statement 'I am content with the delivery of learning and teaching of my course during the COVID-19 pandemic', students of media, journalism and communications, and design, creative and performing arts reported 38% and 40% satisfaction rates respectively, whereas subject areas that maintained a strong face-to-face component of learning such as medicine and dentistry reported 65% satisfaction. Furthermore, it was noted that those students studying online with distance learning providers responded more positively than other students. The NSS reported that 79.9% of distance learning students agreed that they were content with the delivery of learning and teaching on their course during the pandemic, compared with 46% of those students who would normally be engaging in face-to-face contact courses. This difference was also reflected by the data presented for other students. For example, older students and part-time students responded positively to these questions. The largest provider of online learning in the UK, the Open University, maintained its overall satisfaction

rating, with an increase from to 88.24%, and ranked third overall in the NSS, which is a significant achievement given the student demographic. Some modules within a programme may have in excess of 3,000 students and there are no pre requirements for entry. Whilst students are provided advice and support in commencing undergraduate study, entry is open to anyone, irrespective of previous educational attainment. Consequently, this leads to the inevitable challenges of retention and progression.

Describing their provision, the Open University claim: “accessible study resources and expert tutor instruction mean you’ll have the flexibility to study when and where you want” (Open University, 2021). The distinctive elements of this approach are the terms: flexible, accessible, where and when. Furthermore, students of the Open University are able to study a bespoke “Open Degree” where they are able to choose from a large pool of modules to build their unique and personal degree study programme. Simons et al. (2020) assert that one of the key drivers for studying with the Open University was the flexibility it provided in terms of structure of systems, processes and the flexibility and accessibility of materials. Respondents in their study highlighted the value of flexible tutor support, assignment submission and, importantly, the fact that study materials could be accessed at a time and place convenient to the student.

The study by Simons et al. (2020) reiterates the importance of flexibility, and reflects the definition of “online learning” we presented earlier in the chapter: a learning experience, that draws upon the internet in either a synchronous or asynchronous environment where educators interact with students, and participation is not dependent on their presence within a physical

space. It is clear, that the success of this on line learning experience is linked to student centeredness and flexibility.

In order to conceptualize this learning experience, we draw upon the pedagogical approach known as heutagogy. As highlighted earlier, the authors of this chapter have explored and applied this pedagogy in a number of settings (see Snowden and Halsall, 2019; Halsall and Snowden, 2017). Heutagogy, a philosophical shift away from andragogy, is in essence a pedagogical process that has self-determined learning at its core, alongside the principles of capability, development and lifelong learning. Heutagogy, prospective in approach, draws upon the perspectives of Argyryris and Schon (1974), Knowles (1991) and Stephenson (1998) to emphasises the importance and value of a holistic approach to learning in order to develop new skills and knowledge, and, to promote independent capability and the capacity to question self, values and assumptions. Learners are encouraged to research their learning, practice interests, and base their learning on these interests and their aspirations. In this approach to learning, the learner is at the centre of the learning process.

Within heutagogy, it is accepted that people make sense of the context they inhabit and from this sense making conceptualize and perceive invariance. Consequently, people's potential to learn is continuous. Intuition is an integral part of the heutagogical learning process; Snowden and Halsall (2017) emphasize that learning draws upon reflective and double loop, valuing experience and interaction, but, importantly drawing heavily upon community based and societal based learning. Heutagogical approaches to education place great emphasis upon the holism,

self-worth, capability, context, societal need and entails a focus upon student centered learning as opposed to teaching.

Rogers (1951) suggests that all adults have a propensity to learn, and the desire to learn is an internal process controlled by the learners themselves, thus creating a personal ontological space. Snowden and Halsall (2014) and Halsall et al. (2017) suggest that within this personal ontological space, adults learn from within with the teacher presented as a facilitator of learning. When something new is learned, our “being”, that is the notion of who we are suggests Barnett (2010), is changed, as a new space, a new mode of being created, and a new space of learning is entered. This change creates the opportunity for learning, and the potential for the student to develop as an architect of learning, where learning is arranged around their preferences, activities, and experience rather than by pre-determined systems, processes and curriculae. This approach is characteristic of the notion of authentic learning presented by May and Powell (2008). The student as an architect of their learning creates their own pattern of learning, ideas and experiences relevant to them, embracing a holistic, authentic approach to learning. Key to this self-determined or heutagogical process of learning is the place of the learner – who is at the heart of the learning – and the learner drives what, where, when and how they learn.

Fundamental to a heutagogical approach to learning are solution focused learning and mentor assisted learning. Solution focused learning is a transformative learning and teaching experience, stimulating learners to become committed, engaged citizens, and concerned with constructing solutions, as an approach that looks forwards, towards solutions, rather than backwards, by studying problems. It promotes teaching and learning that focuses upon strengths,

abilities, hopes, and distinctly, encourages thinking in terms of possibilities and potential (Snowden and Halsall, 2014) and responds to the challenge presented by online learning encouraging learners to utilize their learning spaces to negotiate how, where, what and when they learn.

University structures, processes, and systems determine when, how and what is learned; these systems can either promote or inhibit the choice of what is learned and what skills are developed (Snowden and Halsall, 2014; Barnett, 2012). Engagement with the process of mentoring within the context of learning, suggest Snowden and Hardy ((2012) see also Snowden and Halsall, 2014), provides the student with the opportunity to rapidly inhabit and navigate the systems and structures, ensuring access to the experience and inside knowledge that the mentor has developed. The mentor, in heutagogical learning, draws upon their own experiences to assist in the translation of reality and learning, aiding the mentee to inhabit their own internalized patterns of reasoning, thus enabling the student, as mentee, to construct, as an architect, their learning landscape.

As Foskett observes (2011), universities have had to become more entrepreneurial. In many ways, technological advances drive the entrepreneurial perspective in higher education. The COVID-19 pandemic emphasized the dynamic nature of global higher education and the value of online learning; however, it has provided a distinct challenge to HEIs in the form of delivering an authentic learning experience. Learning is increasingly concerned with what we do, and the development of those key skills and abilities appropriate for this changing, dynamic and contested place, as emphasized by Quacquarelli (2018), is essential. Flexibility, independence,



entrepreneurship, capability and solution orientation are all key skills of the global graduate; clearly, online learning – underpinned by heutagogical learning – facilitates this by empowering graduates who are flexible, capable and able to respond purposively to new situations and ideas. Capable people, suggests Barnett (2014), are more likely to be, respond and lead effectively within contemporary global society and skills and qualities required by the modern day graduate. Globalization has created a multitude of communities and contexts in which the modern day graduate must operate, and graduates must be prepared for this contemporary dynamic culture. Those learning opportunities that are “inflexible, unable to respond to strangeness – to the challenges and new experiences that the world presents – [is] short-changing its students” (Barnett, 2014, p. 62) and the communities that they serve.

The move to online learning is not without challenge. The recent ONS (2020) and OFS (2021b) reports have illustrated the challenge and potential risks associated with online learning. However, when done well, the benefits of online learning are clear, as demonstrated by Collis and Moonen (2002); McBrein et al. (2009); Croft et al. (2010); O’Shea et al. (2015); Dumford and Miller (2018); Singh and Thurman (2019); Simons et al. (2020); Celestino and Noronha (2021); Farnel (2021) and Simons and Snowden (2021). The challenge for online educators is to ensure that online learning is bespoke and is not simply a process of replacing face-to-face on campus learning with online activities. It must be fit for purpose, student centered, appropriately resourced, flexible and draw from an appropriate pedagogical approach such as heutagogy. The previously cited authors, celebrating the benefits of online learning and drawing upon the experiences of the Open University, provides a useful starting point for the delivery of online learning. Integral to success are:

1. Communication: tutors must be accessible, responsive and engage regularly with students; contact should be regular and appropriate – online specific; discussion forums should be student centric, designed and moderated appropriately.
2. Resources: online learning is resource intensive – resources for technological assistance and support must be readily available; mentors and mentoring should be available.
3. Pedagogy: this should be characterized by an explicit definition of online learning and clear expectations and illustration of learning. Above all, we propose that successful online learning should be underpinned by heutagogy and the philosophical values it presents.

## **Conclusions and Ways Forward**

This chapter has provided an insight into the contemporary issues of internationalization in the higher education context. The chapter began with an evaluation of the globalization and internationalization of higher education. The theoretical position of globalization in higher education has a close relationship with the transformationalist school of thought. This is because the transformationalist thesis is a driving influence in making social, political, and economic alterations in local, national and global contexts (Held et al., 1999). Higher education establishments are seen as one of the key elements in creating change, as, in recent years, universities have contributed to the global knowledge economy.

The chapter then moved on to examine the way higher education institutions have become internationalized. Universities have applied international strategies through growth in recruitment, partnerships with other institutions, and expansion into other parts of the world by building offshore campuses. Here, it is evident that higher education is somewhat complex, with numerous different stakeholders involved.

This complexity has increased indubitably because of the COVID-19 pandemic and the resultant drive towards online learning. Those universities that have been more entrepreneurial or had existing online provision have fared better than those that were unprepared. Education is transformational, and educators have an obligation to ensure higher education remains transformative. It is recognized that many universities have made some progress in developing online delivery (Farnell et al., 2021). However, educators must be creative and innovative in their approaches to teaching and learning, ensuring that the needs of the global graduate are met. We propose that online learning provides an opportunity for students to experience teaching and learning that will enhance self-determination and their capacity to fulfill the demands of the global community, with the caveat that it is underpinned by a flexible and heutagogical approach.

## **Acknowledgements**

The thoughts offered within this chapter were presented at an invited webinar panel discussion on educational challenges amidst COVID-19, hosted by the Counselling and Wellness Center, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Pakistan on the 5th of August 2021. Special thanks go to: Dr Sajida Naz, who organised/chaired this special international event, and to Dr Stefanie El Madawi, our proofreader for this chapter.

## References

- Altbach, P.G. and Teichler, U. (2001) Internationalization and Exchanges in a Globalized University, *Journal of Studies in international Education*, Vol. 5(1), pp. 5-25.
- Argyryris, C. and Schon, D.A. (1974) *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. Jossey Bass. San Francisco.
- Bamberger, A., Morris, P., and Yemini, M. (2019) Neoliberalism, Internationalisation and Higher Education: Connections, Contradictions and Alternatives, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, Vol. 40(2), pp. 203-216.
- Barnett, R. (2014) *Conditions of flexibility: Securing a more responsive higher education system*. York: HEA.
- Barnett, R. (2010) Knowing and Becoming in the Higher Education Curriculum, *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 34(4), pp. 429-440.
- Brown, R. (2011) The March of the Market, In: Molesworth, M., Scullion, R., and Nixon, E. (eds) *The Marketisation of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*, London: Routledge, Chapter 2, pp. 11-24.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Byrne, M. E. and Clarke, M. C. (2020) *The University Challenge*, Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Celestino, E.H. and Noronha, A.B., (2021). Blended learning: a systematic review of advantages and disadvantages in students' perceptions and impacts on higher education institutes. *Administração: Ensino e Pesquisa*, Vol. 22(1), pp. 31-63.
- Chang, J. (2006) Globalization and English in Chinese Higher Education, *World Englishes*, Vol 25(3-4), pp. 513-525.

- Chen, P. D., Lambert, A. D., & Guidry, K. R. (2010). Engaging online learners: The impact of web-based learning technology on student engagement, *Computers & Education*, Vol. 54, pp. 1222–1232
- Collis, B. and Moonen, J (2002) Flexible Learning in a Digital World, *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, Vol. 17(3), pp. 217-230.
- Conservative Party. (2019) *Get Brexit Done Unleash Britain's Potential*,  
Weblink: [https://assets-global.website-files.com/5da42e2cae7ebd3f8bde353c/5dda924905da587992a064ba\\_Conservative%202019%20Manifesto.pdf](https://assets-global.website-files.com/5da42e2cae7ebd3f8bde353c/5dda924905da587992a064ba_Conservative%202019%20Manifesto.pdf)  
Date accessed: 12/07/2021.
- Croft, N., Dalton, A & Grant, M. (2010) Overcoming Isolation in Distance Learning: Building a Learning Community through Time and Space, *Journal for Education in the Built Environment*, Vol. 5(1), pp. 27-64.
- Davitt Jones, S., Arnold, C., and Snowden, M. (2017) *Higher Education Academy Flexible Learning Practice Guide*, York, UK: Higher Education Academy.
- de Sousa Santos, B. (2006) Globalizations, *Theory, Culture & Society*, Vol 23(2-3), pp. 393-399.
- De Wit, H., and Altbach, P., G. (2021) Internationalization in Higher Education: Global Trends and Recommendations for its Future, *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, Vol 5(1), pp. 28-46.
- Dumford, A.D., Miller, A.L. (2018) Online learning in higher education: exploring advantages and disadvantages for engagement, *Journal of Computing Higher Education*, Vol. 30, pp. 452–465.

- Farnell, T. Skledar Matijević, A & Schmidt, N.S. (2021) The impact of COVID-19 on higher education: a review of emerging evidence. Luxembourg. Publications Office of the European Union. Available at:  
[https://nesetweb.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/NESET-AR4-2020\\_Full-Report-1.pdf](https://nesetweb.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/NESET-AR4-2020_Full-Report-1.pdf)  
Date accessed: 10/08/2021.
- Foskett, N. (2011) Markets, Government, Funding and the Marketisation of UK Higher Education, In: Molesworth, M., Scullion, R., and Nixon, E. (eds) *The Marketisation of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*, London: Routledge, Chapter 3, pp. 25-38.
- Halsall, J. P., Powell, J. L., and Snowden, M. (2016) Determined Learning Approach: Implications of Heutagogy Society Based Learning. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 2(1), 1223904.
- Halsall, J. P. and Snowden, M. (2017) *The Pedagogy of the Social Sciences Curriculum*, New York: Springer.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J. (1999) *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, Oxford: Polity Press.
- Kahler, M. (2004) Economic Security in an Era of Globalization: Definition and Provision, *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 17(4), pp. 485-502.
- King, R., Marginson, S. and Naidoo, R. (2011) *Handbook on Globalization and Higher Education*, Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Kleibert, J., M., Bobée, A., Rottlieb, T., and Schulze, M. (2020) *Global Geographies of Offshore Campuses*, Germany: Leibniz Institute for Research on Society and Space.  
Weblink: <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/223315>

Date accessed: 12/07/2021.

Knowles, M. (1991) *The adult learner: A neglected species*. (4th. edn.), Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Kwiek, M. (2001) Globalization and Higher Education, *Higher Education in Europe*, Vol. 26(1), pp. 27-38.

Lave, J., and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lechner, F. J. (2009) *Globalization: The Making of World Society*, Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.

Leyshon, A. (1995) Annihilating Space?: The Speed-Up of Communications, In Allen, J. and Hamnett, C. (Eds.) *A Shrinking World?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, Chapter 1, pp. 12-54.

May, T., and Powell, J. L. (2008). *Situating social theory* (2nd ed.). Maidenhead: McGraw Hill.

McBrien, J., Cheng, R. and Jones, P. (2009). Virtual Spaces: Employing a Synchronous Online Classroom to Facilitate Student Engagement in Online Learning, *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, Vol. 10(3),  
<https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v10i3.605>

Ministry of Education. (2020) Overview, Weblink: <https://www.education.gov.in/en/about-moe>  
Date accessed: 12/07/2021.

Munck, R. (2002) *Globalisation and Labour: The New Great Transformation*, London: Zed Books.

Murphy, P. (2015) *Universities and Innovation Economies: The Creative Wasteland of Post-Industrial Society*, Farnham: Ashgate.

Office for Students (OFS) (2021a) Teaching Excellence Framework Available at:  
<https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/teaching/about-the-tef/>



Date accessed: 19/08/2021.

Office for Students (OFS) (2021b) National Student Survey. Available at:

<https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/student-information-and-data/national-student-survey-nss/nss-data-provider-level/>

Date accessed: 19/08/2021.

Office for National Statistics (ONS) 2021 Coronavirus and the impact on students in higher education in England: September to December 2020 Available at:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/educationandchildcare/articles/coronavirusandtheimpactonstudentsinhighereducationinenglandseptembertodecember2020/2020-12-21>

Date accessed: 17/08/2021.

Open University (2021) What is distance learning. Available at:

<https://www.open.ac.uk/courses/what-is-distance-learning>

Date accessed: 19/08/2021.

O’ Shea, S., Stone, C., and Delahunty, J. (2015) “I ‘feel’ like I am at university even though I am online.” Exploring how students narrate their engagement with higher education institutions in an online learning environment, *Distance Education*, Vol. 36(1), pp. 41-58.

Quacquarelli, N (2018) QS and Institute of Student Employers (ISE) (2018) The Global Skills

Gap in the 21st Century. ISE. Available at: <http://info.qs.com/rs/335-VIN-535/images/The%20Global%20Skills%20Gap%2021st%20Century.pdf>

Date accessed: 17/08/2021.

Shahjahan, R., A., and Edwards, K., T. (2021) Whiteness as futurity and Globalization of Higher Education, *Higher Education*, pp.1-18.

- Simons, J., Leverett, S & Beaumont, K. (2020) Success of distance learning graduates and the role of intrinsic motivation, *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, Vol. 35(3), pp. 277-293.
- Simons, J., and Snowden M. (2021) A qualitative study exploring the perceptions of part time distance learning students learning gain and the Three Gains Employability model *International Journal of Comparative and Multi-disciplinary Studies*, Vol 7 (1-3), pp. 5-18.
- Singh, V., and Thurman, V. (2019) How Many Ways Can We Define Online Learning? A Systematic Literature Review of Definitions of Online Learning (1988-2018), *American Journal of Distance Education*, Vol. 33(4), pp. 289-306.
- Snowden, M. and Halsall, J. P. (2019) *Mentorship, Leadership, and Research: Their Place in the Social Science Curriculum*, New York: Springer.
- Snowden, M. and Halsall, J. P. (2017) Exploring the Application of a Self-Determined Approach to Learning, *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, Vol. 22(3), pp. 293-303.
- Soliman, S., Anchor J., and Taylor, D. (2019) The International Strategies of Universities: Deliberate or Emergent?, *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 44(8), pp. 1413-1424.
- Stephenson, J. (1998) The concept of capability and its importance in higher education, in J Stephenson and M Yorke (eds) *Capability and Quality in Higher Education*, London: Kogan Page.
- UNESCO (2021) Covid-19 Impact on Education, Available:  
<https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse>  
Date accessed: 10/08/2021.

Universities UK (2021) Higher education in numbers, Available at:

<https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/facts-and-stats/Pages/higher-education-data.aspx>

Date accessed: 19/08/2021.

University of Chicago. (2021) Faculty: Establishing a Memorandum of Understanding,

Web link: <https://global.uchicago.edu/faculty/establishing-memorandum-understanding>

Date accessed: 12<sup>th</sup> June 2021.

Vaira, M. (2004) Globalization and Higher Education Organizational Change: A Framework for Analysis, *Higher Education*, Vol. 48(4), pp. 483-510.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wihlborg, M., and Robson, S. (2018) Internationalisation of Higher Education: Drivers, Rationales, Priorities, Values and Impacts, *European Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 8(1), pp. 8-18.

Wilkins, S. (2020) Student Experience at International Branch Campuses, *Australian Universities' Review*, Vol. 62(2), pp. 39-46.

Xu, Q. and Halsall, J. P. (2018) Globalization and Migration: Is there a Borderless World?, In Oberoi, R. and Halsall, J. P. (Eds.) *Revisiting Globalization: From a Border-less to a Gated Globe?*, New York: Springer, Chapter 3, pp. 43-68

Yemini, M. (2015) Internationalisation Discourse Hits the Tipping Point, *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, Vol. 19(1), pp. 19-22.