

# Internationalisation Equals Quality? Students' Perspectives on Quality of Higher Education in Denmark

Journal of Studies in International Education  
2024, Vol. 28(2) 204–220

© 2023 European Association for  
International Education  
Article reuse guidelines:  
sagepub.com/journals-permissions  
DOI: 10.1177/10283153231172020  
journals.sagepub.com/home/jsi



Paola R. S. Eiras<sup>1</sup> 

## Abstract

Higher education (HE) institutions in Europe are ascribing greater importance to internationalisation as adding value to the entire institution, whereby the most important benefit identified is improved quality of teaching and learning. Notwithstanding, students' perceptions of the extent to which quality of education is associated with internationalisation is under-explored. This paper addresses this gap and employs a digital ethno-methodological approach, drawing on 126 h of teaching and learning observation, and 38 semi-structured interviews with Danish and international students enrolled in 8 Masters of Science (MSc) programmes in Denmark. Nuanced aspects of perceptions of quality, relevance and learning were mostly related to two instruments of internationalisation: international staff and an international student body. Results show that *diversity* is a keyword in students' discourses, whereby quality often equals internationalisation. However, there is a disconnect between discourses and actual practices of internationalisation, with implications for policies and practices in internationalised HE contexts.

## Keywords

Quality of HE, internationalisation of HE, Denmark, student perspectives

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Educational Anthropology, Aarhus University, Copenhagen, Denmark

### Corresponding Author:

Paola R. S. Eiras, Danish School of Education, Aarhus University, Tuborgvej 164, D246, DK-2400 Copenhagen NV, Denmark.

Email: p.eiras@yahoo.com.au

## Introduction

Internationalisation of higher education (HE) is regarded as a tool for enhancing the quality of education, research, and service to society (de Wit et al., 2015), yet within Danish HE, there is no clear knowledge of how internationalisation affects ways of thinking about quality, relevance, and learning (Adriansen, 2019). In Europe, quality of higher education is usually conceptualised as, and benchmarked against, a set of standards and/or guidelines agreed upon by local, national and supra-national bodies, which is reflected in quality-assurance policies in educational institutions (e.g., ENQA, 2005; ESG, 2015). While quality assurance generally refers to policies, practices and procedures to ensure quality is being maintained and enhanced, internationalisation has become an indicator for quality in HE. The definition of internationalisation of HE used in this paper is by Wit et al. (2015, p. 29):

The process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, *in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society.* (emphasis added)

In a context where internationalisation is an institutionalised concept, i.e., HE institutions are accredited and benchmarked against a combination of self-assessment and external peer-review embedded in top-down policies and strategies, empirical research on quality enhancement as a result of internationalisation from other stakeholders'<sup>1</sup> perspectives is scarce. This paper therefore explores to what extent students associate internationalisation with quality enhancement of HE.

Driven by the Bologna Declaration in the late 1990s (EHEA, 1999), and the subsequent Lisbon Strategy in 2000 to bring about economic, social and environmental renewal in the EU (Teichler, 2012), European HE institutions have increasingly sought to internationalise their programmes and, as a result, Danish universities have witnessed a steady increase in the number of international students in the past twenty years (MOE, 2018). Student mobility (either inbound or outbound) in this approach is not an objective in itself, but one of the instruments to enable international and intercultural exchanges. Other instruments include academic exchange amongst researchers and lecturers through research cooperation and teaching, and internationalisation of the curriculum, within the 'internationalisation at home' movement (Harrison, 2015), which has a focus on teaching and learning processes. Whilst there are different rationales for internationalisation (de Wit & Altbach, 2021), which are locally and culturally shaped, and whether they are driven by cooperation and/or competition, there has been a focus on two main arguments in the past decade: firstly, the preparation of students for their future careers in a knowledge economy and interconnected society (individual development and transformation); and secondly, developing international and intercultural dimensions in research,

teaching and services, and enhancement of quality and status, as expressed in international rankings (de Wit & Altbach, 2021).

However, while it is easy to agree on the importance of quality, what it actually means for teaching and learning may be challenging to accurately describe, much less identify what would/should need to be improved through internationalisation (e.g., Benneworth et al., 2012; de Wit et al., 2015; Huang, 2007; Teichler, 2017; Van der Wende, 2010). In the past decade, some internationalisation strategies (e.g., inbound and outbound student mobility, joint programmes and internationalisation of the curriculum) have become indicators of quality and have thus been included in quality assessment of HE in some European countries (e.g., The Netherlands and Finland), through institutional self-evaluation quality assurance and peer-reviews (Komotar, 2018). European quality assurance guidelines (ESG, 2015) have focused on the use of learning outcomes, with a shift towards student-centred learning and experiences.

Quality policies and approaches are based on assumptions that international cooperation, research exchange, and student and staff internationalisation contribute to the quality of individual and institutional development (Beerkens et al., 2010; de Wit et al., 2015) by allowing for various outcomes such as intercultural and international learning, and teaching/learning best practices. As Knight notes 'there is a perception that the more international the university is, the better it is and the higher quality of its programmes are [...] but do we have a way to prove it?' (2001, p. 233).

Despite the number of studies focusing on students' perceptions of quality of HE post-Bologna Declaration (e.g., Jungblut et al., 2015; Sarrico & Rosa, 2014), the extent to which students associate quality of HE with internationalisation is under-researched. Furthermore, increased internationalisation, triggered by the Bologna Declaration through increased offers of English study programmes<sup>2</sup> and enhanced student mobility into Denmark, implies a diverse (e.g., geographically, linguistically, culturally and socially) student population, suggesting a need for further qualitative studies. The present research thus contributes to the literature on students' perceptions of quality of HE as associated with internationalisation in the Danish context. This study is embedded in a larger project, *GeoInt* (anonymised), which explores six instruments of internationalisation in Denmark – inbound mobility, outbound mobility, English as a medium of instruction (EMI), international specialisation, internationalisation at home (curriculum), and mobility of researchers - and how they affect perceptions of quality, relevance and learning in HE.

The first section provides a conceptual framework of quality of HE, followed by the context of the present study. This is then followed by a methodology section before the final sections discuss the findings and implications of this study.

## Quality and Internationalisation of HE

In the past two decades, internationalisation has been seen as a means to improve the quality of HE (de Wit, 2020). Harvey and Green (1993), whose concept of quality in HE is still widely used, define quality of HE as encompassing five distinct but inter-

related categories: exceptionality, perfection, fitness for purpose, value for money, and potential to be transformative. Exceptionality as excellence is an institutional perspective that considers taking the best students, and providing them with the best resources, implying that quality of output is a function of input. Perfection is performance to specifications, which is related to meeting external benchmark standards. Quality as fitness for purpose is judged as fulfilling the purposes defined by stakeholders and is an extensively acknowledged benchmark for quality assurance (Cheng, 2017; ESG, 2015; ESU, 2020; Uzhegova & Baik, 2022). Quality as value for money, or the cost-benefit relationship in the provision of goods and services, is directly related to the notion of accountability (European Commission, 2018), which is generally benchmarked against performance indicators. Finally, quality as a transformative category refers to the extent to which educational experiences enhance students' knowledge, abilities and skills.

Quality assurance, in this context, has increasingly focused on two areas: accountability and academic quality, centring on inputs and outputs. This approach to quality in HE, whereby accountability is achieved through specific quantitative targets and indicators (e.g., institutional internationalisation, recruitment of international staff and students, institutional reputation, developing strategic partnerships, economic gain from international recruitment, and international benchmarking, among others), considers students as users of public services and, thus, as customers with rights (Milliken & Colohan, 2004). Furthermore, accountability means the need to demonstrate that institutions achieve what they set out to achieve, being accountable to public funders. Performance indicators provide a measure of accountability for funders and customers, as a measure of academic quality.

Notwithstanding predominant neo-liberal discourses of students as consumers (Brooks, 2021; Brooks & Abrahams, 2018; Tsiligiris & Hill, 2019), there is consensus in the literature around the value of educational quality as an indicator of quality in HE (Biggs & Tang, 2011; OECD, 2009). Educational quality places emphasis on student-centred internationalisation initiatives, such as internationalisation of curriculum, and development of global citizenship and intercultural competence (Green & Whitsed, 2013; Jones, 2019). Similarly, some European institutions (e.g., Germany and The Netherlands) have adopted internationalisation indicators (Aerden et al., 2013; Beerkens et al., 2010; de Wit, 2009, 2020; de Wit et al., 2017; Komotar, 2018), and internationalisation accreditation procedures, which are also based on quantitative input and output indicators. Thus, while internationalisation is regarded as an indicator of quality in HE, questions remain about what quality of internationalisation means.

Overall then, the relationship between quality and internationalisation is complex, and the contribution of internationalisation to the quality of HE therefore needs to be further explored qualitatively.

## **Context of the Study: the Danish Case**

Post-Bologna Declaration in the late 1990s (EHEA, 1999), a number of studies exploring various dimensions of internationalisation of HE in a Scandinavian context,

including Denmark, have been published (e.g., Airey et al., 2017; Eiras, 2022; Fabricius et al., 2017; Gregersen & Ostman, 2018; Hultgren, 2017).

While Denmark's role in internationalisation of HE predates the Bologna Declaration, Danish universities have enjoyed a fast increase of international students in the past twenty years, from 5,503 to 14,547 as reported by the Danish Ministry of Education (MOE, 2018). In this context, internationalisation of HE has normalised English as a medium of instruction, which has been seen as a 'necessity' for internationalised programmes in Denmark (Airey et al., 2017; Fabricius et al., 2017; Tange, 2021), aiding universities in meeting national objectives of international student recruitment, associated with Denmark's competitive agenda (Mosneaga & Agergaard, 2012). Other factors, such as free tuition for EU and EEA students and eligibility for a stipend<sup>3</sup>, make Denmark an attractive study destination (Wright & Zitnansky, 2021). Regardless of varying rationales underlying strategies for the internationalisation of HE, a common argument is about added value to HE systems, and as enhancing the international dimension of teaching and learning, research and service (de Wit et al., 2015; Knight & de Wit, 2018). Although student participation has been included in both quality assurance and quality standardisation policies in recent years (DSF, 2022; ESG, 2015), little is known about their perception of the link between quality of HE and internationalisation in the Danish context. This paper therefore addresses the following research questions:

1. To what extent is quality of education associated with internationalisation, according to students' perceptions?
2. Which instruments of internationalisation are identified by students as associated with quality and how?

## **Methodology**

This qualitative study used a digital ethno-methodological approach (Hine, 2000), combined with Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1995; 2003). Data is drawn from 126 h of online teaching and learning observation, and 38 semi-structured interviews (Kvale, 1996) with domestic and international postgraduate students.

A critical realist position (Bhaskar, 2008) was adopted, whereby symbolic and material realities surrounding the participants' teaching/learning experiences were taken into consideration, as enabling or constraining their discursive constructions of quality. This emphasized the contextual nature of the qualitative research findings, which were elicited in a hermeneutical (Heidegger, 1962) co-constructive manner between participants and the researcher.

### ***A Critical Approach to Internationalisation***

Classrooms are contexts embedded in historical, social, and political discourses. In the present study, a critical approach (Fairclough, 1995; 2003) allows for analysis of

interactions and social practices of students, and tensions between teaching practices and students' expectations of learning in an internationalised space.

If internationalisation is a means to '...enhance the quality of education and research [...] and make a meaningful contribution to society' (de Wit et al., 2015, p. 29), how do students perceive notions of quality in this context, in 'the hidden relationship between individual interaction in the classroom and the wider sociocultural and socio-political structures that impinge that interaction' (Kumaravadivelu, 1999, p. 479)?

### *Research Setting*

Three different courses, delivered at a research-intensive Faculty of Science at a Danish university, were selected for digital ethnographic fieldwork. Students attending these courses were enrolled in eight 2-year Master of Science (MSc) programmes, and were diverse in their academic fields. All eight study-programmes are delivered in English and attract international students. Teaching staff comprise Danish and international academic staff.

### *Positionality*

The author was a postdoctoral research fellow, and part of a larger project (anonymised), when conducting this research. She holds dual nationality with transnational teaching experience in four continents. Her positionality, as both an insider/outsider and as occupying spaces in-between (e.g., researcher, participant observer, and interviewer), played a significant role in the intercultural context of this study. For instance, domestic students spelled their educational experiences in a Danish context out to a 'non-Danish scholar', while international students apparently felt at ease sharing uncomfortable and adjustment issues about their experiences of living and studying abroad.

### *Participants and the Digital Ethnographic Fieldwork*

Virtual ethnographic fieldwork (Hine, 2000) was conducted between April and June 2021 in Denmark, where the institution had adopted full online delivery due to COVID-19, thus posing challenges to research methods. Compared to face-face classroom observations, digital ethnography is not defined by a particular perspective, but comprises an ethnography mediated by digital technologies, which is equally reflexive and socially rooted (Hine, 2000). While online ethnography adds a new array of data collection in a virtual medium (i.e., both in terms of observation and fieldnotes), my active participation in 'the virtual classroom' made it very close to face-to-face classroom observations, in that my presence was transparent and explicit. However, I might have missed some of the students' body language (e.g., when temporarily switching off their camera). Furthermore, data collection included a second component:

interviews with the same participants (who have volunteered) in the digital classroom observations. This triangulation allowed for clarifications of fieldnotes, and students' views, thus contributing to rigour of the data produced. Ethical guidelines were complied with, with prospective participants being informed of the role of the researcher's online presence prior to observations, and being given the opportunity to quit participation at any time. They were further assured that anonymity and confidentiality would be kept.

During the first stage, the researcher attended daily online lectures, seminars and students' group work of MSc students in the final third of their first MSc year, totalling 126 h of online observation. With a focus on individual interactions in the classroom (as whole and in groups in breakout rooms), students' behaviour, activities, and interactions were observed. Initially a 'fly on the wall' (non-participatory observation), the researcher subsequently engaged in participatory observation when either invited or when questioning, for example, language switch during students' interactions. During these exchanges, students eventually voiced their interest in participating in this study and, in a snowball fashion, they increasingly volunteered to take part in the research.

The second component comprised semi-structured online interviews with 38 participants from the observation pool of students. Participants were provided with an information sheet and a consent form prior to 45–70 min interviews, which were audio-recorded and transcribed. The interviews were conversational and covered themes around their personal and academic experiences.

Final sampling included 20 Danish students (15 male and 5 female) and 18 international students (6 male and 12 female): 11 European, 7 non-European (American, Chinese and Brazilian). All participants had been living in Denmark for nearly a year or longer. Most were aged between 24–26 (24 informants), with 10 students aged between 20–23, and 4 students between 27–30. Most Danish students in this research had experienced at least one semester abroad as part of their undergraduate studies and claimed to be bi- or multilingual. Finally, students from other Nordic countries were deliberately not included due to similarities of the educational and welfare systems. While the region is not necessarily monolithic, nuanced variables would deserve another layer of analysis that is beyond the scope of this paper.

## **Findings and Discussion**

The excerpts in this section show the prevalent themes related to how most students (including domestic and international participants of the 8 MSc programmes) associated internationalisation with quality of HE.

### *International Staff and the Value of Diverse Pedagogy*

I think it's a great opportunity to have different teachers from all over the world, because they bring together different knowledge, and they also teach differently, so I can learn different points of view on a subject, and I think this is quality... (international student)

... having international academics is important, and can be related to quality of education because when we get out of the university we won't be working only with Danish people, we will be working with people all over the world from different universities... and you have to be able to adapt to people who think differently, you have to adapt to and learn another way of doing things because you have been exposed to something different... (Danish student)

The value of varied pedagogies was appreciated amongst students who perceive themselves as citizens of an interconnected and globalised society, where international dialogue is seen as a necessity for future professionals. 'Internationalisation at home' includes the recruitment of international academics, who are at the forefront of engaging with multicultural students. While pedagogical approaches to multicultural classrooms have been researched (e.g., Gu et al., 2009; Wang & Moskal, 2019), much work remains to be done on pedagogies for academics to proactively facilitate internationalisation. This is reflected across ninety percent of international students' perceptions of Danish lecturers' pedagogy as being domestically-oriented.

...it feels like I entered a Danish university, where the Danish professors are teaching Danish students... and you are allowed in just because everything is taught in English. (international student)

... sometimes I can understand foreign teachers better [...] and I think international teachers are better than Danish teachers, perhaps because they know why we don't understand something... (international student)

Although most Danish staff in this Faculty of Science have international experience through international research and teaching collaborations (as described in their academic profiles), they do not necessarily engage with international students through their pedagogical practices, based on both observations and the participants' accounts. For instance, lecturers often did not invite the diverse voices of students attending the courses. While students did not attempt to devalue local pedagogy, they did have a broader view of internationalisation that went beyond the 'inter-national', which has implications for internationalised settings, in terms of how the local connects with the global through teaching and learning practices. It further shows the importance of international staff in 'internationalisation at home' strategies, since inbound student mobility and use of English as a medium of instruction have long shown not to lead to internationalisation of curriculum (Hunter et al., 2018).

When probed on their responses about the value of diverse pedagogies, participants were challenged by assumptions of universality of how science is studied and practiced worldwide (Nwanegbo-Ben, 2013). Students' responses challenged assumptions about why it would matter where their lecturers were from.

Science is not necessarily universal; for example, I see a lot of bias in the western literature we need to read, but having academics from abroad, they bring other perspectives and the literature they bring also highlights issues from the perspective of regions, where the literature is produced, and I think this is quality in terms of a global view. (Danish student)

I think it's important for staff to be international ... because quality education, especially in a field like this... you need to know a lot more than just a singular context... and I guess that knowing people from different places, you learn different ways of thinking... (international student)

The value of international staff was intertwined with internationalisation of curriculum practices, as participants mentioned the importance of learning different theories and methods generated in other geographies of knowledge. While these accounts demonstrate how students value the development of critical thinking and skills, by becoming aware of dominant knowledge paradigms, and the importance of knowledge circulation, this was associated with the idea of an ever-changing nature of STEM, and thus the need to be updated and able to work with diverse groups in an interconnected global society.

Whilst this shows the connections between internationalisation and global dimensions within HE, it does not necessarily afford global citizenship in their future careers. Pitts and Brooks (2017, p. 264) define a global citizen as 'someone who is able to understand and be open to 'diverse modes of being', learns to appreciate and accept cultural enigmas, and has the ability to look beyond cultural divides and assumptions.' Thus, exploring how both inbound staff mobility and internationalisation of domestic staff (including internationalisation of the curriculum) add value to the classroom through teaching and learning practices can challenge monocultural pedagogical practices.

### *International Students Adding Quality to Educational Experiences*

Across the dataset, both domestic and international participants highly valued the presence of international students in the MSc programmes and associated this with HE quality enhancement. The presence of international students was linked to being exposed to different perspectives.

In my programme 70–75% of the students are international... and for me it's important because they bring something extra to my education that I wouldn't be able to achieve in a Danish classroom. In this sense, I think international students add to quality in terms of the different points of view they bring. (Danish student)

There are lots of students from different countries and different backgrounds, and it's good that we have opportunity to exchange ideas because we may have different

understanding about something, especially people from China and the US, and this opens my mind to another way of thinking... or a student coming from a not very rich country may have a different perspective from another student coming from Sweden... so I think internationalisation adds quality to education. (International student)

Most international participants expressed the importance of other foreign students as part of their educational and personal experiences. In this sense, they seemed to have expectations of a transformative experience through social and academic exchanges. On the other hand, they found it challenging to engage with Danish students, as emphasised by this international student: *'there is a very obvious divide between international students and Danish students in the classroom.'*

Conversely, despite almost all domestic students valuing the presence of international students as adding quality to their education experiences, their behaviour during observations confirmed, to some extent, international students' perceptions of such (dis)integration. Danish students tended to form breakout groups amongst themselves when they were given the option and often switched to Danish language. Even though the classes and assignments were in English, they shared that they *'like to clarify their understanding in Danish'*. Furthermore, when students were given long-term assessments and were grouped randomly, domestic students commonly critiqued international students' level of commitment to the given task. This absence of regular contact between domestic and international students for long-term tasks is reinforced by another recent study in Denmark (Fabricius et al., 2017), which showed that international students were more successful in engaging with other international students. Wiers-Jenssen (2022) explored international students' satisfaction, coping and social networks while studying in Norway, and their study also showed low social and academic interactions between international and Norwegians students.

This lack of interaction as part of class activities and assignments between domestic and international students is not new in the literature, but has been mostly explored in Anglophone settings (e.g., Spencer-Oatey et al., 2017; Spencer-Oatey & Dauber, 2019), whereby domestic students' main concerns were about international students' levels of English proficiency, and its impact on group grades. However, in the present research, levels of English proficiency were not an issue raised by either domestic or international students; rather, the level of commitment of international students in group tasks with Danish students was frequently mentioned. Notwithstanding the value attached to inbound student mobility, the paradox remains: to what extent do domestic students benefit from international students in the classroom? While Danish participants noted the presence of international students as adding value and quality to their educational experiences, this did not necessarily translate into practice. Conversely, how do international students benefit from host cultures in their educational experiences?

Intercultural skills can be regarded as a global citizenship graduate attribute, and internationalisation and integration are thus closely related (Spencer-Oatey & Dauber, 2019). Lilley et al. (2015) empirical study challenged the ontology of *being* and *becoming* global citizens in HE and proposed a conceptual model for an

ongoing process of global citizenship learning. They suggested that global citizenship learning occurs when students in intercultural relationships: ‘leave comfort zones’, ‘think differently’, ‘engage beyond immediate circles of peers, family and friends’, ‘show maturity and initiative’ and ‘consider self, life, others, and career, and the world beyond narrow expectations’ (p.241). A number of studies (e.g., Bethel et al., 2016; Gareis, 2000) have examined a range of factors promoting and preventing interactions between domestic and international students in HE settings, in relation to characteristics of the receiving society. The findings in this paper, in a Danish context, similarly suggest that international and domestic students live parallel lives.

Finally, the richness of data in this study can be translated as: ‘what participants say is not what they do’. Participatory classroom observations added to interviews allowed the researcher to challenge students’ accounts and behaviours and thus, not only have a second ‘verification layer’<sup>4</sup>, but a more in-depth understanding of students’ attitudes towards internationalisation and what they perceive as quality of HE.

## **Conclusion**

Despite various meanings of quality in HE assigned by different stakeholders – as well as how quality is assured and benchmarked – this paper has shown that domestic and international participants perceived academic exchanges of both staff and students as important to prepare them for a globalised society. While international staff were valued as a source of varied pedagogical approaches and other geographies of knowledge, international students were regarded as adding different perspectives to educational experiences.

This paper has highlighted that enhanced quality of HE associated with internationalisation instruments, as argued in institutionalised internationalisation policies (de Wit et al., 2015), is challenged by participants’ actual classroom social practices; that is, there is a disconnect between discourses and practices of internationalisation. The observations and interviews have further shown that mobility in itself and English as a medium of instruction are not enough to promote internationalisation and enhance the quality of HE, even if international students create a diverse environment. Teaching and learning practices within multicultural classrooms play a pivotal role in fostering integration between international and domestic students, as well as valuing students’ diversity as a pedagogical resource; additionally, academic staff’s proficiency in English is not enough to turn pedagogical approaches into an international learning experience. Realigning institutional activities to implement internationalisation practices ‘... requires that those working in international HE push the boundaries of their own and others’ thinking [...] challenging long-held views of what it is to be “international” as a university, a teacher, a student and as a human being’ (de Wit & Leask, 2019, p. 466). In addition to quality enhancement benchmarks in internationalised contexts (e.g., Komotar, 2018), whereby institutional policies claim that international students contribute to the enhancement of quality of education because they bring diversity (knowledge, culture and experiences), evidence here

shows that domestic students do not necessarily benefit from it. Although participants' perceptions of quality of internationalised programmes are related to expectations of a transformative learning experience through academic and social exchanges (be it with staff and other students), there are cultural barriers (both individual and institutional) in place that potentially prevent the realisation of internationalised experiences.

While this research has focused on eight internationalised MSC programmes of a single Danish university, the findings raise central issues for HE scholars and practitioners in broader internationalised contexts. Further qualitative studies are needed to evaluate the ways in which internationalisation truly enhances quality of HE, including for all students and academic staff, and how this is translated into teaching and learning practices (i.e., processes) and outcomes (i.e., results/product?). Internationalisation rationales require alignment with humanistic values of enrichment and transformation for the common good, rather than just '...educate graduates with competences enabling them to work in an internationalised labour market' (Anonymised University's statement, 2022).

### Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

Det Frie Forskningsråd, Grant/Award Number: 8108-00032B.

### ORCID iD

Paola R. S. Eiras  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5987-8892>

### Notes

1. 'Stakeholders' in the context of quality of (international) HE includes students and staff, as well as external stakeholders such as employers and external partners of an institution. In this paper, quality from students' perspectives is the main focus.
2. Internationalisation in Denmark is manifested in reforms making universities accountable for meeting national objectives of international student recruitment, whereby English has been accepted as a natural, albeit contested, consequence of internationalisation (Wright & Zitnansky, 2021).
3. In 2013, the European Court of Justice decided that EU and EEA students who work part time in Denmark are eligible for the same student grant as Danish students (MOE, 2018). However, in 2018, politicians concern over the raising number of EU citizens claiming students' grants motivated the formulation of a new policy that required universities to cut up to 25% of their programmes offered in English. This 'de-internationalisation' has been a topic of hot current debates in Denmark (Wright & Zitnansky, 2021).
4. Please note that 'verification layer' here means rigour in data collection for further interpretation and analysis rather than 'looking for the truth'.

## References

- Adriansen, H. K. (2019). *Geographies of internationalisation*. [https://projects.au.dk/fileadmin/projects/GeoInt/Geographies\\_of\\_internationalisation\\_short\\_project\\_description.pdf](https://projects.au.dk/fileadmin/projects/GeoInt/Geographies_of_internationalisation_short_project_description.pdf).
- Aerden, A., de Decker, F., Divis, J., Frederiks, M., & de Wit, H. (2013). Assessing the internationalisation of degree programmes: Experiences from a Dutch-flemish pilot certifying internationalisation. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 43(1), 56–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2013.746562>
- Airey, J., Lauridsen, K. M., Räsänen, A., Salö, L., & Schwach, V. (2017). The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries: Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education*, 73, 561–576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9950-2>
- Beerens, E., Brandenburg, U., Evers, N., van Gaalen, A., Leichsenring, H., & Zimmermann, V. (2010). *Indicator projects on internationalisation: Approaches, methods and findings: A report in the context of the european project “indicators for mapping & profiling internationalisation (IMPI)*. CHE Consult.
- Benneworth, P. S., de Boer, H. F., File, J. M., Jongbloed, B. W. A., & Westerheijden, D. F. (2012). *Engaging in the modernisation agenda for European higher education. (Lifelong Learning Project)*. ESMU.
- Bethel, A., Szaso, A., & Ward, C. (2016). Parallel lives?: Predicting and enhancing connectedness between international and domestic students. In D. Jindal-Snape & B. Rienties (Eds.), *Multidimensional transition of international students to higher education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315680200>.
- Bhaskar, R. (2008). *A realist theory of science*. Routledge.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Open University Press.
- Brooks, R. (2021). The construction of higher education students within national policy: A cross-European comparison. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 51(2), 161–180. <https://doi.org/doi-org.ez.statsbiblioteket.dk:12048/10.1080/03057925.2019.1604118>
- Brooks, R., & Abrahams, J. (2018). Higher education students as consumers? Evidence from England. In: *Routledge Research in International and Comparative Education (Ed.), Educational choices, aspirations and transitions in Europe: Systemic, institutional and subjective constraints* (pp. 185–193). Routledge. ISBN 978-1138104037.
- Cheng, M. (2017). Reclaiming quality in higher education: A human factor approach. *Quality in Higher Education*, 23(2), 153–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2017.1358954>
- de Wit, H. (2009). Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education. EAIE occasional paper 22. *European Association for International Education*. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael-Stohl/publication/232219994\\_Modeling\\_Assessment\\_of\\_Outcomes\\_and\\_Impacts\\_from\\_Internationalization/links/0fcfd50c01eacc0df0000000/Modeling-Assessment-of-Outcomes-and-Impacts-from-Internationalization.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael-Stohl/publication/232219994_Modeling_Assessment_of_Outcomes_and_Impacts_from_Internationalization/links/0fcfd50c01eacc0df0000000/Modeling-Assessment-of-Outcomes-and-Impacts-from-Internationalization.pdf).
- de Wit, H. (Ed.) (2020). Quality assurance and internationalisation, higher education. In: *The international encyclopaedia of higher education systems and institutions*. Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8905-95>.
- de Wit, H., & Altbach, P. G. (2021). Internationalization in higher education: Global trends and recommendations for its future. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 5(1), 28–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2020.1820898>

- de Wit, H., Gacel-Avila, J., Jones, E., & Jooste, N. (Eds.) (2017). *The globalization of internationalization: Emerging voices and perspectives*. Internationalization in Higher Education Series. Routledge.
- de Wit, H., Hunter, F., Howard, L., & Egron-Polak, E. (2015). *Internationalisation of higher education study*. Report for the European Parliament's Committee on Culture and Education. Brussels: European Union.
- de Wit, H., & Leask, B. (2019). Towards new ways of becoming and being international. *University World News*. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190722112900397>.
- DSF – Danish Student Union. (2022). *Quality of education*. Danish Student Union. <https://www.dsfnat.dk/politikpapirer>
- EHEA. (1999). *Ministerial Conference Bologna 1999 – Bologna Declaration* (English). European Higher Education Area. <http://www.ehea.info/page-ministerial-conference-bologna-1999>
- Eiras, P. R. S. (2022). Students' experiences of internationalisation of MSc programmes in Denmark. *European Educational Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14749041221136899>
- ENQA (2005). *Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in European higher education area*. European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.
- ESG (2015). *Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European education area*. Brussels, Belgium.
- ESU (2020). *European students union. Bologna with students eyes*. Brussels. <https://www.esu-online.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/0037-Bologna-Publication-2021-WEB3.pdf>.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice. (2018). *The European higher education area in 2018: Bologna process implementation report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/sites/default/files/bologna\\_internet\\_chapter\\_3\\_0.pdf](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/sites/default/files/bologna_internet_chapter_3_0.pdf).
- Fabricius, A., Mortensen, J., & Haberland, H. (2017). The lure of internationalization: Paradoxical discourses of transnational student mobility, linguistic diversity and cross-cultural exchange. *Higher Education*, 73(4), 577–595. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9978-3>
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. Routledge.
- Gareis, E. (2000). Intercultural friendship: Five case studies of German students in the USA. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 21(1), 67–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07256860050000803>
- Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2013). Reflections on an alternative approach to continuing professional learning for internationalisation of the curriculum across disciplines. *Journal of Studies in Introducing Critical Perspectives on Internationalising the Curriculum in International Education: Special Issue, Internationalisation of the Curriculum and the Disciplines*, 17(2), 148–164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312463825>
- Gregersen, F., & Ostman, J. (2018). *More parallel, please! Best practice of parallel language use at Nordic universities: 11 Recommendations*, Nordic Council of Ministers, Nordic Council of Ministers Secretariat.
- Gu, Q., Schweisfurth, M., & Day, C. (2009). Learning and growing in a 'foreign' context: Intercultural experiences of international students. *Compare*, 40(1), 7–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920903115983>
- Harrison, N. (2015). Practice, problems and power in 'internationalisation at home': Critical reflections on recent research evidence. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(4), 412–430. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2015.1022147>

- Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 18*(1), 9–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293930180102>
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time*. Harper. Original work published 1927.
- Hine, C. (2000). *Virtual Ethnography*. Sage Publications.
- Huang, F. (2007). Internationalization of higher education in the developing and emerging countries: A focus on transnational higher education in Asia. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), 421–432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303919>
- Hultgren, A. K. (2017). The drive towards English as a medium of instruction in non-English-dominant European higher education: The role of university rankings. In E. Macaro (Ed.), *English medium instruction: Global views and countries in focus: Introduction to the symposium held at the department of education*. University of Oxford on Wednesday 4 November 2015. *Language Teaching, 1*-18.
- Hunter, F., Jones, E., & de Wit, H. (2018). The Staff who are overlooked in Internationalisation. *University World News*. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20181031081234166>.
- Jones, E. (2019). From mobility to internationalization of the curriculum at home: Where are the students in the intelligent internationalisation conversation? In K. A. Godwin & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Intelligent Internationalisation: The Shape of Things to Come*. Brill/Sense Publishing.
- Jungblut, J., Vukasovic, M., & Stensaker, B. (2015). Student perspectives on quality in higher education. *European Journal of Higher Education, 5*(2), 157–180. <https://doi.org/doi-org.ez.statsbiblioteket.dk:12048/10.1080/21568235.2014.998693>
- Knight, J. (2001). Monitoring the quality and progress of internationalisation. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5*(3), 228–243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/102831530153004>
- Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (2018). What contributions has internationalisation made to HE? *University World News*, 12 October 2018. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20181010093946721>.
- Komotar, M. H. (2018). Quality assurance of internationalisation and internationalisation of quality assurance in Slovenian and Dutch higher education. *European Journal of Higher Education, 8*(4), 415–434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2018.1458635>
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 453–484. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587674>
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Lilley, K., Barker, M., & Harris, N. (2015). Exploring the process of global citizen learning and the student mind-set. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 19*(3), 225–245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315314547822>
- Milliken, J., & Colohan, G. (2004). Quality or control? Management in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 26*(3), 381–391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080042000290221>
- MOE (2018). Uddannelses- og Forskningsministeriet (2018) *Justering af engelsksprogede uddannelser*. <https://ufm.dk/publikationer/2018/justering-af-engelsksprogede-uddannelser>
- Mosneaga, A., & Agergaard, J. (2012). Agents of internationalisation? Danish universities' practices for attracting international students. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 10*(4), 519–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2012.690309>
- Nwanegbo-Ben, J. (2013). The paradox of scientific universality. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS), 13*(4), 80–83.

- OECD. (2009). *Review on quality teaching in higher education*. Institutional Management in Higher Education.
- Pitts, M. J., & Brooks, C. F. (2017). Critical pedagogy, internationalisation, and a third space: Cultural tensions revealed in students' discourse. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(3), 251–267. <https://doi.org/doi-org.ez.statsbiblioteket.dk:12048/10.1080/01434632.2015.1134553>
- Sarrico, C. S., & Rosa, M. J. (2014). Student satisfaction with Portuguese higher education institutions: The view of different types of students. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 20(2), 165–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2014.900108>
- Spencer-Oatey, H., & Dauber, D. (2019). Internationalisation and student diversity: How far are the opportunity benefits being perceived and exploited? *High Education*, 78, 1035–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00386-4>
- Spencer-Oatey, H., Dauber, D., Jing, J., & Lifei, W. (2017). Chinese Students' social integration into the university community: Hearing the students' voices. *High Education*, 74, 739–756. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0074-0>
- Tange, H. (2021). *Teaching Practices in a Global Learning Environment: An Interdisciplinary Take on International Education*. Routledge, Global Connections. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315398662>.
- Teichler, U. (2012). International student mobility and the Bologna process. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 7(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.2304/rcie.2012.7.1.34>
- Teichler, U. (2017). Internationalisation trends in higher education and the changing role of international student mobility. *Journal of International Mobility*, 1(5), 177–216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-009-9002-7>
- Tsiligiris, V., & Hill, C. (2019). A prospective model for aligning educational quality and student experience in international higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(2), 228–244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1628203>
- Uzhegova, D., & Baik, C. (2022). Internationalisation of higher education in an uneven world: An integrated approach to internationalisation of universities in the academic periphery. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(4), 847–859. <https://doi.org/doi-org.ez.statsbiblioteket.dk:12048/10.1080/03075079.2020.1811220>
- Van der Wende, M. (2010). Internationalisation of higher education. In P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. McGaw (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Elsevier.
- Wang, S., & Moskal, M. (2019). What is wrong with silence in intercultural classrooms? An insight into international students' integration at a UK university. *Journal of Comparative and International Higher Education*, 11, 52–58. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jcihe.v11iWinter.1087>
- Wiers-Jenssen, J. (2022). International students in Norway: Satisfaction, coping and social networks. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 0(0), 102831532210827. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153221082720>
- Wright, S., & Zitnansky, M. (2021). *De-internationalising Danish Higher Education: Reframing the Discussion*. CHEF, Danish School of Education. ISBN: 978-87-7684-511-7.

### Author biography

**Paola Eiras** is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Danish School of Education, Aarhus University, Denmark, and she holds a PhD in Sociology of Higher Education (HE).

In the past 5 years, her research has focused on students' experiences in multicultural settings and the role of languages, pedagogy, spaces, and relationships in fostering educational experiences that incorporate intercultural and global dimensions, as a desired and expected outcome of internationalisation of HE. Further information <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5987-8892>