

Using Bernstein's Pedagogic Device in Internationalisation Studies: Success and Challenges.

James O'Meara
University of Ballarat
Australia

The pedagogic device model provides a logic to educational process 'rules' that link to larger structural conditions; within the context of the larger educational and policy questions of educators (Bernstein, 2000). Within Australia, this model was used to examine questions linked to secondary schools implementing State-level policies through school-based curricula (O'Meara, 2005). Additional challenges emerged when this model was applied to internationalisation questions involving transnational tertiary settings. This shift raised questions about the structure, capacity, and potential of the pedagogic device model within the context of internationalisation through research. The paper presents an ongoing project using the pedagogic device within this context. The International Council on Education for Teaching (ICET) writing project involves finding answers for the following three research questions:

1. What activities could reflect key attributes within an internationalisation process involving research?
2. What roles can individuals play when promoting internationalisation research at and through their institution?
3. How can an investigator distinguish between and discuss different types of internationalisation research occurring at the different institutions?

The answers to these questions are assisting researchers with the design and delivery of projects across institutions. The internationalisation 'concept' (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969) identified a set of themes that defined the scope of internationalisation for the group of researchers. The 'theory' (Kerlinger, 1986) of comparative inquiry (King, 1967) provided a four-step approach that resulted in descriptive criteria that elaborated on these themes. Step one provided a set of internationalisation issues relevant to the participating authors. Step two, created a typology (Bowker and Starr, 2000) of internationalisation issues, which defined the 'what' of internationalisation and assisted with classifying each case into a particular category of internationalisation through research. Step three yielded a classification hierarchy enabling an orderly grouping of internationalisation cases based on the similarity and differences. The final step of this approach involved a comparative analysis of the writer's research project. The outcomes of this step will be realised in March 2010, once the research manuscripts have been completed.

Using the pedagogic device model for analysing internationalisation research is yielding some positive outcomes. The pedagogic device is proving a useful as a structure for locating fields of activity where individuals or groups are shaping internationalisation processes. Identifying UNESCO as a key 'producing' field' (UNESCO,2009,1998) is helping with locating where, constructing and positioning of an official internationalisation discourse is occurring. Considering the University of Ballarat as a recontextualizing field is assisting with identifying where the appropriating and repositioning of 'educational' knowledge is occurring. These sites include Academic Board for recontextualising UNESCO guidelines into a university policy (i.e. ORF) and staff-member's offices for 'framing' UB compliant policies for

the collaborating ICET researchers (i.e. PRF). Locating the collaborating universities as the place where pedagogic practice is taking place, is providing a focal point for comparing and contrasting the 'manual discourses' of research collaborating through this project.

The pedagogic device model is also providing a useful means of describing the processes linked to the activities occurring in these fields. The distributive rules are helping with analysing the regulating and distributing of the 'worthwhile'. The recontextualising rules are assisting with transforming an official discourse into a pedagogic discourse in a form suitable for transmitting the ICET/UB internationalisation 'message'. The evaluative rules are informing the process for transforming this pedagogic discourse into a set of internationalisation standards for the collaborating researchers. Combining the rules and fields is assisting with analysing the 'arena' (Bernstein, 1996) of conflict where people will be adhering to and/or reconstructing the ICET/UB internationalisation standards.

Working in a developing area of internationalisation through research with the Bernstein model presented a challenge. The language the researchers used to describe internationalisation research was unique to the individuals. Elaborated internationalisation codes (Bernstein, 1971) were required for such a diverse group with no prior or shared understanding and knowledge of internationalisation through research. The loose structure of the volunteer group reinforced the potential to use an elaborate code (Littlejohn, 2002), the problem was that there were few if any existing internationalisation language 'codes' available to the group. While the Bernstein model was useful in identifying the need for a code, King's (1967) comparative theory was required to create a code that required no previous knowledge on the part of the academic 'listeners' (Bernstein, 1971). The use of the four steps in this theory provided a set of integrated internationalisation concepts, i.e. research, impact, collaboration, and sustainability. It also led to a hierarchical internationalisation or 'knowledge structure' (Bernstein, 1999), based on the four internationalisation concepts. The four levels of the internationalisation hierarchy were Level 1 - Individual Process- Personal Focus; Level 2 - Collaborative Process- Homogenous Focus; Level 3 - Collaborative Process- Heterogeneous Focus and Level 4 - Collaborative Process- Strategic Focus. Without the use of King's (1967) comparative theory, this would not have occurred and research questions about internationalisation attributes and different types of internationalisation research at the different institutions would remain unanswered.

As long as researchers (see for example Christie & Martin 2007) continue to research how knowledge is produced there could be a place for limiting knowledge investigations to Bernstein's concepts of arenas, codes, fields, processes, and rules. When researchers take an active role in generating educational knowledge or using existing knowledge in different ways i.e. 'research' (MCEEYTA, 2007) then the integration of additional models may be necessary. Setting or explaining internationalisation standards to new colleagues would most certainly involve communicating in an elaborated code, the challenge is that this code is yet to be fully developed. The diversity of internationalisation classifications, the 'openness of systems' (Littlejohn, 2002) built around borderless universities and the expectations for researchers to participate in trans national research (Seddoh, 2003) warrants continued research in this area. Despite the ongoing nature of this research, the author expects internationalisation researchers can use the existing findings to replicate or

generate internationalisation codes that reflect the structure of their group and the values of the participating collaborators.

References

- Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, Codes and Control vol. I*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1977). *Class, codes and control, vol. 3*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *Class Codes and Control vol IV: The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. (Revised edition). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield publishers.

- International Association of Universities (IAU). (2000). *Towards a Century of Cooperation: Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Retrieved November 30, 2009, from <http://www.iau-aiu.net/internationalization/index.html>
- Bowker G. C., Starr S. L., (2000). *Sorting Things Out: Classification and its Consequences* New Baskerville: MIT Press.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- King, E. (1967). *Comparative Studies and Educational Decision*. London: Methuen.
- Knight, J. (2003). "Updated Definition of Internationalization" *International Higher Education: The Boston College Center for International Higher Education Newsletter* 33 Fall 2003: 2-3.
- Littlejohn, S. (2002). *Theories of Human Communication*. Albuquerque: Wadsworth
- MCEETYA. (2007) National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes Retrieved January 28, 2010, from <http://www.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Programs/StudentSupport/NationalProtocolsforHEApprovalProcesses/>
- O'Meara, J.G. (2005). Policies, Practices and Professional Development: A Study of Curriculum Implementation within an Australian High School. *Research in Education*.
- Richards, J.C. (1990). *The Language Teaching Matrix*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Seddoh, K. (2003). Internationalisation of Higher Education: Trends and Developments since 1998. Retrieved November 30, 2009, from <http://pps.teithe.gr/UNESCO145505E.pdf>
- Theodorson, G.A., & Theodorson, A.G. (1969). *A Modern Dictionary of Sociology*. New York: Barnes & Noble.
- UNESCO, (2009). 2009 World Conference on Higher Education: The New Dynamics of Higher Education and Research For Societal Change and Development (UNESCO, Paris, 5 – 8 July 2009). Retrieved January 25, 2010, from http://www.unesco.org/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/ED/ED/pdf/WCHE_2009/FINAL%20COMMUNIQUE%20WCHE%202009.pdf
- UNESCO, (1998). World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century: Vision and Action. Retrieved November 30, 2009, from http://www.unesco.org/education/educprog/wche/declaration_eng.htm