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EDITORIAL

In talking of boundaries in international education, our minds generally turn to national borders and the significant focus of international educators and their students on crossing those borders, either literally — through exchange, study abroad or degree-seeking mobility, or figuratively — through Internationalisation at Home activities and the fostering of cross-cultural awareness.

In the Winter 2023 edition of Forum, however, we take a different perspective on the crossing of boundaries, narrowing our focus to an important set of boundaries within and between our institutions — the boundaries between disciplines and disciplinary communities. In so doing, we seek to apply a different lens to the work of international educators, enabling us to conceive of our work from new perspectives, just as we did with the Winter 2021 edition of Forum focused on distributed leadership in internationalisation.

At the outset, of course, we should acknowledge that the disciplines themselves are a truly international construct, unbounded by the walls of any single institution. As such, it is no surprise that scholars in a particular discipline have more in common with their disciplinary peers in other institutions and countries than with colleagues from other disciplines on their home campus. The pursuit of new knowledge in a global context is the very essence of what ties disciplinary scholars together.

In today’s world of higher education, however, interdisciplinarity is increasingly being put forward as the solution to a range of problems. Indeed, many see that innovative, boundary-spanning approaches to education and research are crucial to address the most urgent and complex challenges of our time.

European Universities alliances, for example, are urged to work ambitiously both across countries and across disciplines. The European Commission’s 2022 European strategy for universities variously envisions “flexible, interdisciplinary paths” for students, synergies across key European initiatives to stimulate “innovative and interdisciplinary learning, teaching and research” and “flexibility in funding programmes to allow for interdisciplinarity”.

The articles selected for this edition of Forum look at interdisciplinarity from a range of angles — through Collaborative Online International Learning, for example, or through mobility programmes or other initiatives that draw on multiple disciplines. In each case, the authors acknowledge that interdisciplinarity generally goes hand-in-hand with internationalisation.

To further our understanding of interdisciplinarity, I am delighted that Professor Georgina Born OBE FBA, Professor of Anthropology and Music at University College London agreed to be interviewed for this issue. In her academic life, Professor Born’s work combines ethnographic and theoretical writings on music, sound, television and digital media, and she has also had a professional life as a musician in experimental rock, jazz and free improvisation. Importantly, Professor Born is currently leading a European Research Council funded project looking at the cultural implications of artificial intelligence (AI) on music from an interdisciplinary perspective. In addition to University College London, other partners in the MusAI (Music and Artificial Intelligence) project are the Max Planck Institute for Empirical Aesthetics (Germany) and King’s College London.

While the breaking down of traditional boundaries and silos within higher education serves to unleash new creative and intellectual impulses, it also introduces a whole host of questions about how institutions manage complex boundary-crossing initiatives and how we evaluate the quality and impact of this type of work. This is perhaps the next boundary that international educators will need to cross, as our institutions turn to us for guidance on how to ensure the successful replication of interdisciplinary projects and partnerships.

I hope that this edition of Forum provides new insights into the importance of disciplinary boundaries in international education, and the opportunities presented by crossing those boundaries. With thanks to the authors and to Arnim Heinemann on the EAIE Publications Committee who joined me in reviewing submissions for this issue.

I hope that you enjoy reading this edition of Forum.

— DOUGLAS PROCTOR, EDITOR
publications@eaie.org
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Georgina Born OBE FBA is Professor of Anthropology and Music at University College London. In her academic life, Professor Born’s work crosses many traditional disciplinary boundaries, and she has also had a professional life as a musician in experimental rock, jazz and free improvisation. At this stage in what has already been a highly multidisciplinary career, Professor Born is currently leading a European Research Council funded project looking at the cultural implications of artificial intelligence (AI) on music from an interdisciplinary perspective.

To what extent do you believe that your periods of time living and working overseas have influenced your career in academia? Do you see a connection between interdisciplinary research and internationalisation?

GB: Living and working overseas has been a welcome feature of my academic life. I spent a year and lots of visits back and forth to Paris for my PhD research, which became my first and most well-known book, so that was pretty formative for me. Since that time, I’ve done a lot of visiting in North America and Europe, but much less outside the Global North, except for research in the last decade which involved going to Kenya, Argentina, India, Cuba and other places I had never been before. So I think the short answer is that I’ve enormously benefited from – and I hope benefited – those places I’ve visited as an increasingly senior academic, but in my own case I don’t think it particularly relates to interdisciplinarity as such.

That being said, my interdisciplinary research is very, very international. The two main computer scientists I collaborate with right now are an engineer based in the States and Canada, and an American engineer and expert in music information retrieval based in Stockholm. I do think that intellectual life and research life these days are profoundly international. The UK just re-signed the international agreement allowing it to re-enter the European Union Horizon scheme about three weeks ago. We’ve all been on tenterhooks about this scheme, as it is a principal funding source for many of us. It’s just one example of the absolute vitality of our internationalisation. So in terms of research, I would say internationalisation and interdisciplinarity are intrinsically good bedfellows and good partners.

How did you discover the possibilities of interdisciplinarity in your own work? Was this early in your career? Or did your fields of anthropology and music lend themselves more readily to interdisciplinary approaches?

GB: When I left school at 18 I was going to train as a classical musician, but I decided not to and dropped out to work professionally as a musician. After about five years touring a lot in Europe and other places, I decided I needed some space to do some thinking and reading and wanted to do a degree. So I then applied to do anthropology, and took that degree thinking I’d just do it for the sheer interest of it. For some reason it went well, I got a first class degree, and they offered me a PhD grant. But what was interesting was, I immediately took my anthropological focus to music. And so from the very get-go, I was really oriented to using anthropology to address questions in music, and vice-versa.
My first PhD study was about computer music. I was looking at a very famous institute in Paris, called IRCAM, that is probably the world leading centre in computer music, and I was studying it as a kind of social and cultural organisation. By that point, I was mixing anthropology and music with a focus on computing and media. My first job was actually in media studies at a university in Britain, and my second job was also in media studies. And then a very interesting thing happened, which was that I was hired at Cambridge to teach the sociology of media and culture. I've now had academic jobs in media studies, sociology, music, and now finally, I'm back in anthropology, so it's kind of come full circle. I think one thing this shows is that, within the social sciences and humanities, there are so many currents crossing between these disciplines. You know, if you're sitting in media studies, to read some sociology or to absorb some anthropology is perfectly normal.

In terms of research, I would say internationalisation and interdisciplinarity are intrinsically good bedfellows and good partners in Britain, and my second job was also in media studies. And then a very interesting thing happened, which was that I was hired at Cambridge to teach the sociology of media and culture. I've now had academic jobs in media studies, sociology, music, and now finally, I'm back in anthropology, so it's kind of come full circle. I think one thing this shows is that, within the social sciences and humanities, there are so many currents crossing between these disciplines. You know, if you're sitting in media studies, to read some sociology or to absorb some anthropology is perfectly normal.

You currently lead an EU-funded project with interdisciplinarity at the core, looking at music and artificial intelligence. Who are the key partners in this project, and what were the principal drivers behind its formation?

Gb: The particular scheme that I got my grant from is the European Research Council, which is famous in Europe because it's a stunning opportunity for a leading researcher to have a visionary idea and orchestrate a research project around it. My idea was that there's lots of work on social and ethical aspects of AI, but there's very little work yet on the specifically cultural implications of AI, and certainly rather little critical work on this. So my project is predicated on developing a set of smaller research projects, which are in dialogue with each other, looking critically at the cultural implications of AI and doing that through music.

The project is built around me and a series of rather senior and mid-career collaborators from Europe and the US and Australia. Together we have ten projects, and each of them addresses a different aspect of this question. Some are more and some are less interdisciplinarity, but the most interesting and radical interdisciplinarity is evident in two of the projects which are collaborations with leading figures from computer science and data science. There's a field called 'music information retrieval', or MIR, which is what happens to data science when it engages with music, and in these two projects we're developing radically alternative approaches to the normal work in each field, by putting the computer science directly in dialogue with people like me and a few others who come from the social sciences and humanities and who bring completely new perspectives. It's a kind of two-way dialogue, out of which we are trying to forge completely new approaches to the problems at hand – one project is focused on alternative, 'public interest' designs for recommender systems, and the other on new computational approaches to modelling musical genres.

Some argue that national quality assurance frameworks, university rankings and research publication practices serve as barriers to interdisciplinary work. Has this been your experience? And, if so, how have you worked around this?

Gb: It's a well-aired criticism that these quality assurance audits are poor at recognising interdisciplinary work. I have to say that, as someone whose work has always been fundamentally across a number of boundaries, I've never felt particularly disadvantaged, and that is because, in the British system, at least, we have the Research Excellence Framework (REF). In my earlier career as a younger and mid-career academic, what used to happen is that my outputs and publications would be put into whichever disciplinary panel it was relevant to: some of my work would go to anthropology, to sociology, to music, to media studies and so on. And I never really found it a problem because those panels would feed a mark back into the central tally of research quality. Now, it's
also the case that in the last ten years or so, the whole design of the REF has been changed to encourage greater interdisciplinarity by making panels that are often themselves composed of interdisciplinary elements. So if you’re in the arts these days, you’ll send your research outputs to an interdisciplinary creative arts panel, which has theatre, dance, music, etc. So interdisciplinary work is more likely to be judged in a sympathetic way in the UK audits. Of course, some colleagues might criticise that, because they think it inevitably dilutes the specifically musical expertise or the theatre studies expertise that ought to be brought into evaluations. But in my opinion, there’s no mechanical issue here, and in fact, at least in the UK, a lot of effort has been expended in trying to recognise how many of us are now doing interdisciplinary work, particularly within the humanities, and between them and the social sciences.

Many EAIE members work in international offices, supporting international student mobility and the broader internationalisation of their campuses. As a senior academic, what boundaries do you believe we need to cross to ensure the most effective collaboration between academic and professional staff in our institutions?

gb: I now have mixed feelings about advocating an academic career for my young, brilliant colleagues, because of the loss of earnings, tenure and security, but also because of the absolute excess of online monitoring and auditing of the everyday practices of young academics, which has grown out of control and is onerous. I feel that the pressures on young academics of these multiple kinds are becoming excessive, and causing the rewards, the freedoms, the pleasures, the benefits of the job to be overshadowed.

I think the problem in Britain has been taking the American model of an increasingly professionalised administrative career structure, and I do sympathise with the professionalised academic administrative staff, because they’ve faced an escalating avalanche of demands, including their own auditing processes by which everything now has to be triply confirmed and calibrated. Although there are certain benefits to that, there now seems to be a cultural gap between the training of the professional administrative staff and academic values. So there’s a cultural problem whereby we academics often feel the administrative staff don’t listen enough to what our priorities and needs are.

I feel that administrative staff should be aware that escalating the demands of online monitoring and grading is not the right way to create the best teaching and learning environment. I don’t know if administrative staff are aware quite how much some of these demands are eating into not only our well-being, our time for research and intellectual scholarship, but crucially the contacts we can have with students and the quality of the teaching experience. Because above all, our students want contact.

There’s lots of work on social and ethical aspects of AI, but there’s very little work yet on the specifically cultural implications which has theatre, dance, music, etc. So interdisciplinary work is now more likely to be judged in a sympathetic way in the UK audits. Of course, some colleagues might criticise that, because they think it inevitably dilutes the specifically musical expertise or the theatre studies expertise that ought to be brought into evaluations. But in my opinion, there’s no mechanical issue here, and in fact, at least in the UK, a lot of effort has been expended in trying to recognise how many of us are now doing interdisciplinary work, particularly within the humanities, and between them and the social sciences.
CROSS-BOUNDARY COLLABORATION WITH COIL
One of the readiest tools for breaking down barriers in higher education is Collaborative Online International Learning, or COIL. Relying as it does on meaningful interactions between participants from different cultures – be they the cultures of a particular people group or of a specific academic discipline – this form of virtual exchange is perfectly poised to further both interdisciplinarity and internationalisation.

Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) is a teaching and learning method used to internationalise the curriculum and facilitate students’ intercultural and curriculum content learning. COIL can be seen as one of the most intensive forms of intercultural and interdisciplinary collaboration for both students and educators within higher education.

COIL adds an intercultural dimension to the curriculum, in any course, and should be recognised as an essential form of internationalisation at all levels within universities. It is a unique form of virtual exchange as it revolves entirely around the collaboration of two or more educators, from different universities located in different countries, co-developing and co-facilitating online collaborative assignments for their students. With its foundations in social constructivism and collaborative learning, COIL in practice is highly interdependent as it relies on social interaction and brings educators and students from multiple diverse backgrounds, cultures and disciplines together, interacting and collaborating on a common goal.

The university alliances created through the European Universities Initiative often use COIL because of its project-based learning approach, which involves connecting various subjects and developing different skills to complete a project. It merges different ways of thinking and behaving, different values, beliefs and norms and different university cultures, and it can also involve collaboration between leaders at different levels.

We are not just aiming to reach a common goal despite our differences; we ideally want to reach a higher goal because of our differences.

Beliefs, behaviours, ideas, philosophies and practices shared by any specific group of people. Each discipline actually has its own culture (e.g., the field of medicine versus the field of philosophy). From this perspective, ‘intercultural learning’ takes on a different meaning, where the cultural boundaries that are being crossed also relate to differences between disciplines.

The interdisciplinary element within COIL is fundamental: the COIL experience is truly transformative when both educators and students leave their comfort zone. We are not just aiming to reach a common goal despite our differences; we ideally want to reach a higher goal because of our differences.
Going through the COIL experience means challenging our assumptions about the differences between us: both finding differences where they were not expected and realising that presumed differences are often smaller than we think.

**LEARNING FROM EACH OTHER**

One of the first steps in implementing COIL involves crossing organisation-al cultures. Educators need to find a suitable COIL partner from a university abroad with whom they can co-develop and co-facilitate the COIL course. This involves the careful consideration of various elements that can differ greatly even between universities in the same country, let alone universities in different countries. It can lead to a lot of surprises that can facilitate or hinder the successful implementation of COIL. When co-designing a COIL course, educators need to consider differences in educational levels, academic calendars, time zones, class size, assessment formats, data protection regulations, technology and so on.

For example, one COIL course brought together physical education (PE) teacher training students from the Netherlands and primary school teacher training students from Ireland to develop an inclusive physical education lesson plan. Teacher training Bachelor’s courses are offered at research universities in Ireland, while most teacher training courses are offered at universities of applied sciences (hogescholen) in the Netherlands. In addition, the Irish students were trained as generalist primary school teachers, teaching an array of different subjects, while the Dutch students were being trained only to specialise in PE at different educational levels.

The students participating in this COIL course therefore had different levels of knowledge and were trained in different ways; the Irish students had more theoretical knowledge, while the Dutch students had more practical, specialised knowledge. At first, the educators thought these differences could be problematic – but as the course progressed, these different levels of knowledge and experience complemented one another and resulted in a well-designed lesson plan that took different perspectives into account.

One Irish student said: “The Dutch were very relaxed and chilled out. They were very good at providing real-life examples for PE practices, while we were good at providing the educational theories behind the practices but not the examples.”

Another Irish student had this to say: “I learned that PE is a more serious subject in the Netherlands than in Ireland. For example, in the Netherlands, to be able to teach PE at primary school level you have to be a certified PE teacher; in Ireland, this is not the case – you just have to be a certified regular teacher with some PE knowledge.”

And a Dutch perspective: “I learned a lot about Irish culture – especially about the Irish school system. In addition, the hurling and Gaelic football clinic was especially valuable to me as a gym teacher, because I can apply this in my gym lessons. It is nice to learn more about sports that we don’t play here in the Netherlands.”

This is just one example of how the differences between two programmes can facilitate students’ curriculum content and intercultural learning. There are many more examples of COIL involving students and lecturers from diverse disciplines collaborating and learning from one another.

**LIMITLESS POTENTIAL**

COIL has so much to offer and its potential is limitless. The COIL method will only become more popular as universities and educators realise its potential and how it can be used as an inclusive teaching and learning method for both curriculum content and intercultural learning across countries and across disciplines. We envisage COIL becoming even more impactful as it is used in a more intentional way for teaching and learning across boundaries of all kinds.

— SIMONE HACKETT & PIET VAN HOVE
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