

Beyond The Discourse: The Internationalization Of The Curriculum In Higher Education From The FCQ-UJED

Miriam Hazel Rodríguez López¹, Araceli Benitez Hernández², María de Jesús Antonia Ochoa Oliva^{3*}

¹ Juarez University of the State of Durango, Faculty of Chemical Sciences, Mexico. UJED

miriamhazel.rodriguez@ujed.mx ORCID:0000-0002-8609-5068

² National School for Kindergarten Teachers, Mexico.

araceli.benitez@aefcm.gob.mx ORCID:009-004-0643-8166

³ Autonomous University of Nuevo Leon, Faculty of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Mexico. UANL.

maria.ochoa@uanl.edu.mx ORCID:0000-0002-8723-8446

HOW TO CITE:

Miriam Hazel Rodríguez López.,
Araceli Benitez Hernández., María de
Jesús Antonia Ochoa Oliva (2026).
Beyond The Discourse: The
Internationalization Of The Curriculum
In Higher Education From The FCQ-
UJED.
International Journal of Special
Education, 41(3s), 01-07.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the
terms and conditions
of the Creative Commons Attribution
(CC BY)
license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT:

In a context of growing interdependence among nations, the incorporation of the international, intercultural and global dimension in the curriculum has become a strategic necessity for higher education institutions. This integration not only responds to the demands of an increasingly connected world, but also contributes to the formation of citizens with a broad vision, capable of understanding and acting in diverse cultural realities (Knight, 2004; UNESCO, 2015). From this perspective, the internationalization of the curriculum should not be understood only as academic mobility, but as a broader process that involves integrating content, methodologies, training experiences and assessment strategies with a global and intercultural approach (De Wit & Leask, 2015).

Various international organizations have pointed out that this dimension strengthens educational quality and contributes to the development of key competencies such as critical thinking, intercultural communication, social responsibility, and global citizenship (UNESCO, 2022; AUIP, 2020). It also favors a more relevant articulation between higher education and the dynamics of knowledge in a global context (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

Keywords: Higher Education, FCQ-UJED

INTRODUCTION

In a context of growing interdependence among nations, the incorporation of the international, intercultural and global dimension in the curriculum has become a strategic necessity for higher education institutions. This integration not only responds to the demands of an increasingly connected world, but also contributes to the formation of citizens with a broad vision, capable of understanding and acting in diverse cultural realities (Knight, 2004; UNESCO, 2015).

From this perspective, the internationalization of the curriculum should not be understood only as academic mobility, but as a broader process that involves integrating content, methodologies, training experiences and assessment strategies with a global and intercultural approach (De Wit & Leask, 2015).

Various international organizations have pointed out that this dimension strengthens educational quality and contributes to the development of key competencies such as critical thinking, intercultural communication,

social responsibility, and global citizenship (UNESCO, 2022; AUIP, 2020). It also favors a more relevant articulation between higher education and the dynamics of knowledge in a global context (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

From a theoretical perspective, the internationalization of the curriculum can be understood as a deliberate process of incorporating an international, intercultural or global dimension in content, learning outcomes, training activities and evaluation mechanisms (Knight, 2004; De Wit & Leask, 2015). This approach is related to educational theories such as transformative learning, social constructivism, cultural capital theory and critical interculturality (Mezirow, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978; Bourdieu, 1986; Walsh, 2007).

In this framework, this research is aimed at identifying how the international, intercultural and global dimension has been incorporated into the curricula of the Faculty of Chemical Sciences of the Universidad Juárez of the State of Durango, in order to generate a diagnosis that contributes to strengthening the relevance of professional training. The internationalization of the curriculum is a relevant axis to move towards a more comprehensive, contextualized and forward-looking education.

From a theoretical perspective, the internationalization of the curriculum can be understood as a deliberate process of incorporating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into content, learning outcomes, training activities, and evaluation mechanisms (Knight, 2004; Leask, 2015). This approach is related to educational theories such as Mezirow's (1997) transformative learning, Vygotsky's (1978) social constructivism, Bourdieu's (1986) theory of cultural

capital, and Walsh's (2007) critical interculturality, which coincide in the importance of intercultural dialogue, critical reflection, and the social construction of knowledge.

METHOD

The research was developed under a quantitative approach, with a non-experimental descriptive cross-sectional design.

A total of 21 full-time professors from the Faculty of Chemical Sciences of the UJED participated, representing 80% of the active academic staff. A structured questionnaire was used consisting of three dimensions: cross-border internationalization, internationalization at home and international, intercultural and global as a strategy. The instrument integrated 39 items measured using a five-level Likert scale. The questionnaire was distributed using Google Forms.

SPSS version 23 was used for statistical analysis, obtaining a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .969, which indicates a high and adequate internal consistency for data analysis (Ventura & Peña, 2020).

RESULTS.

When carrying out the descriptive statistical analysis, ($n = 21$ records with complete responses in the items of the instrument) are recorded. The analysis replicates the logic of the diagnostic example document: sociodemographic frequencies, global descriptive statistics, item assessment and interpretation. The above is presented in Table 1: Sociodemographic characterization according to the frequency of each program.

Table 1. Sociodemographic characterization of the sample by frequency of the Program.

Category	Frequency	Percentage
BWI	5.0	23.8%
QBT	12.0	57.1%
QFB	4.0	19.0%

Prepared by the SPSS

The distribution of the sample shows a predominantly participation in the Biotechnologist Chemistry (QBT) program, with 57.1% of the total students surveyed. This overrepresentation suggests that the perception of the internationalization process observed in the global analysis is strongly influenced by the experience of this program.

In second place are the professors of Materials Science Engineering, who represent 23.8% of the sample. Although their relative weight is lower, they provide an important contrast in terms of professional training, disciplinary approach and

possible differential opportunities for internationalization. Finally, the Pharmaceutical Chemist and Biologist program contributes 19.0% of the sample. Although it is the group with the least presence, its inclusion allows us to maintain a comparative perspective between the three areas of training within the Faculty. Overall, this distribution shows that the subsequent analysis, especially the means of the items and the global reading of internationalization, is more aligned with the reality of QBT students, as it is the majority group.

Statistical analysis corresponding to the distribution

by age. The sample was made up of people with an average age of 50.7 years, with a range ranging from 38 to 68 years. This indicates that most of the staff is teaching or administrative with a consolidated work career, which influences their experience, expectations and reading of the internationalization process. It can be observed that the age with the highest percentage is that which corresponds to the ages of 45 and 50 years with a percentage of 15.8%

each

The results of the analyses regarding the level of English are shown in Table 2, where it is observed that most teachers reported English levels between basic (23.8%) and 4.8%; values that are outside the scale. This shows the need to strengthen language competencies to promote teacher internationalization.

Table 2 Level of English

English level	Frequency	Percentage
Basic	5	23.8%
Intermediate	3	14.3%
Advanced	7	33.3%
Other	4	19.0%
5.0	1	4.8%

Own elaboration SPSS

Regarding the level of studies, the highest percentage was concentrated in the doctorate with 52.4%. The lowest was obtained at the bachelor's level.

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistical analysis of

the three dimensions, with respect to the mean and standard deviation obtained by dimension; this with the intention of presenting the general vision of the results.

Table 3 Global descriptive statistics by dimension

Dimension		Media	Standard deviation
D1.	Cross-border internationalization	2.575	1.31
D2.	Internationalization at home	2.858	1.278
D3.	International, intercultural and global as a strategy	3.1	1.295

Prepared by the SPSS

It can be seen that dimension 3 registers the highest mean, followed by dimension 2, while dimension one is the one with the lowest score, which suggests greater consolidation of institutional practices associated with the global and intercultural strategy than with strict cross-border mobility.

Table 4 shows the results of the analysis of dimension one, which corresponds to cross-border internationalization.

Table 4, Dimension 1. Cross-border internationalization

Item	Media	Standard deviation
1. Do you have international cooperation agreements with other Universities, Faculties or Schools?	3.526	1.264
2. Do you develop student mobility?	3.789	1.182
3. Does it develop teacher mobility?	21.5206	1.074
4. Do you develop the mobility of your administrative staff?	1.526	0.697
5. Are you part of international academic research networks?	3.211	1.316
6. Do you have at least one research project registered with a foreign partner?	2.737	1.24
7. Do you develop double degree processes?	1.842	1.015

8. Do you develop internships abroad for teachers and researchers?	2.158	1.068
9. Do you develop internships abroad for administrative staff?	1.368	0.684
10. Do you receive foreign students?	2.842	1.425
11. Do you offer courses, seminars, workshops or others to higher education institutions in other countries?	2.474	1.124
12. Do you have access to databases of international publications?	3.368	1.3
13. Do you provide advice for the writing and submission of articles to indexed international journals?	2.789	1.182
14. Do you offer financial support for the payment of memberships to international research networks?	1.947	1.177
15. Do you provide advice for the preparation of international research projects?	2.316	1.003

Prepared by the SPSS

As can be seen, the item with the highest rating is the one corresponding to number two, which states: Does student mobility develop? With an average value of 3,789, followed by item one, which states: Do you have international cooperation agreements with other Universities, Faculties or Schools? With an average value of 3,526. Thirdly, item twelve, which states: Do you have access to databases of international publications? With an average value of 3,368. The result of this dimension reflects a moderate participation in international academic research networks (mean of 3,211), and considerable access to databases of international publications (mean of 3,368), other key practices such as

internships abroad for teachers and researchers present a very low average (1,368, being the lowest of this dimension and overall). The overall average of D1 is 2,575, showing a limited level of cross-border implementation, despite some strengths. This suggests that cross-border initiatives in the Faculty are still under development and face obstacles to their full implementation.

The descriptive statistical analysis was performed on dimension 2. Internationalization at home. Table 5 describes the evaluations obtained with respect to the mean and standard deviation of their corresponding items.

Table 5, Dimension 2. Internationalization at home

Item	Media	Standard deviation
1. Do you conduct conferences, symposia, seminars, internships with international experts?	3.579	0.961
2. Do you offer exchanges of experience with foreign students?	3.053	1.224
3. Do you carry out discussions and analyses on various topics with foreign experts?	3.211	0.976
4. Is the learning of a second language promoted as compulsory?	4.0	1.054
5. Do you hold internationalization fairs open to the university community?	2.842	1.463
6. Do you have at least one research project registered with a foreign partner?	2.737	1.24
7. Do you offer courses, certifications or diplomas from foreign universities that can be developed online?	2.474	1.264
8. Do you develop dual courses?	2.105	1.11
9. Do you develop courses that motivate the learning of English as a foreign language in a playful and attractive way?	2.895	1.41

10. Do you develop collaborative work projects with foreign experts or universities?	2.684	1.108
11. Do you exchange internationalization experiences with other Academic Units of the University?	2.895	1.197
12. Do you develop final graduation projects directed by professionals abroad?	2.158	1.119

Prepared by the SPSS

It can be seen that the four main items resulting in a higher rating were 4, 1, 3 and 6 respectively.

The results in this dimension reflect that the institution in promoting the learning of a second language as compulsory is the best-rated item (mean of 4.00), which suggests a significant effort in this aspect of internationalization at home. However, the item "developing dual courses" obtained one of the lowest averages (2.105). The overall average of D2 internationalization at home is 2.858, indicating that, despite the promotion of languages, the integration of other internationalization practices is

still limited and requires a broader institutional strategic approach. The third dimension of the model is also addressed, identified as International, intercultural and global as a strategy (D3). This dimension is conceived as an articulating axis oriented to the epistemologically deliberate integration of international, intercultural and global perspectives within the design, structuring and operation of academic programs. The statistical characterization corresponding to this dimension is presented in Table 6.

Table 6, Dimension 3. International, intercultural and global as a strategy

Item	Media	Standard deviation
1. Does it contain a section on internationalization in its curriculum documents?	2.947	1.311
2. Is internationalization part of the purposes/objectives of careers/professions?	3.368	1.165
3. Is there a plan for the development of the internationalization strategy?	3.474	1.02
4. Is there an institutional Commission/work team in charge of planning, executing and evaluating the processes of internationalization, interculturality and globality in the curricula?	3.684	1.293
5. Do you have communication and dissemination strategies so that the university community knows about the academic possibilities offered by the international, intercultural and global dimension?	3.579	1.216
6. Do you develop any strategy for the recognition of internationalization practices that the faculty carries out as part of their courses?	2.684	1.057
7. Do you develop any strategy that recognizes the participation of teachers in international activities?	2.579	1.17
8. Does it prepare annual reports related to internationalization, interculturality and globality practices?	2.684	1.493
9. Do the career have accreditation offered by a national agency?	3.579	1.465
10. Do the careers have accreditation offered by an international agency?	2.368	1.257

Prepared by the SPSS

The three main items resulting in a higher rating were 4, 5 and 3 respectively. In this dimension, the best

rated item was whether "there is an institutional commission/work team in charge of planning,

executing and evaluating the processes of internationalization, interculturality and globality in the curricula" with a mean of 3.68. However, other fundamental aspects such as "... the careers have accreditation offered by an international agency" obtained a low average (2.368), being the lowest item in this dimension. The global average for this dimension is 3.1. This indicates that, although there is recognition of the importance of accreditation, the integration of the international, intercultural and global dimension as an intentional and reported strategy is still limited, which suggests the need to strengthen the management of institutional policies in this area.

The results emerging from the application of the questionnaire to the teaching staff of the FCQ allow us to identify that the integration of the international, intercultural and global dimension in educational programs is still in an incipient and structurally fragile phase.

In this sense, the diagnosis points to the need to reconfigure the institutional frameworks of curricular governance, moving towards internationalization policies that transcend isolated or low-intensity actions, to constitute systemic strategies, with epistemological coherence, organizational sustainability, and the capacity to influence the profound transformation of teaching practices, pedagogical approaches, and learning outcomes. This reorientation implies recognizing internationalization not as a peripheral addition, but as a structuring construct of the educational project, capable of articulating global, intercultural, and critical approaches that respond to the contemporary challenges of higher education.

DISCUSSION

The findings affirm that curricular internationalization is still in a partial and fragmented process; there are advances in some areas, these do not yet configure an articulated policy capable of profoundly transforming the training processes. The dimension best valued was that related to the international, intercultural and global strategy, which shows that there is institutional recognition of the importance of the subject; however, this recognition does not always translate into consistent practices within the curriculum.

The dimension of cross-border internationalization

was the weakest, evidencing limitations in mobility, double degrees, internships, financing, and projects with foreign partners. This finding coincides with what Altbach and Knight (2007) have argued, who point out that international mobility and cooperation tend to be concentrated in institutional conditions that are not always within the reach of all universities, especially when there is a lack of specific support policies and resources.

On the other hand, internationalization at home has made moderate progress, especially in the promotion of second language learning and in the organization of activities with international specialists. However, the low presence of dual courses, sustained collaborative experiences, and degree work with foreign participation shows that a transversal appropriation of this dimension has not yet been achieved. There are documents, commissions, and certain dissemination mechanisms, but the strategies for monitoring, evaluation, and institutional recognition are limited.

CONCLUSIONS

The research identified that the internationalization of the curriculum in the Faculty of Chemical Sciences of the UJED presents relevant advances, but still insufficient to be considered a consolidated process. "The results obtained show that there is an incipient institutional base," especially in the strategic dimension, although important weaknesses persist in mobility, international academic collaboration, external accreditation and institutional recognition of internationalized practices. Cross-border internationalization is the most lagging component, while internationalization at home shows moderate progress, although still dependent on isolated initiatives. The international, intercultural and global dimension as a strategy presents the highest average, which indicates that there is a positive institutional assessment of the subject, but still without a systematic curricular implementation. It is concluded that the FCQ has the conditions to move towards a more relevant model of curricular internationalization; however, to achieve this, it is necessary to strengthen institutional policies, teacher training in global competencies, internationalization strategies at home, and international cooperation mechanisms.

REFERENCES:

- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3–4), 290–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832>
- Ibero-American University Postgraduate Association (AUIP). (2020). *The internationalization of the curriculum in Ibero-*

American higher education. AUIP.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. En J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.

De Wit, H., & Leask, B. (2015). Internationalization of the curriculum: A framework. *International Higher Education*, 83, 28–30. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2015.83.9073>

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832>

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 74, 5–12.

UNESCO. (2015). *Education 2030: Incheon declaration and framework for action*. UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2022). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO.

Ventura, A., & Peña, E. (2020). Reliability and validity in educational research. *Journal of Educational Research*, 38(1), 15–34.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Walsh, C. (2007). Critical interculturality and intercultural education. *Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 19(48), 25–38.