Critical Perspectives on International Education

Yvonne Hébert and Ali A. Abdi (Eds.)

*Sense*Publishers

Critical Perspectives on
International Education

COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION:
A Diversity of Voices
Volume 15

Scope

Comparative and International Education: A Diversity of Voices aims to provide a comprehensive range of titles, making available to readers work from across the comparative and international education research community. Authors will represent as broad a range of voices as possible, from geographic, cultural and ideological standpoints. The editors are making a conscious effort to disseminate the work of newer scholars as well as that of well-established writers. The series includes authored books and edited works focusing upon current issues and controversies in a field that is undergoing changes as profound as the geopolitical and economic forces that are reshaping our worlds. The series aims to provide books which present new work, in which the range of methodologies associated with comparative education and international education are both exemplified and opened up for debate. As the series develops, it is intended that new writers from settings and locations not frequently part of the English language discourse will find a place in the list.

Critical Perspectives on International Education

Edited by

Yvonne Hébert
University of Calgary, Canada

and

Ali A. Abdi
University of Alberta, Canada

Printed on acid-free paper

In memoriam

Ottilia Chareka

and

Helen Harper

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

We are witnessing a major historical shift that scholars from various disciplines regularly discuss under the umbrella of globalization and that represents a qualitative change that is recreating our way of life. Precipitated by the technological revolution, it has roots in the economic and political history of the Western world. Many factors contribute to the changes, but what distinguishes the current process of globalization from before is its supranational character.[1] Nonetheless, a diverse, intense relationship with knowledge and new ways of learning emerged along with new forms of social communication that nourished democratic aspirations and broadened ethical conceptions of life. The impact of globalization on education, and particularly higher education, has led to its repositioning in the global economy and the transnational political landscape.

The process of internationalization, construed as imperative by educational leaders, implies an integration of international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the purposes of the institution. But quite often, planners neglect to consider that, behind those purposes, there is or should be an ethically defensible vision of education that also informs the process of internationalization. The literature is vast and there are outstanding scholarly contributions. However, this book – which brings together scholars from around the world – goes to the core of the issue by trying to understand how views of knowledge, positioned at the heart of globalization, re-define international education; explores mobility in its positive and negative dimensions (but as a route to knowledge); and goes beyond complacency by exploring critical perspectives using concrete examples.

The introductory chapter by Yvonne M. Hébert and Ali A. Abdi provides a theoretical introduction of tremendous use to the reader, by exploring various theories and discourses that served as heuristic tools to the authors. This will help readers navigate through the understandings of complex receptions of policies and ideas and discern the interweaving of culture-specific settings and processes of supranational integration, consider the limits to exportation of reforms and political ideals (including democracy), and ponder on the many faces of diversity. Most importantly, the chapters make a unique contribution, given their specificity of well-documented case studies in various countries and settings, yet also their

theoretical reach. This is a much needed book, an important point of reference for future research as well as for educators.

Rosa Bruno-Jofré, Queen's University

NOTES

[1]   Dale, R/ (2003) Globalization: A new world for comparative education? In J. Schriewer (Ed.), *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education,* Frankfurt and Main, Peter Lang, 87–110.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A project of this nature is always the result of constructive efforts that are undertaken by many more people than the editors. In the realization of this book, especially, our contributors have been supportive and willing to share their work, and it was mainly due to their hard work, patience and excellent submissions that we have achieved this substantial international education reader. We are grateful for their generosity and positive spirit of collegiality, and we are excited to contribute to the expansion of their intelligent disquisitions to the wider world of scholars, researchers and the general public.

On a more sober note, during the period of the book production, two esteemed colleagues passed away: Dr. Ottilia Chareka, St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, Canada, and Dr. Helen Harper, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, USA. Both editors have, in one context or another, worked with both Ottilia and Helen, and while we fondly remember their active times in the scholarship of educational and social development, we are as well, grateful to their co-authors, Pamela von Dommelen and Judith Dunkerly respectively, who have completed their contributions.

While most of the chapters in this book are original, several are adopted from previously published material, and the editors are grateful for the kind permissions granted to facilitate this: Chapters by each of Stephanie Garneau, Annie Pilote, Vincenzo Cicchelli and Abdelwahab Benhafaeidh appeared originally in *Lettre de l'Observatoire Jeunes et Société*, U Québec, vol. 7, no. 1 (2008) and were translated into English for this book. The chapter by Yvonne Hébert, Lori Wilkinson and Mehrunissa Ali originated as an article in *Brock Education*, vol. 17, no. 2 (2008): 50-70. Kazuko Kurihara's chapter first appeared in *Canadian and International Education*, vol. 38, 01 (2009). Suzanne Majhanovich's chapter was published in *World Studies in Education*, vol. 1, no. 10, 2009; and the chapter by the late Helen Harper and Judith Dunkerly has appeared in *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2009. John Willinsky's chapter first appeared in his book, *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006). Most of these have been selectively updated for inclusion in this volume.

In addition, we are grateful to the *Comparative and International Education Society of Canada* (CIESC) for its generous support of the 2008 pre-conference project in Vancouver, Canada, that planted the first seeds for this project. Many of the contributors to this volume participated in the pre-conference symposium on the intensification of international education, which Yvonne Hébert instigated and served as lead organiser. As President of CIESC, Ali A. Abdi facilitated the organisational support. Our gratitude also goes to

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Abdelwahab Ben Hafaiedh is professor of sociology at the University of Tunis since 1997. He is the founder of the Arab Watch of Education since 2002. From 2006 till 2011, he ensured the direction of the Middle East Research Competition (MERC). In 2011 he created the Applied Social Science Forum (ASSF) which aims at the development of the applied research in relation with public policies. E-mail: w.hafaiedh@yahoo.fr.

Ali A. Abdi is Professor of development education, and Co-Director, Centre for Global Citizenship Education and Research (CGCER) in the Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Alberta. He is past President of the Comparative and International Education Society of Canada (CIESC). He is also the founding editor of the online publication, *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education*, and co-founding editor of *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry*. Recent co-edited publications include *Education and social development: global issues and analyses* (2008 with Shibao Guo), and *Citizenship education and social development in Zambia* (2010 with Edward Shizha & Lee Ellis).

Allan Pitman, PhD., is Past President of the Comparative and International Education Society of Canada. An Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, his research includes work dealing with the nature of professional practice, the work of teachers and the role of curriculum in identity formation. The changing roles of universities and the consequent shifts in the work of the professoriate have developed as an extension of these interests. Prior to moving to North America, he was Secretary of the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia.

Ana Cruceru, M. Ed., is a teacher currently working in Italy as an ESL teacher. In graduate work, she studied internationalization processes in higher education, specifically 'study abroad' programs and internships. As a graduate student, Cruceru participated in an international exchange program in Germany where she attended university for a semester. Her academic interests include curriculum development and teacher training focusing on inclusive and equity education in increasingly multicultural communities, and how students' experiences in culturally diverse international educational settings operate in marginalizing some while extending privileges to others.

Ana Marija Petrunic, M.A., is the Academic Planner for the English Language Program, Continuing Education at the University of Calgary. As a graduate in Educational Contexts, the Faculty of Education, University of Calgary, her research focused on the role of identity formation on educators in post-conflict Kosovo and its effect on the democratization of education as it relates to minority group rights. Her research led her to a position with the Educator Development Program (a CIDA funded initiative) in which she divided her time between Kosovo and Serbia working in the areas of in-service teacher training, youth and gender development and professional development of regional school administration offices.

Annie Pilote, PhD, is Vice-Dean of graduate studies and research at the Faculty of Education, Université Laval, Québec (Canada). An associate professor, she teaches social foundations and qualitative methods. She is also a regular researcher with the *Centre de recherche et d'intervention sur l'éducation et la vie au travail* and the *Observatoire Jeunes et Société*. Her research projects deal mainly with youth, identity, mobility and educational paths among linguistic minorities. She also specializes in intercultural education and ethnic relations. She recently co-edited a book, with Silvio Marcus de Souza Correa, focusing on minority youths in Canada and Brazil, *Regards sur… l'identité des jeunes en contexte minoritaire* (Presses de l'Université Laval, 2010).

Ann Sherman is the Dean of Education at the University of New Brunswick in Fredericton, Canada. She has been involved in Bhutan through teaching and curriculum design since 1998. Her Ph.D. is in Early Childhood Education from the University of Nottingham (1995) and she has other degrees in Science Education and Educational Leadership. She was a public school teacher and administrator for thirteen years before beginning her university career. Her research is focused in two main areas: the perspectives of children about school and the way their views can help teachers reflect on their own teaching, and ways of supporting teachers in their teaching of science. Her work in Bhutan has addressed both of these areas through curriculum development projects and professional support of teachers.

Carl E. James (PhD Sociology) is Director of the York Centre for Education and Community at York University where he also teaches in the Faculty of Education and in the Graduate Program in Sociology. James works on issues of identification/identity pertaining to race, ethnicity, gender, class, and immigrant status. His work concerns issues of equity, particularly in relation to access and inclusivity at all levels of schooling and education for marginalized and racialized youth. James has many years of experience working with "international students" in Canada, as well as in Sweden where he currently

teaches a course on multiculturalism to international students, mostly from European countries and Asia, in the Faculty of Education at Uppsala University, Sweden.

Chedly Belkhodja is Professor of political science at the Université de Moncton. His research focuses in policies and practices of regionalization of immigration and on the discourse and representations od cultural and ethnic diversity. He has published articles in *Canadian Ethnic Studies,Canadian Journal of Political Science*, *Politique et Sociétés, Argument, Francophonie d'Amérique,* and *Lexicometrica*. He also directed two films which were produced by the National Film Board of Canada: *Tableaux d'un voyage imaginaire* [Imaginary Journeys] in 2001 with filmmaker Jean Chabot, and *Au bout du fil* [Hanging On].

Cris Clifford Cullinan, PhD., is Associate Director of Organizational Development and Training at the University of Oregon. She designs and delivers programs that help to identify and eliminate structures that support patterns of inequity within the university. She coordinates, designs, and implements training programs for administrators, faculty and staff focusing on equity, harassment and discrimination with the aim of creating a respectful and inclusive work environment. Dr. Cullinan holds a Ph.D. in educational policy and management in higher education and consults and trains on issues of equity at colleges and universities across the United States. For years, Dr. Cullinan has led an Institute at the annual conference of NCORE (National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in Higher Education in the U.S.) on issues pertaining to internationalization and multiculturalism in higher education in universities and colleges.

Dalene M. Swanson, PhD., is Professor of Education at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in South Africa; she also holds adjunct professorships in the Faculties of Education at the University of British Columbia and Alberta, and is a Research Faculty Associate of the Centre for Culture, Identity and Education at UBC. Dalene's interests span curriculum studies, mathematics education, cultural studies, critical theory/pedagogy, teacher education, international education, innovative qualitative research methodologies, socio-political perspectives in education, global citizenship and democratic education, as well as indigenous epistemologies and indigeneity. Dalene writes from poststructural and postcolonial perspectives and her educational work and commitments are to human rights, anti-oppressive education, imaginative dialogical engagement with curricula alternatives, and social and ecological justice. Dalene, who was born and raised in South Africa, is particularly interested in African philosophies and ways of knowing, as well as critical development studies. These experiences and perspectives have contributed to

her philosophy of holistic praxis, democracy and critical engagement in educational discourses, especially in providing counter-hegemonic alternatives to globalizing neoliberal models of education and society. Her website can be found at: www.ualberta.ca/~dalene/index.html.

Helen Harper, PhD., was a Professor of Cultural Studies and English Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Her research explored the intersection of social justice and cosmopolitan theory informed by a critical pedagogy stance. She is the co-author of books on advocacy and literacy, young adult literature, and numerous articles on adolescent literacy, democracy, and freedom. She served as co-editor of the International Reading Association's *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*.

John Willinsky is Khosla Family Professor of Education at Stanford University and Distinguished University Professor (Adjunct) in the Department of Language and Literacy Education at the University of British Columbia. He is the director of the Public Knowledge Project at Stanford, UBC, and SFU, which has been working for a decade on improving the scholarly and public quality of research through the development of open source platforms for journals and a research program studying the impact of this increased access to research on professionals and the public, as well as on the global dimensions of the academic community. Much of his work, including his book, *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship* (MIT Press, 2006), as well as the software for journals and conferences, is freely available on the project's website (http://pkp.sfu.ca).

Judith Dunkerly, PhD., is a faculty member in the College of Education at the University of Nevada - Las Vegas. Her research focuses on the intersection of literacy, social justice and human rights education. She is currently the co-editor of the International Reading Association's *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*.

Kazuko Kurihara was a teacher in the Tokyo Board of Education for 38 years and completed her MEd at the University of Calgary in 2005. Her research interests are in the comparative studies of English literacy and teacher education between Japan and Canada. Her Japanese publications are included in "Education in Canada at the Dawn of the 21st Century "(2003) and "Official Languages Education in Diverse Canada" (2005).

Kumari Beck is Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Education and Co-Director of the Centre for Research on International Education at Simon Fraser University. Her primary area of research is the internationalization of

higher education, and she is currently conducting a SSHRC-funded study on the everyday practices of internationalization across one university. Other areas of research and teaching include international education, globalization, culture and postcolonial theory, the politics of difference, anti-racist and critical multicultural education, social justice and teacher education. Her work in the academy is informed by over twenty years of experience in NGO international development.

Lori Wilkinson is Professor in the Department of Sociology and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs, Faculty of Arts, University of Manitoba. She specializes in immigration and refugee studies. She is currently the Chair of the Policy, Ethics and Professional Concerns Committee of the Canadian Sociological Association, Vice-President of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association, the Economic and Labour Market Domain Leader for the Prairie Metropolis Centre and editor, journal of international Migration and Immigration (JIMI).

Lynette Shultz, PhD., is Associate Professor and Co-Director of the Centre for Global Citizenship Education and Research (CGCER), Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Alberta. Her interests and contributions are in the areas of global social justice and education policy, global citizenship education, leadership and social change. She has extensive experience working with schools and community education organizations in Canada and internationally. She is a frequent invited speaker and has published numerous journal articles and chapters in her areas of research and teaching and is the co-editor of *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship* (SUNY Press, 2008) and *Global Citizenship Education in Post-Secondary Institutions: Theories, Practices, Policies* (Peter Lang, 2011).

Marilyn Tobin (PhD. U Calgary, 2005) was the recipient of a University of Calgary President's Internationalization Achievement Award (2002) for her academic work in India, 2001-2002. Since taking early retirement as a school administrator with the Calgary Board of Education, she has been a Field Advisor at the University of Calgary and the University of Alberta. Presently, she is an ESL teacher/host to international students. Current research interests pertain to Gandhi's wife, Kasturba, and her powerful role in India's Freedom Movement.

Mary Alfred is Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Affairs and Professor of Adult Education and Human Resource Development in the College of Education and Human Development at Texas A&M University. Her research interests include learning and development among women of the African Diaspora, sociocultural contexts of immigration, welfare reform and women's

economic development, and issues of equity and social justice in higher education and in the workplace. She received her Ph.D. in Educational Administration with a focus in Adult Education and Human Resource Development Leadership from the University of Texas at Austin.

Mehrunnisa Ahmad Ali is an Professor at Ryerson University, Toronto, where she teaches in Immigration and Settlement Studies, Policy Studies, and Early Childhood Studies program. She is the Director of the Graduate Program in Early Childhood Studies and co-director of CERIS - The Ontario Metropolis Centre. Her research interest is in studying settlement issues of immigrant and refugee children, youth and families. Her most recent research project is entitled 'Making Ontario Home'; which is a study of immigrants' use of settlement services in Ontario.

Michael O'Sullivan, PhD., is Associate Professor of International, Comparative, and Global Education in the Faculty of Education at Brock University. His current research interests include the practice of global citizenship education in Canadian classrooms; the impact of short term study abroad experiences on Canadian secondary and post-secondary students; the experience of international students at Canadian post secondary institutions; and the impact of recent economic changes in Cuba on Cuban youth. He can be reached at mosullivan@brocku.ca.

Mathieu Wade is currently PhD candidate in sociology at l'Université du Québec à Montréal. He completed a Masters degree in sociology of arts and culture at l'Université Grenoble.

Ottilia Chareka was Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education at St. Francis Xavier University. Her research interests included multicultural education, citizenship education, migration and integration of immigrants, global education, inclusive practices, and research methods. During her tenure at the university, she taught a variety of courses in the Bachelor of Education and Master of Education programs. She was also instrumental in the implementation of the part-time Bachelor of Education program for African Nova Scotian learners and worked on the Mi'kmaw Kinamatnewey School Improvement program. Her co-authored article (with Alan Sears), 'Civic duty: young people's conceptions of voting as a means of political participation' (2006) in the *Canadian Journal od Education,* won that year's best paper award.

Pamela van Dommelen completed her Master's degree in Education at Saint Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia and is currently teaching

grade five at Bras d'Or Elementary School, Cape Breton-Victoria School Board, also in Nova Scotia.

Peter Joong is Senior Lecturer in Math Education at the University of the West Indies in Mona, Jamaica. This new position brought him back to Jamaica where he started his career as a high school teacher in 1972. He has taught and held administrative roles in Jamaican and Ontario schools for thirty years. He was an assistant professor at Nipissing University in Canada for seven years. He has also taught in-service Math Education and Leadership programs in Nepal, Jordan, UAE, Mongolia, Sierra Leone, Jamaica and China. He received the Prime Minister's Award for Teaching Excellence in 1988 and the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Research in 2005. Peter's current research work centers on school violence and safe schools and secondary reforms in Canada, China, Sierra Leone, Jamaica and Brazil. He has an Environmental project in China and a Peace Education project in Sierra Leone. Peter has written numerous textbooks and teacher resource books.

Sarah Elaine Eaton earned her PhD in Educational Leadership and Master of Arts in Spanish from the University of Calgary. She has managed English as a Second Language programs at the post-secondary level in Canada and has been seconded to work in Mexico and Honduras to develop and deliver programs for English-language teaching for the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels. She has taught at the University of Calgary, Mount Royal University and Idaho State University. Her research interests include language program administration and management, literacy and the use of technology to improve literacy and language skills. She has served as a Research Associate at the Language Research Centre, University of Calgary, since 2009.

Shibao Guo, PhD., is associate professor in the Faculty of Education, University of Calgary. He is an affiliated researcher with the Prairie Metropolis Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration, Integration, and Diversity. His research interests include citizenship and immigration, Chinese immigrants, social justice and equity in education, adult education and community development, comparative and international education. His recent works appeared in the *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, *Teaching in Higher Education*, and *Journal of International Migration and Integration.*

Stéphanie Garneau (Ph.D., in Sociology) is associate professor at the School of Social Work of the University of Ottawa. Based on an interactionist approach and carried out with an ethnographic methodology, her research focuses on students' paths of mobility, education and integration into the labour market, in

the context of the internationalization of higher education. Professor Garneau is also an affiliated researcher of the Observatory on Youth and Society.

Suzanne Majhanovich is Professor Emerita/Adjunct Research Professor at the University of Western Ontario. She is a former President of the Comparative and International Education Society of Canada (CIESC), was Editor of the Society's journal, *Canadian and International Education,* and is also Chair of the WCCES Publications Standing Committee. Her research interests include first and second language acquisition, the teaching of English as a Foreign Language in international contexts, globalization, educational restructuring, and internationalization of education. She is the author of numerous articles and books. Her most recent publications are: *Education, Language, and Economics: Growing National and Global Dilemmas* which she co-edited with Macleans A. Geo-JaJa (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 2010, 200pp.), and *A Tribute to David N. Wilson. Clamouring for a Better World* (2010) co-edited with Vandra Masemann, Nhung Truong and Kara Janigan, (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 292 pp.). She can be reached at smajhano@uwo.ca

Thomas G. Ryan, EdD., is an Associate Professor in the Schulich School of Education, Nipissing University, in North Bay, Ontario, Canada. He has authored several books, chapters and many journal articles. He can be reached at thomasr@nipissingu.ca or by mail at Nipissing University, Faculty of Education, 100 College Drive, North Bay, Ontario, P1B 8L7

Tim Goddard, PhD., has extensive international experience working as a teacher, principal, superintendent of schools, university professor and education consultant. His primary area of research and teaching is educational leadership and administration, broadly defined, with a focus on the role and impact of cultural and demographic change on structural systems within schools, particularly those serving minority and marginalized populations.

Vincenzo Cicchelli is Maître de Conférences at Paris Descartes, Research Fellow at Gemass (CNRS, Paris 4). He is currently working on national and European identities, on the impact of globalization on youth conditions, on the cosmopolitan socialization of young people in a comparative perspective. He is series editor (« Youth in a globalising world") at Brill (Leyde/Boston). He is President (with Vittorio Cotesta) of the Research Comittee 13 « Société globale, cosmopolitisme et droits humains » (Association Internationale des Sociologues de Langue Française ». Among his recent publications are : « Adolescences méditerranéennes. L'espace public à petits pas » (ed. with Breviglieri M., Paris, 2007) ; « Deux pays, deux jeunesses ? La condition juvénile en France et en Italie » (ed. with Cavalli. A. et Galland O., Rennes,

2008) ; « La jeunesse n'est plus ce qu'elle était » (ed. with Hamel et alii, Rennes, 2010) ; Cicchelli et Gérôme Truc, « De la mondialisation au cosmopolitisme » (Problèmes politiques et sociaux n.986-987, La Documentation française, 2011); et « L'esprit cosmopolite : Voyages de formation des jeunes en Europe ». Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2012.

Yvonne Hébert, PhD., is Professor of Education at the University of Calgary and is an affiliated researcher with the Prairie Metropolis Research Centre, l'Observatoire Jeunes et Société à l'UQuébec, and the Centre for Identity, Culture and Education at UBC. She served as President of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE) and is honorary life member of the Canadian Education Association (CEA). Taking up sociological perspectives, her research interests focus on migration, youth, identity, democracy and citizenship education, minority studies, as well as policy and educational reform. Her current research projects focus on the impact of French language immigration on an urban Francophone national minority community; youth's mobility and identity construction in transition to postsecondary education; and youth's negotiation of difference and democracy, a SSHRC-funded comparative study in three Canadian cities. Her books include: *Negotiating Transcultural Lives: Belongings and Social Capital among Youth in Comparative Perspectives* (with Dirk Hoerder & Irina Schmitt); *Citizenship in Transformation in Canada* and *Indian Education in Canada* (2vols.).

YVONNE M. HÉBERT AND ALI A. ABDI

1. CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION:

Redefinitions, Knowledge-making, Mobilities and Changing the World

INTRODUCTION

In the knowledge era, indeed, the struggle is between knowledge that is both resource and product in a world of fast capitalism and knowledge as mutual engagement in processes of shared critical social construction, and thus, more culturally inclusive and socially productive. The former has been taken for granted since the aftermath of the Second World War, but is now facing serious criticisms for its avaricious market approach. Today, the idea of knowledge as an economic product, commodified, for sale on a global market, is no longer palatable. Key to a very recent philosophical shift towards another model is the emergence of global knowledge cultures, as proposed by Kapitzke & Peters (2007). The main phenomena that globalised societies face today emerge from the issues raised around redefinitions of the nature of education; mobilities involving the internal and external movement of workers, students, teachers, researchers, tourists, business people, volunteers and people in general; as well as efforts to change the world towards a more democratic, socially responsible, culturally sensitive model, as taken up by the contributors to this book.

The purpose of this book is to assure that you/we all participate in the global conversation about knowledge, its meanings, uses and possibilities. In this light, it is vitally important to understand how knowledge is created, what it means to know, how it is shared, to whose benefit and why. Several primary questions arise:

What is the role of education in human well-being? What does knowledge making entail? How do contemporary knowledge contructions respond to prevailing social contexts? Why is it important for learning prospects to respond or not to today's globalizing political and economic contexts? These dimensions and questions of knowledge are critical to the future of educational policy and provision, and ultimately to the quality of human life, as the locations and practices of knowledge are more complex than ever.

The education-globalisation dynamic has been the object of much attention, with concomitant competing views contributing to knowledge-making and

marketing. A dominant view of globalisation considers knowledge and information to be international goods and proposes that their acquisition and distribution should determine our understanding of causation in the real world. Michael Peters puts it so very well, "the transformation of knowledge production and its legitimation are central to an understanding of globalisation and its effects on educational policy" (2003: 363).

In this light, let us first consider important links between education and economics; then in a second section, discuss the various theories and discourses that provide the background to this book. Then in four major sections, we spell out how each of the chapters and how their authors contribute to the new view of knowledge as a shared social good: redefining internationalisation and international education in section three; universities as sources of knowledge-making in the global economy in section four; youth mobilities of international students and of migrant youth in section five; and finally, a sixth section on changing the world, with critical perspectives on human well-being and on intensive transformative processes. In a concluding note, we discuss briefly how we have moved from the knowledge-as-economic capital towards knowledge-as-shared socio-cultural capital while seeking to better understand the new directions in creating knowledge as a shared social good rather than as a saleable good. In so doing, we end with critical perspectives on the role of education on human well-being and citizenship development.

I KNOWLEDGE AT THE HEART OF GLOBALIZATION

Globalization includes many different kinds of processes, all of which are accelerating, such as communications networks, human mobility, information technology, genetic information, organisations, as well as international trade and investment, creating a world of interconnected, open systems (Anderson, 2001). No living system is entirely closed. Globalisation brings greater mobility, not only of people but also of all manner of life forms, resulting in a transforming, bio-socially world. Similarly, globalization brings greater communication, inter-connectivity and exchange of cultural goods and creative processes, resulting in rapid movement and mixing of musical, artistic and other aesthetic expressions, linked with a fluid myriad of identity positioning and re-positioning. These globalizing processes began thousands of years ago and are as old as human evolution itself.

Set within the acceleration of globalization since World War II, a knowledge-based economy is based on the idea that future economic prosperity lies in the generation of highly skilled and knowledge-rich production and trade. According to Casey,

such a knowledge-based economy is characterized by increased production of knowledge and information-rich projects, innovation in

products, markets, and production processes, and global expansion and integration of economy. The knowledge economy requires, its theoreticians and policy-makers argue, vastly expanded generation of education and training and lifelong learning workers. The last two decades have witnessed considerable government activities towards this end (2009, p. 173).

It is in the aftermath of the Second World War that Hayek (1945) elaborated his theory of knowledge in society. He was dedicated to restoring classical liberalism and the free market based on the rights of individuals, thus preparing the way for others who developed what came to be known as American neo-liberalism. Two decades later, free market ideas were applied to education (Friedman & Friedman, 1962) and were further developed as new growth theory which assumed that technology and levels of information flow were critical for economic development (Lucas, 1988; Romer, 1994, Solow, 1994). From that perspective, the economics-of-education posit that an abundance of information and knowledge can be shared and actually grown through application (Peters, 2003). Thus, as discussed in this book, issues of intellectual property rights, organisational dimensions of knowledge and the marketplace of ideas have become fundamental to public policy, pedagogy and practice today.

Two terms are used today to discuss the ideas of the knowledge economy and knowledge capitalism. The former, the knowledge economy is characterised as the economics of abundance, the annihilation of distance, the de-territorialisation of the State and investment in human capital (Peters, 2003, p. 364). The latter, knowledge capitalism, is seen as a new genre of capitalism (Burton-Jones, 1999), that is, as an economic system in which the means of knowledge production, the creation of goods and services are privately owned and operated for profit. The latter approach has been taken up by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) for fundamentally rethinking the relationship between education, learning and work, as well as focusing on a new coalition between education and industry. Used distinctly and interchangeable, the two terms are not mutually exclusive and have been in evidence in reports of the OECD and the World Bank throughout the 1990s, being adopted thereafter as global educational policy.

Through these lenses, education is seen as a greatly undervalued form of knowledge capital that has the power to shape society through its capacity to determine the future of work as well as the organisation of knowledge-creating institutions. Policies followed, in support of heavy investments in research laboratories and institutions of higher education, and emphasised propositional and tacit knowledge (OECD, 1996). Over at the World Bank, universities were seen as the essential connection between education and development (albeit with the select de-emphasis of so-called non-scientific areas such as the arts and the social sciences) and were to become leading future service industries to

be more fully integrated into major modes of production. In this view, then, development is "less like a construction business and more like education in the broad and comprehensive sense that covers knowledge, institutions and culture" (Stiglitz, 1999, p. 2). Thus, while the Bank's prescriptions would be inclusive for western countries and their educational systems, these were historically, culturally, and even epistemically problematic for developing societies in Africa and elsewhere.

The World Bank then focussed on knowledge about technology, knowledge gaps and information problems. However, knowledge creation and transfer are unlike other markets; given human variability, the homogeneity of products is impossible in education. Furthermore, knowledge transactions require trust and reciprocity if knowledge workers are to share their knowledge. Such changes would require the institutions of an open society, such as a free press, transparent government, pluralism, minority education, checks and balances, acceptance of others, freedom of thought, and open public debate (Peters, 2003; Stiglitz, 1999). Focusing on knowledge capitalism, Burton-Jones (1999), among others, stresses the economic demand for a skilled work force as well as lifelong learning, while acknowledging that governments have an important role to play in fostering knowledge acquisition and development. These twin ways of viewing education and globalization, as economics and as capitalism, are, however, inadequate and simplistic; they blur the importance of symbolic cultural goods which are central to international education. That peoples around the world seek to trade goods or physically move to work elsewhere is not new, to wit, the race to explore and conquer the New World by European powers, such as France, Spain, Germany and Great Britain, in previous centuries as well as the legendary Silk Trade Route, for economic reasons. What is new is the scope and speed of global exchanges, or as Held and McGrew (2004) put it, the realities of the unprecedented intensities and extensities of new globalizations.

II COMPETING VIEWS AND VOICES

Four competing theories and twelve major discourses are concerned with the complex relationships between globalisation and education (Kapitzke & Peters, 2007; Peters and Besley, 2006; Spring, 2008). Briefly sketched below, these theories and discourses inform many chapters in this book.

Competing views

The *first* of four major and somewhat overlapping interpretations of the process of educational globalisation posits the existence of a *world culture* whereby Western ideals of mass schooling serve as a model for national school systems. This view proposes that all cultures are slowly coalescing into one

global culture (Baker & LeTendre, 2005; Boli & Thomas 1999; Meyer, Kamens & Benavot, 1992; Ramirez, 2003). Many phenomena contribute to this view, such as the emergence of world marketplaces, the proliferation of social trends especially among young people, such as short-lived world music, the popularity of beer in Russia, the use of henna for body decoration, clothing fashions and food products from around the world in local shops. Moreover, major global phenomena multiply, such as the fluctuation of value of stocks and bonds on the international currency market, the spread of contagious disease such as AIDs, and the urgency of concerns for global climate change caused by human activity, all fast-moving and made possible through the migration of peoples and through technological communication systems. The global significance of regional phenomena, such as the Arab spring summer and fall of 2011, Tiananmen Square protests of 1989 (Wong, 1997), give credence to the spread of democratic and economic ideas at the root of the liberation of peoples everywhere. At the same time, the establishment of large farms in poor countries to feed populations in larger more powerful countries proliferates, thus continuing the exploitive nature of relationships between rich-poor countries (von Braun & Meinzen-Dick, 2009; York, 2009).

Although many attempts have been made to develop global solutions for global problems, this would require that all countries and all peoples arrive at some consensus about the nature of these problems and undertake collective global solutions and action. While there is some evidence of the emergence of partial and controversial global consensus on the usefulness of free trade and democracy, there is not yet any global agreement on climate change and other pressing issues, nor any world-wide responsive mobilisation. In other words, the emergence of a global culture and global society that would act as a whole system has begun but has yet to be achieved (Anderson, 2001).

The *second* interpretation, the *world systems approach*, sees the globe as integrated, but with two major unequal zones, with the USA, Europe, Japan, probably China and possibly South Korea as the core zone and the rest of the world in the periphery, with the core inculcating its values into peripheral countries, thus legitimising its overarching power (Arnove, 1980; Clayton, 1998; Wallerstein, 1984, 2004). The idea of a clash of civilisations stems from this understanding of differing cultures and values between unequal zones which was the gist of Huntington's 1996 book on the topic. He argued that the world is changing, that its map is being replaced by a global map of civilisations based on major differences of cultures and values, and that those of the United States of American and its allies were more powerful than most zones. Although the highly critical responses in the subsequent volume of *Foreign Affairs* (74: 4) were swift, the idea of 'west is best' continues to hold a certain degree of attention. With the current new financial crisis, however, the centre may be shifting, if not now, but in the foreseeable future. According to

systems theory, the intertwining economic, political, cultural and biological processes of globalisation create global challenges and global risks.

Concerns about the unequal treatment as well as the exploitation of poor nations' resources, about epidemics and the facile spread of disease, about international crime, about climate change, about overpopulation, about shortages of basic resources such as water, about the re-emergence of competing religious views with political overtones, about the world domination of certain languages, identities, cultures and erasure of others, about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, about the eventual shortages of oil and gas as sources of energy and the negative impact on food supplies stemming from the use of plants as fuel, and about the destructive power of nuclear sources of energy as illustrated with the Fukushima nuclear crisis of 2011, the Chernobyl meltdown of 1956, those of Three Mile Island, USA in 1979 and Windsack, UK in 1957, create enormous global challenges. Ulrich Beck describes these as "a world risk society" in which world politics is no longer dominated by two opposing superpowers but rather by challenges that are "global, local, and personal at the one and same time" (Beck, 1999, p. 5).

These global-local-personal challenges "generate conflicts over who is to blame, heighten differences of opinion about what is to be done, and breathe new life in old ideologies. But they are also unifying forces because they remind us that we all live in the same world" (Anderson, 2001, p. 222). The de-collectivization and de-politicization of workers has greatly weakened organizational democracy and citizen-worker participation in the workplace in recent decades, yet renewed interests in social models and social citizenship to present viable new prospects for citizen action in the socio-cultural regulation of work (Casey, 2009). Resolving these disputes requires that all parties and all countries work together constructively so as to arrive at a consensus about the nature of the problem and to undertake collective action to solve it (Anderson, 2001; Casey, 2009). Although such collaboration has occurred on a very limited global scale, it too constitutes a globalising challenge.

The *third* interpretation, *post-colonialist theory and analysis,* views globalisation as the imposition of the economic and political agendas of major world powers on the global society so as to benefit rich, wealthy nations and corporations to the detriment of the world's poor (Abdi, 2006, 1998; Apple, 2005; Brown & Lauder, 2006; Gabbard, 2000; Olson, 2006; Weiler, 2001). According to this perspective, Western style schooling spread around the world as a result of European imperialism, including Christian missionary allies, oft precursors to the appearance of merchants, during the eras of extensive world empires, which affords a remarkably different understanding of the development of a world culture and of world systems, posited by the two previous views.

Postcolonial perspectives consider the dominant global model of schooling as exploitive of the majority of humanity and destructive to the planet and propose instead that education should be more progressive so as to liberate and

empower the masses (Abdi & Guo, 2008; Abdi, 2006, 1998; Camara, 2006; Crossley & Tickly, 2004; Kothari, 2006; Leys, 1996; Spring, 2008). Indeed, as an astute observer of the problems of colonial education, Julius Nyerere, Tanzania's first postcolonial president, advocated for *culturally relevant projects of* learning that were philosophically and epistemologically of Africa and African, with educational resources to be used for effective social development. Yet such educational programs were not broadly undertaken and those that were, did not achieve relevant development possibilities in many parts of the world, given unaddressed inequalities, thus necessitating new projects within critical perspectives allowing for the power of self-awareness and the development of cooperative, networked alliances to support project action taking up a capacities approach towards empowerment in the face of multiple inequalities (Abdi & Guo, 2008; Tobin, 2004; Nussbaum, 2002).

Unfortunately, the dismantling of colonial empires after WWII, mostly by means of violent movements, did not resolve the rich-poor dichotomy; nor did it assure a balance of power and an end to corruption, much to the detriment and distress of ordinary people (Bauman, 2006; Collier, 2007). Such changes of government systems raise profound questionings and redefinitions of societies and selves. Among other effects, subjected peoples sometimes produced vigorous cultures of opposition and resistance to domination. Nevertheless, multinational corporations, trade agreements such as the WTO/GATS, and international non-government organisations (IGO), move in and promote market economies, human capital education, neo-liberal educational and health reforms, all designed to continue to promote the interests of rich, powerful corporations and nations. These are new schemes of development policy recolonization, modeled on the old hegemonic structure (Leys, 1996; Abdi, 2006).

Once again, the focus on the domination of others – the idea at the very core of the notion of empire – is seen in the geographical possession of land, territories and domains (Saïd, 1993). In spite of their efforts, poor countries find themselves relegated to the status of 'third world' countries and getting poorer (Collier, 2007). From a postcolonial view, the negative effects of such domination continues historical inequalities, marks and characterises relations between poor regions with the world's richer countries (Schugurensky & Davidson-Harden, 2003). Such unresolved relations continue today, in a form of neo-colonialism, with powerful countries leasing or buying arable land in poor countries, mostly on the African continent in 2007-2008, to the detriment and disadvantage of Indigenous peoples (von Braun & Meinzen-Dick, 2009; York, 2009). According to Camara (2006) and Mbele (2009), such countries have not developed systems of knowledge production, specifically targeted for the amelioration of living conditions of their populations.

In general, postcolonial analysis considers prevailing forms of knowledge to be the result of political and economic power, in hierarchical arrangement,

fostering and favouring one form of knowledge above another. In other words, postcolonial analysis:

> includes issues of slavery, migration and diaspora formation; the effects of race, culture, class and gender in postcolonial settings; histories of resistance and struggle against colonial and neo-colonial domination; the complexities of identity formation and hybridity; language and language rights; the ongoing struggles of Indigenous peoples for recognition of their rights (Crossley & Tickly, 2004: 148).

Given the possibilities of post-colonial theory which attempts to analyse slavery, racialisation and identity in conjunction with colonization, it is nonetheless, geographically limited. The term, post-colonial, does not extend its focus on forms of anti-racist and Aboriginal struggles in the United States and Canada. In the latter countries, the term, 'post-civil rights' broadly refer to the impact of struggles of Black Americans, American Indian, La Raza and Asian-American communities, collectively producing a transformation of racial awareness, racial meaning and racial subjectivity (Frankenbert & Mani,1992).This perspective places de-colonisation struggles within a pluralistic framework which tends to obscure these struggles. In writing about the struggles of Aboriginal peoples in Canada, Lawrence and Dua (2011) suggest that "on-going colonisation and decolonisation struggles need to be foundational in our understandings of racism, racial subjectivities and anti-racism" (p. 248).

What then would be an appropriate education? In response, Willinsky's proposal is "to supplement our education with a consideration of imperialism's influence on the teaching of history, geography, science, language, and literature in the hope that it will change the way this legacy works on us" (1998, p. 247). More specifically, such an education would consider the educational legacy of imperialism

> in the portrayal of the other, in the treatment of distance from the West, in the placement of the non-Western outside history, in the suggestion of evolutionary differences along moral, cultural, and/or psychological lines, in the construction of racial differences, and in the equation of cultural and or nationality with race (Willinsky, 1998, p. 256).

The *fourth* interpretation, termed the *culturalists* by Joel Spring (2008), argues that there are other educational ideas, besides human capital, of considerable relevance, especially religious ideas, Freirean views, human rights and education for democracy, environmental education as well as multiple forms of progressive education (Apple & Beane, 2007; Benhabib, 2004, 2002; Freire, 1998; Steiner-Khamsi, 2004). Culturalists stress the existence of different forms of knowledge as well as different ways of seeing and knowing the world

(Hayhoe & Pan, 2001; Little, 2003; Rahnema, 2001; Steiner-Khamsi, 2004; and Zeera, 2001). In addition to recognising multiple knowledges and alternative cultural frameworks for schooling, the culturalists attach importance to studying the interaction between the local and the global, as well as to listening to Others' narratives in order to recognise and discover distinctive threads of human cultural thought and experience (Hayhoe & Pan, 2001).

Similarities between post-colonialist and culturalist perspectives concern the existence of multiple knowledges and the subjugation of some knowledges by others. Of considerable importance to international education is that both post-colonial and culturalist interpretations acknowledge a hierarchy of knowledges where one form is privileged above another, legitimated by power and playing out differently from one context to another.

Competing Voices

Beyond the lenses of these theoretical perspectives, *twelve sustained, and sometimes intertwining, discourses* play important roles in creating common educational practices, pedagogies and policies leading to greater uniformity as part of neo-liberalism. These discourses are typical of the knowledge economy and the development of human capital feature debates on the critical nature of technology; on the role of human capital; the feasibility of lifelong learning; the global migration of workers; living in diversity and democratisation, for now, that economies depend upon the skills and knowledge of all peoples (Becker, 2006, 1964; Spring, 2008).

1. Technology as Critical to the Knowledge Economy. Within a first discourse, growing income inequalities between individuals and countries are said to be the result of differences in knowledge and skills (Reich, 1991). Moreover, a shift from industrial to post-industrial modes of production requires a major increase in educated workers (Bell, 1973). Doing so necessitates educating students with skills, especially in the comprehension and application of technology, its reconfiguration of the processes of production and distribution, as well as its uses to access the world's knowledges, so that students and workers alike can continuously adapt to the workplace which relies primarily on ideas (Stoer & Magalhaes, 2004; Stromquist, 2002). In other words, changes in *human capital* in post-industrial contexts create a knowledge economy where wealth is tied to knowledge workers engaged with technology in lifelong learning and ultimately tied to educational systems.

This global discourse has set the agenda for many national educational policies, if not most, and has spread rapidly around the world (Spring, 1998, 2006). Furthermore, the extensive use of social technologies opens up lived experiences for sale, in that leisure, friendship, lifestyle services, media

consumption are increasingly commodified. The very act of engagement becomes restrictive to the act of consumption (Hearn, 2007). Although "human knowledge as human capital is the principal productive force in contemporary capitalism," this has been shown to have very mixed benefits for workers as the narrower, specific economic goals of the corporation are the drivers behind the 'learning organisation' rather than the worker's subjective interests in his/her learning and in workplace management (Casey, 2009, p. 173). Included in the production of learning for the organisation is "the extraction and codification of workers' personal capacities, tacit knowledge and affective creativity" so that these can be shared and regenerated, not for individual but for organisational benefit (p. 174).

2. *Lifelong Learning*. A second powerful global discourse linked to the knowledge economy, life-long learning was originally rooted in a humanist approach as part of personal cultural growth characterised by continuous, voluntary and self-motivated learning. This humanist approach was very much part of the seventies and eighties, for example, in language teaching, as integral to the move from structuralist to functionalist perspectives of learning (Fauré et al., 1972; Galisson, 1980). Today, however, lifelong learning is clothed in economic garb, making it part of human capital theory, whereby it is considered essential for individuals to keep up with constantly changing technology and the global job market, with purposeful learning activity, undertaken on an ongoing basis with the aim of improving knowledge, skills, competence and employability (Commission of the European Communities, 2002). So learning additional languages, for example, is no longer motivated by self-development and understanding of other cultures but is undertaken to equip oneself to better fit into the market economy.

3. *The Learning Organization*. A third discursive notion, the learning organization is premised on the idea that human knowledge is the principal productive force in contemporary capitalism (Harvey, 1989; Drucker, 1993; Castells, 1996). Learning in organizations focuses on tasks of selection, coordination and retention of practical and theoretical productive knowledge, including the extraction and codification of workers' personal capacities, tacit knowledge and affective creativity so that these knowledges may be shared and regenerated. This effectively separates the worker from his or her knowledge and objectifies both knowledge and worker. And yet it is well known in education that knowledge is socially constructed, permitting learners to internalize and personify their knowledge.

Given these premises of the learning organisation, there are serious paradoxes inherent to this approach to organisational management, in that the intensification of work results in the diminishment of workers' control and

participation in the design, management, structures and processes of their work, especially with highly skilled and often well-paid work (Green, 2006). Similarly, the complexification of the production process through knowledge enrichment has simplified the work by objectifying the knowledge of employees, rendering more extensive and irresistible the systems' control (Durand, 2007). Moreover, as pointed out in Fenwick (2001), management's usurpation of participatory models in the workplace is central to the dominant model of the learning organization. Flowing from this forceful stance, the learning organizational model is similarly dismissive of earlier socio-political aspirations toward expanded democratization in economic production as a right of social citizenship, thus contributing to a crisis in social cohesion and weakening participatory democracy (Fenwick, 2001; Casey, 2009).

4. Individual Responsibility. Further to the global recession of 2009-2010, the discourse and concomitant policies of lifelong learning have come to mean that individuals whose jobs are cut, are personally and individually responsible for upgrading for other equally elusive work at a later uncertain time, without governments being financially able to invest in postsecondary institutions of all types (vocational, professional, academic) to support continuous learning. In other words, students are to be socialised so that it is their sole responsibility to continuously adapt to a work world where technological innovations are changing almost daily, supposedly making it easier for students to access the world's knowledges (Stromquist, 2002). This evokes one of five principles of neoliberalism, the orientation now dominating Canadian ministries of education: the elimination of concepts of 'the public good' or 'community' to be replaced with 'individual responsibility'. The other four are familiar: the rule of the market imposed by government, no matter the resulting social damage; the reduction of public expenditures for social and educational services; the reduction of government regulations that might diminish profits; and privatization, i.e., the sale of government-owned enterprises to private investors (Bauman, 2011; Schuetze, Kuehn, Davidson-Harden, Schugurensky and Weber, 2011).

Moreover, as Hearn (2007) points out, terms such as 'downsizing', 'outsourcing', and 'negative growth' maintain the public invisibility of economic outcomes while distorting, obscuring, euphemising and denying the realities referred to, all the while displacing ethical concerns dealing with the fair ownership of knowledge with economic concepts. Consequently, questions arise in educational systems around the world about what counts as suitable curriculum for students of all ages so that they can become lifelong learners. Pressure is on systems and students alike to have acquired basic skills in primary school, in particular communication and math skills, as well as "ability to work in teams, to learn other subjects, to communicate effectively, to manage oneself,

to question and to innovate, to assume personal responsibility" (Cheng &Yip, 2006).

Nonetheless, the idea of lifelong learning has long roots, having fermented in the 1960s and early 1970s when it was promoted by UNESCO and earlier in the post-WWI period (Field, 2001). Furthermore, this concept is recognised as being part of many intellectual traditions, including Chinese, Indian Buddhism, and Greek philosophy as well as in the spirit of the European Renaissance (Gelpi, 1985). However, its postmodern incorporation rests upon an underlying view of human beings as producers-consumers, an untenable reduction tied to human capital theory which puts the individual at the centre of the educational process in which the responsibility for learning is that of the individual who is entirely responsible for the outcomes (Borg & Mayo, 2005) whereas the reality in the work world is such that it is the corporations that benefit from learning, rather than individual learners, leaving discouragement in its wake (Casey, 2009).

5. Accountability Agenda of a Market Approach to Education. In the face of media and public criticisms of teachers and professors alike, tuned-up technological services and solutions are proposed and acted upon, so as to continuously raise achievement as measured by means of *standardized testing,* be these international such as OECD's Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), national or regional, for ex., the systematic testing of student achievement in Alberta with province-wide standardized tests in grades 3, 6, 9 and 12. The results of these obligatory province-wide tests are rarely made available to researchers but rather to neo-liberal think tanks, such as the Fraser Institute in Canada, whose reports are highly publicized in newspapers, thus furthering the accountability agenda of a market approach to education with its concomitant pressures.

These are so made of sufficient importance that school districts move significantly to deepen, broaden and strengthen effectiveness, such as the Parkland School Division in Alberta which is experimenting with a more supportive grading system that includes comprehensive descriptors of learning such as 'established, emerging, and developing' rather than letter-grading or numerical scores for feedback to students and parents through report cards (CTV, 05 May 2011; Alberta Prime Time, 07 June 2011).

These and other *educational reforms* create a great deal of pressure on school systems and especially on teachers. In consideration of the top rankings of 15-year old students in Finland and Alberta, among the top six countries on the PISA exams, a study of teachers' views of systemic changes that contribute to that dubious success, indicates that several interconnected aspects of a culture of teaching have emerged since the early 1990s when a wave of educational reforms began in Alberta (Farrell, 2011). Embedded in broader systemic pressures to implement bold education-reform plans, a 'Race to the Top' as part

of economic impetus in the USA involves four areas for improvement: teacher effectiveness, data systems, low-performing schools, and standards and assessments, as instigated in 2010 with a competition for $4 billion-dollar grant funding from the U.S. Department of Education. Financed by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, this competition has become a high-profile centerpiece of the Obama administration's education agenda.

The weight accorded to accountability, educational reforms and lifelong learning is such that it is claimed that systemic changes must be put into place to improve *teaching effectiveness*. Of these, teacher practice has become more tightly focused in terms of curriculum expectations and outcomes, a refinement that pays more attention to teaching processes and strategies, with teacher professionalism and responsibility reinvented by means of continuous professional development throughout the province (Farrell, 2011, p. 217). Key to these changes is the annual Teacher Professional Growth Plans (nicknamed TPGP's), which requires teachers to establish individual goals to be monitored by both the teacher and school principal. Initially met with some degree of scepticism, the TPGP's were taken up by many teachers, leading to various changes, including action research on their own teacher practice, early assessment, followed up with feedback and intervention especially early on, professional learning communities, collaboration and collegiality, an exhausting list of changes, contributing to the framing and surveillance of teachers, and ultimately to teacher dropout rates (Farrell, 2011, p. 233). In light of the Finnish educational system which emphases creativity and hence its successes in the PISA country comparisons, Sahlberg proposed that rather than competition between education systems, schools and students, what is needed is networking, deeper co-operation and open sharing of ideas at all levels if the role of education in economic competitiveness is to be strengthened. Given these ideas, several jurisdictions are now talking and planning cooperative efforts, including Alberta, Finland, Shanghai and still others.

6. *Migration as Global Mobility.* The global migration of workers is yet another much studied global phenomena, with movement generally from poorer to richer countries, from rural to urban areas. Motivated by economic and political factors, migrants and their families engage in a search for opportunities for economic betterment, social mobility, better education and political stability (Li, 2003; Isajiw, 1999). Many migrants experience variably difficult adaptations marked by downward occupational mobility relative to occupations held previously in the country of origin, such as China (Zong, 2004). International transferences and non-recognition of credentials constitute major barriers to establishment and integration into new countries, as do challenges of reconstructing social networks as primary forms of their social capital (Guo, 2009; Hagan, 1998; Hébert, Kowch & Sun, 2004; Hébert, Lee,

Sun & Berti, 2003; Kazemipur, 2006, 2008, 2009). Although highly educated, recent immigrants to Canada have lower incomes compared to previous waves of less educated immigrants who came thirty years ago and to native-born Canadians (Hébert, Wanner et al, 2009, 2010; Li, 2003, 2001; Wanner, 2008), still, a generalized consensus in an extensively credentialised yet selectively networked world, ascertains that documents that certify some agreed-upon scholastic achievements could accord one a better job, a better house, more food choices and a faster transportation system. Ironically, all of these could also contribute to extensive ecological de-development and even destruction of functioning life management systems of the natural world (Abdi, 1998).

Within global migration patterns are a special class of *temporary foreign workers* who take up low-skilled work, for example, in factories, meat packing plants, construction and the oil industry, agriculture, or serve as live-in caretakers. Typically, such workers enter a richer country under stringent conditions, for limited periods of time and then must return to their country of origin (Ding, 2010; Li, 2003). Poor working conditions, low wages, and other human rights issues however may plague such workers. Consequently, employers often face more rigorous assessments to meet labour standards in Canada, for example, especially in light of many violations of worker rights. Nonetheless, established knowledge societies are continuously gaining at the expense of the educational have-nots. While this may respect historical and cultural inclusions achieved by the collective strife of all people from every continent of the world (Longino, 2002; Harding, 1998, 2008), the migration of workers may also create and continue problems of philosophical and epistemological exclusions, also historically inscribed in time and place.

The complexities of return migration, a form of *brain circulation*, also termed *brain drain* and *brain gain,* reveals that a return to countries of origin or a move to another country, of highly educated, early career professionals, is conditioned by several factors: times of economic slump; the ability to obtain high returns in their homeland for the human capital and citizenship gained in the host country; and the inability to find a professionally satisfactory place for themselves in the host society (DeVoretz & Zhang, 2004; DeVoretz & Ma, 2002; Ding, 2010; Ley & Kobayashi, 2005; Zong, 2004a,b, 2007, 2009).

7. English as Language of World Communication. Closely aligned to the realities of world-wide migration is the growth of *English as a language of world communication*, taken up by speakers around the world with their own accents, tempi and phrasing, thus creating thriving linguistic industries. Taken up from postcolonial perspectives, for example, considerable awe if not anguish accompanies the spread of English, displacing other colonial languages as well as national, sub-national, and local languages. While this represents a tremendous loss of knowledge of the particularities of the world, it

also acknowledges that we live in a world of American and European (UK) domination, which could be termed as a new empire of sorts, mostly economic but to some extent, also political and sometimes militaristic.

A telling example is constituted of American and Allied military interventions in what is now termed, the Arab Spring, populist resistance movements in several countries, with an important role attributed to digital communications. The military intervention taken up by the USA and its Allies protects Western interests in oil production in this part of the world, a telling motive, rarely discussed aloud. Indeed, the USA and its allies were lukewarm, if not intentionally disinterested in popular uprising against human rights violating regimes that were their supporters, but vociferously against the governments of those countries that historically opposed USA policies in the Middle East. Given China's economic rise and its financial capacity to bear American debt, this may gradually lead to Mandarin as the next world language, as one empire replaces another. Quite importantly, the Arab uprising was motivated by a desire for democracy and economic renewal, including jobs; these ideas continue to spread around the world, tentatively moving into China as well, where any sound of insurrection, such as the torrential critical response to a train wreck, forces authorities to reverse themselves while, at the same time, to subsequently quickly put down any dissent (Wines and Lafranière, 2011).

8. *Living in Diversity and Multiculturalism.* Yet another complex, fulsome and powerful global discourse focuses on the realities and consequences of *living in diversity*, with global migrations resulting in increases in concerns about potential cultural and religious conflict, integration and social cohesion, as well as what is an appropriate quality education for migrant children (McAndrew, 2007; Crul, 2007; Xiao, 2011).

Attempts to cohere human diversity within a country lead to state concerns with social cohesion (Beauvais & Jensen, 2002; Bernard, 1999) and a multitude of understandings of multiculturalism although most countries have neither policy, nor law, nor founding myths, with the notable exception of Canada. To clarify, a country may be diverse or multicultural "descriptively (as sociological fact), prescriptively (as ideology), from a political perspective (policy) or as a set of intergroup dynamics (as process)" (Dewing, 2009, p. 1). These four uses of the term, *multiculturalism*, lead to considerable confusion and many claims.

Many countries, however, are constituted of considerable diversity as a sociological fact, amplified in this era of globalization by global migration patterns, including foreign temporary or guest workers. A notable example of such a country without explicit multicultural policy or law is Germany, and yet Angela Merkel as Chancellor announced that 'multiculturalism' is dead, that it

had failed utterly, in a startling shift from her previous views, in reference to the 'gastarbeiters' or guest workers, mostly from Turkey, who arrived in Germany to fill a labour shortage during the economic boom of the 1960s. While her unexpected outburst against the immigrant communities was mainly political opportunism, Merkel, nevertheless, expounded on the idea of multiculturalism:

> We kidded ourselves for a while that they wouldn't stay, but that's not the reality…Of course the tendency had been to say, 'let's adopt the multicultural concept and live happily side by side, and be happy to be living with each other'. But this concept has failed, and failed utterly (17 October 2010).

The nature and causes of this presumed failure of multiculturalism are internal to the political system and its leaders, who did not act to articulate a poorly adopted ideology into effective socio-cultural and economic policy, programs and practices. This pronouncement reverberated around the world, later to be taken up by the British Prime Minister, again for political purposes, further contributing to one side of a complex discourse on the difficulties of living in multiplicity. Serious critiques were raised against these pronouncements, notably that there is no such policy in Germany and that in England, informal policies at the local and school levels are inoperable without government backing. Moreover, these statements were interpreted as political stances in a bid to retain power in a country with complex historical tradition of intolerance against others, rather than ready acceptance.

The debate continues, as it is further fueled in Australia, Britain, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway among other countries, wherein a range of extremist voices emit oft-repeated false messages that 'they', i.e., recent racially and or religiously different group of migrants, are fast becoming a majority, are all literate religious believers unable to integrate, building an impending societal takeover unless unspecified action is taken (Saunders, 2011a, b). While these voices are part of:

> A continuum of response that includes violence at its extreme end, their ideas should never be banned or outlawed. But these figures, like moderates in other such movements, have a responsibility to work to eliminate the threats that have emerged from their ranks. And we all have a responsibility to expose their dangerous fictions (Saunders, 2011b).

Applying the discourse of serious limitations to the cultural integration of immigrants, these countries have retreated from the multicultural ideology, due to a variety of factors, their importance varying across cases, such as "the chronic lack of public support, the failures of socio-economic integration,

leading to downscaling and retreats from multiculturalism as ideology"
(Joppke, 2004).

The only country to have formally adopted a multicultural policy and law is
Canada in 1971 and 1988 respectively. The complexities of *living in diversity, in
multiplicity* are revealed in terms of identity formation, social cohesion,
multicultural education, citizenship or civic education, and language teaching
and learning, in discussions herein and in many publications (for ex., Ghosh
&Abdi, 2004; Hébert, 2002; Hoerder, Hébert & Schmitt, 2006; McHugh &
Challinor, 2011; Peters, Britton & Blee, 2008; Zajda, Davies & Majhanovich,
2008).

In Québec, the now well-known commission on accommodation headed by
two stellar scholars, Gérard Bouchard, sociologist, and Charles Taylor,
philosopher, considered public opinion, media reports as well as research
findings and philosophical thought (Bouchard-Taylor, 2008). Three types of
guidelines make it possible to manage accommodation or adjustment requests:
restrictive guidelines (*undue hardship*), ethical reference points (*the attitudes
sought in negotiations*), and incentives (*society's purposes*) (p. 53). A policy of
reasonable accommodation and concerted adjustment to harmonization
practices, must **not** in an educational milieu:

- Violate the student's other rights or the rights of other
  students;
- Run counter to the rigorously restrictive requirements of the
  Education Act, program organization or other statutes; and
- Impose undue hardship on the school with regard to its
  operations and its budget (p. 54)

According to these educational criteria developed by McAndrew and cited in
Bouchard & Taylor (2008), accommodation or adjustment requests are limited
by: (a) the institution's aims (provision of care, education, profit, and so on);
(b) the financial cost and functional constraints; and (c) other people's rights.

Furthermore, the multiculturalism policy in Canada has been very productive
in stimulating much scholarly work on possibilities of diversity and education for
liberation with respect to its realities, possibilities and problems (Ghosh, 1996;
Ghosh & McDonough, 2011; McAndrew, Potvin, Triki-Yamani, 2011) as well
as a plethora of educational materials (for example, Egbo, 2008) and much
more. Most of this rich and productive work assumes that the school is the
ideal institution for the realization of visions of social justice and progress.
Leading to a plethora of strategies, new models replace old ones. While
schooling has changed and continues to change, the possibility that the school
is not able to live up to the ideal of societal salvation, remains as does the
claim that schools are remarkable stable, transmitting the norms of society
(Tröhler, 2008). In other words, the school's own culture as an institution,

termed a 'grammar of schooling', preserves its central characteristics which include the division of knowledge into identifiable school subjects; the distribution of instruction into identical time periods; the allocation of students to grades by age; the regulation of transitions between school levels; and the assessment and certification of achievements (Tröhler, 2008, p. 10).

In-depth studies have shown that there are conflicting models of schooling, existing since Greek times (Egan, 1986, 1997, 2005) and evidenced in visions of schooling articulated by Aboriginal elders (Hébert, 1997). And yet, while not perfect, schools have changed in contemporary times, responding to societal changes flowing, for example, from multicultural policies and programming, to ministerial edicts on the incorporation of digital technologies to better support learning and on personalizing curriculum so as to respond to learners' needs.

Of particular significance are the three policy debates which have been preoccupations for over a century, each of which is addressed in turn:

(1) *Common schooling versus ethnocultural institutions in the educational integration of newcomers:* School segregation is both a product of exclusion and a voluntary alternative pursued by parents and communities, given the intensification of supranational loyalties (McAndrew, 2007, p. 235). Given the generalization of pluralistic, child-centered, and human rights ideologies, the common public school is more receptive to the needs of immigrant students, and thus more attractive to parents (Banks & McGee-Banks; Glen & De Jong, 1996). Moreover, the dominance of social class over ethnic factors explains school performance and mobility, even if class does not account for all discrepancies between majority and minority students (Crul, 2007; Anisef, Blais, McAndrew, Ungerleider & Sweet, 2004).

(2) *Majority versus immigrant minority languages in the curriculum*: A broad consensus has emerged regarding the necessity of school systems to ensure mastery of an official language(s) by all students, as an essential vehicle of educational and social mobility for immigrant students, necessary to intergroup exchanges and common citizenship. The debate however has focussed on the legitimacy of making immigrant languages part of the curriculum (Berque, 1985; Krashen, 1996; McAndrew & Cicéri, 1998). The emerging trend is towards additive bilingual education and immersion programs (Cummins, 1979; Mackey, 1970; Painchaud, d'Anglejan, Armand & Jesak, 1993). Other things being equal, it is better for immigrant students to continue mastering their heritage languages while learning host languages (Greene, 1998; Dolson & Mayer, 1992; Glenn & De Jong, 1996).

(3) *The adaptation of norms and regulations of public schools in regard to religious and cultural diversity*: McAndrew distinguishes five groups of practices on a continuum from least to most actively committed to diversity, establishing some links to various models of citizenship, epistemological paradigms and ethical positions (2007, pp. 245–246):

- Selective incorporation of elements pertaining to immigrant cultures and religions in school activities to foster integration of immigrant students;
- Implementation of activities specially tailored to the needs and characteristics of immigrant minorities from an equalization-of-opportunity perspective;
- Integration of specific immigrant-oriented content or perspective into the regular school curriculum so that differences and even conflicts over interpretation are acknowledged;
- In response to religious claims made by certain immigrant groups, adaptation of norms and regulations governing school life; and
- Tailoring or transforming various elements of the curriculum in response to the demands of the 'organized' community.

9. Education for Democracy. All the more important therefore are initiatives in *critical, social and participatory citizenship education,* yet another timely discourse. The recent development of new programs of study in social studies, history and geography in Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario, provide stellar examples of such approaches, as is the Council of Europe's development of education for democracy within the European Union. Embedded in other discourses, we note that this democratic discourse appears in the *Memorandum on Lifelong Learning* issued by the European Commission in 2000 in declaring the promotion of tailored learning opportunities, the promotion of employ ability and social inclusion, creation of an information society for all, and the fostering of mobility, i.e., more generally, active citizenship, vocational skills and social cohesion, as major educational objectives. Of considerable interest is the focus in the European model on preparation for living in democratic countries and its concomitant societal intergroupal tensions, be these religious or ethnic, and the focus on citizenship, i.e., both belonging and participation in civil society.

Thus, each state develops its own regime of citizenship education for its own political purposes, as amply demonstrated in twelve case studies and commented upon (Reid, Gill, Sears, 2010). In some countries, with each change of government, the civic education curriculum subsequently changes whereas in other countries, citizenship education is preparation for living in pluralistic society (Bruno-Jofré & Aponiuk, 2001). Evidently, there are many issues of citizenship and globalisation, rooted in previous centuries, in experiences of migrant communities, yet freshly insightful in drawing on recent and ongoing political events, making a case for a truly global citizenship education (Peters, Britton & Blee, 2008; Reid, Gill, Sears, 2010).

Yet with the recent rise of global citizenship education (GCE) and the global ethic debates (Dower, 2002), the questioning of current educational programs as democratic is a legitimate enterprise as is casting a critical eye

upon the contextualizing post-Cold War politico-economic and educational impositions on developing countries (Abdi & Richardson, 2008b). These initiatives tend to represent hegemonic interventions that speak for western values and understandings of the world. At least on the ground in the majority of countries in the world, the rhetoric of democratic education should overwhelm the realities of the case. To be sure, the imposed liberal democratic system as condition for loans and aid, on poor countries in Africa, led to more economic and educational weaknesses, which at least indirectly, can justify the construction of such schooling contexts as anti-democratic. Even in supposedly highly evolved democracies in Europe and North America, the heavy colouring of learning systems by social class attributes such as sociocultural capital and by ongoing epistemic exclusions of the experiences as well as the languages of working class, minority and migrant students, deconstructs the claims of inclusive education, and thus democratic education. Nevertheless, the desire to achieve culturally inclusive democratic education is still a noble goal and critiques in this book should minimally enhance the debate on the issues.

10. Social Development. The notion of social development has been examined within research that locates and analyses the dynamism of its very active space in the current processes of globalization, learning possibilities and platforms. The meanings as well as the criticisms of such development have been taken to almost all the corners of the socio-cultural and politico-economic discourses (Schuurmann, 1993; Ake, 1996; Leys, 1996; Rahnema & Bowtree, 1997; de Rivero, 2002; Rist, 2003; Kothari, 2006; Abdi, 2006). In the most simplistic form of the case, and with the desired learning attachments considered, one could speak about development as the well-being of societies and individuals in contexts where they can make the right choices that affect their lives. Such contexts of livelihood desires and possible actions would include both societal and personal situations where groups and individuals acquire the capacity to enhance their economic, political, educational, cultural, technological and emotional well-being, and where they can effectively function to achieve vis-à-vis national and global institutions and actors. This has been especially difficult for people in developing countries who, as Ake (1996) so cogently noted, have been exposed to designs of development that were foreign to their histories, cultures, and viable needs. Here, as in other spheres of social life, the unidirectional impositions from the west have been extensive and the pragmatics of development itself were questioned in many instances (Rahnema & Bowtree, 1997). As Abdi (2006) pointed out, the need for development (precariously definable as the material endowments westerners possess) has been already injected and the potential for disengagement, especially in these times of rapid globalization, may not be possible for the less 'developed'. Hence, the critical

notations are still attached to education as a developmental agent in this introductory chapter, as in a number of chapters in this book.

11. Choice. Unless people have the freedom to choose the actual character and potentially the destiny of their lives, development can only represent imposed life clusters. As Claude Ake (1996, 2000) explained, the export of development never works in foreign lands. Hence, our desire is to place development in socially complex situations where its formations and interactions with education are fluid, multidirectional, situationally metamorphosing, and selectively constructive and deconstructive both in their practical and inter-activations.

Having more life choices can facilitate people's viable connections to today's highly globalized world, as still as desirable as ever, without detaching from local realities. And while this is not detached from the previous policy and program arrangements that were responding to identified national exigencies, it nonetheless brings more possibilities of greater wellbeing. While that assertion might have some currency in the context of official discourses or to use Foucault's terms, in the established categories of officialised knowledge systems, more sober historical analyses point to other possibilities. To be sure, socio-cultural dimensions are essential for any type of development, and the greatest proof of that lies in complex relationships between Europe and Africa wherein the former assumed the dominance of its descriptive and manufacturing requirements, almost all learning dimensions, objectives and histories, thus denying the validity of the latter's historical worldview, consciousness and knowledge systems, and underdeveloping Africa and other conquered lands (Rodney, 1982).

In other words, people learn to make changes in their lives, and the learning choices they make are designed to deal with perceived deficiencies in their midst, but people also learn to improve their contexts with the understanding that the new knowledge accorded them brings the capacity to attain 'higher' life possibilities. So choice in international education should take historical inequities into account, and align educational programs to people's contemporary needs and expectations. It should also limit the current global learning impositions that always accompany the ideologies of neoliberal privatization and related problematic of education and development.

12. Building a Knowledge Culture as Integral to International Education, Moving towards Knowledge Socialism. The rapid exchange and intercontinental movement of commerce, labour, culture, information technologies and knowledge systems, in the context of increasingly extensive globalization, has instigated new issues, intensifications and critiques of international education and the knowledge systems that sustain and define its categories and sub-categories. These new formations of international education are neither

accidental nor benign in the way they affect and interact with people's lives across the globe. While the the knowledge derivatives of international education should have improved social and economic well-being, especially in those areas of the world that are instructionally marginalized, there remains the need to problematise the power relations that are created, the socio-cultural outcomes that are harnessed, the linguistic categories that are deployed, the teacher training, teaching methodologies and pedagogical relationships that are established. Indeed, it is still necessary to critically examine all sectors of learning and the overall subjectivities and institutionalizations that interactively result from the overall knowledge enterprise. Schooling is still seen as one important way of catching up with developed countries, formerly perceived to be exclusively located in the Western hemisphere (Abdi & Guo, 2008). But the sources of knowledge are changing fast. With the current rise of countries such as China and South Korea, and with postcolonial and Aboriginal demands for the inclusion of indigenous epistemic systems, both national and international locations of knowledge are increasingly becoming multisource, multicentric, and more than ever, multiculturally inclusive. Even with these trends, one should have known that knowledge has always been a collective human heritage and achievement (Harding, 1998, 2008). Both the establishment and the practice of knowledge have always been a shared project, and the global co-creation of epistemic platforms is a centuries-old human tradition. But clearly, there were also many instances where such knowledge has been ethnocentrically claimed as emanating from one region and/or from one tradition. Suffice it to say here, that the co-development of knowledge systems should accord all of us a stake in the positive use of these knowledges, so that all societies can benefit from the intellectual labour of all humanity.

In terms of the processes of internationalisation that are influencing these multiplicities of knowledge locations, these can be defined with respect to three educational concepts, for example, as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the *purpose, functions* or *delivery* of post-secondary education", thus, dealing with the overall role and objectives; teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service; as well as the education course itself and programs (Knight, 2003, p. 11). This definition conveys the idea that rationales, providers, stakeholders, activities are all internationalised in substantial ways. Moreover, it recognizes internationalisation as a continuous effort at the local, institutional, and regional and national/sectors, as well as within complex, nuanced relationships, between and among nations, cultures, or countries.

Have the forces of globalization really understood the type of social and cultural development sought through education, especially in the context of these historical and social multitudes? In the views of the contributors to this

book, whether clearly stipulated or not, all education is potentially development education, critically co-constructed in transdisciplinary perspectives. Even in the many cases where learning contexts are being critiqued, the intentions are shifting so as to seek new ways of improving the situation in the context of the still difficult definitional space of postcolonial socio-political systems. The problématique of the postcolonial governments in many parts of the world is the failure to realise the untenability of colonial education philosophies and epistemologies, which have for so long, suppressed the enfranchisement of local knowledges and ways of knowing, for national social and human development. Only when this realization is made explicit and deconstructed will we be enabled to move towards knowledge socialism in which knowledge belongs to us all.

In response to these timely and important educational and potential social development issues and possibilities, contributors to this volume on knowledge as a shared socio-cultural good examine four broad themes of international education:

- Redefining internationalisation and international education, in Section III;
- Universities and knowledge-making in the global economy, in Section IV;
- Youth mobilities in terms of new issues, fragmentation and routes to knowledge, in Section V; and
- Changing the world: critical perspectives on human well-being and on intensive transformative processes, in Section VI.

Each broad theme is each addressed in subsequent sections which each encompass several chapters.

III. REDEFINING INTERNATIONALISATION AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Internationalized categories of knowledge are examined in this section, as is the need to achieve some fairness among institutions, agents and spaces in advancing specific notions and practices of knowledge, and the imperative to assure that such internationalizations contribute to more equitable social and learning relationships. This should be complemented by the opening up of inclusive learning and cultural spaces for international students (especially those coming to the West from the so-called developing countries) whose numbers are expected to increase in the coming years and decades. Indeed, without achieving at least some of these, spaces of internationalization and international education will be at best limited, and will be at least partially exclusionists in both their epistemic and pedagogical intentions and practices.

For too long, international education has long meant learning programs that Western powers and parties deliver to others seen as 'underdeveloped', i.e., from nation to nation. With the advent of globalization however, national borders are no longer barriers to keep people in or out of a protected space. Instead the term, 'global education' is increasingly used to refer to education beyond boundaries and to forms of attachment and belonging that focus on the individual as a member of a global community of shared humanity.

Pursuing a deeper understanding of the idea of *Understanding Internationalisation,* Kumari Beck argues in chapter two that a comprehensive analysis of the process will support educators and scholars alike in discerning and implementing ethical practices. In addition, she contends that any analysis that overlooks globalization is incomplete and misleading. In response, she employs the scholarship on globalization theory, and illustrates how a more inclusive framework can enable an effective analysis of internationalisation and a deeper understanding of this process from a student perspective. As she suggests, this approach should help practitioners and scholars to develop a 'grassroots' understanding of internationalisation and a reconceptualization of what an academic rationale for internationalisation means.

The reconceptualization of the human capital value of education as a private good, linked to a market-oriented commodification of university knowledge, underpins a repositioning of universities as entrepreneurial enterprises, as discussed in Allan Pitman's contribution on *The Ideological and Economic Re-Positioning of Universities*. In the third chapter, Pitman further explores the implications for universities and the professoriate, with a particular emphasis on the ways in which the institutions and those who work within them are being redefined, with examples drawn from Canadian and Australian experiences.

Within the context of increasing expectations that post-secondary institutions expand their international reach through changes in policy and program, there is a tendency to focus on institutional goals and individual student learning at the expense of wider social justice considerations and implications of internationalization. Lynette Shultz takes up this observation in chapter four, *Exploring Partnership Principles and Ethical Guidelines for Internationalizing Post-secondary Education*. With the need for internalization efforts to support relationships of reciprocity, Shultz says that attention must be given to the intentions and processes of partnerships for these are particularly important in the overall post-secondary education agenda. It is on this basis that she examines the work of the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) in establishing international partnership principles to guide Canadian civil society organizations in building equitable and just partnerships in their international work. The issues and challenges faced by CCIC as well as the established partnership principles are explored in relation to current post-secondary internationalization trends to provide insights and to make policy and practical recommendations for Canadian universities.

In chapter five, *Japanese Aesthetics and English Education in the Global Age*, Kazuko Kurihara re-imagines Japanese education, as she discusses how, with the advent of the global information age, Japanese youth today are required to have authentic abilities to communicate with different peoples from different countries in the English language, rather than simply a good knowledge of practical and functional American English. Kurihara proposes that more affective learners of English are created through aesthetic reading, especially English poetry, when moved or inspired by the authenticity of the content implying the profound but subtle meaning of human emotion in life. In this sense, the way of affective and aesthetic English learning enhances the traditional Japanese appreciation of ephemeral beauty. As an authentic incentive to intellectual activities, this sensitivity leads to a deep, accurate, and rapid understanding of different peoples in the world. American English education in Japan therefore, Kurihara says, should be aimed at a broader goal of English as a shared language for Internet-based communication, fostering a greater sense of traditional Japanese beauty for more affective English-learning in the global community.

In chapter six, *From a Global Education Idiot to a Competent Global Educator,* Ottilia Chareka and Pamela van Dommelen redefine graduate education via their experience teaching an online global education as an elective course to M.Ed. graduate students at their university. At the end of the course, one of the students summed up her learning experience in the course as "…from a global education idiot teacher to a competent global education teacher." This remark was very similar to views expressed by other students in this course who felt that their B.Ed. programs did not prepare them to face the culturally diverse classes they were teaching today. From this pedagogical encounter, Chareka and her co-author examine the history of multiculturalism policy in Canada, its context and how it is situated in teacher education programs. They briefly distinguish the differences and similarities among multicultural education, antiracist education, diverse cultures and global education. As such, the chapter discusses the gap between multiculturalism as federal policy and teacher preparation as policy implementation in Canadian Universities. In so doing, the authors argue that today's Canadian teachers need to have a solid background in multicultural, antiracist, diverse cultures and global education because Canada is a mosaic country living in a global village in which international education is at the centre stage of the 21st century.

IV. UNIVERSITIES AND KNOWLEDGE-MAKING IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY

In this section, the contributors individually but with clear interrelated descriptive proposals achieve juxtaposed analytical platforms that discuss and

critique the relationship between the institutions that create specific knowledges and the realities of the global economy that enfranchises some while essentially marginalizing others. This should be complemented by a specialized understanding of the role of higher education institutions and their professoriate who are interactively located within and sometimes around the constructions of international education and the knowledge systems that prevail in its formations and dispensations. As should be expected, a more inclusive understanding of the co-functionalities of the global and local in issues pertinent to equity and diversity, the place of instructors versus internalization, and the agency of teachers in partaking in the changes, are now very relevant and timely.

Questions of equity, diversity and internationalisation are taken by Tim Goddard who explores these with respect to programs tasked with the pre-service education of teachers and school administrators. In his previous work, he examined the implications of globalisation and changing demographics on the work of Canadian school administrators (2006, 2007). In his contribution herein, chapter seven, *Redesign or Rearrangement? The Intensification of Teacher Education and the Recognition of Equity, Diversity and Internationalization*, Goddard moves the focus beyond the school setting to examine the degree to which changing professional practice is being reflected in university-based teacher education programs.

In chapter eight, *Intensification of Faculty Engagement in the Internationalisation of Adult Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Canada and the United States.* Shibao Guo and Mary Alfred explore the issue of academics as knowledge workers, and examine the extent to which faculty members are engaged in the internationalization of research and curricular development in adult higher education in Canada and the United States. Noting that academic transformation begins with the creation and dissemination of knowledge, two questions drive their inquiry: (a) What is the level of faculty engagement in cross- national research, and (b) In what ways do adult education programs reflect an international perspective in curricula and practice? In this qualitative study based on interviews and content analyses of conference papers, Guo and Alfred's findings reveal a lack of interest in research relating to internationalization in both countries. In their critical interpretation, the authors propose that this reveals the near-static nature of Canadian and American education as well as a reluctance to move into the international arena of adult education.

In chapter nine, *Knowledge, Networks and Educational Redesign: Transformation or Reproduction?*, Carl James, Cris Cullinan and Ana Cruceru reference the need to address the problems, challenges, pressures and struggles faced by instructors of international students. It should also be recognized, they e relay, that 'local' students are affected by the presence of international students in their classes, and as such, there are to be specific changes and

adjustments that institutions, along with instructors, need to make if they are to be responsive to the experiences, needs, interests, expectations and aspirations of international students, particularly if international students are to feel welcome, and not seen as mere income, meeting the growing financial needs of "Western institutions." By focusing on these and related issues, James, Cullinan and Cruceru discuss the need for systemic changes in today's institutions with regard to inequity, colonialism and racism that operate as barriers to marginalized students' full participation and successful outcomes. To do so, they suggest that instructors, administrators and 'home' students alike need to recognize and accommodate the cultural, social, linguistic, familial and aspirational capital that the growing numbers of international students bring into our institutions, understanding that in doing so we all benefit.

Beyond the role and contributions of educators, Sarah Eaton explores the precarious and arguably unethical position of directors of English in post-secondary institutions, in chapter ten, *The Administration of English as a Second Language (ESL) Programs in Higher Education: Striking the Balance between Generating Revenues and Serving Students*. With universities regarding such programs as lucrative, Eaton finds that directors are charged with the responsibility of marketing these programs and recruiting students internationally, often with little or no training on how to do so. With this problematic intersections of education and profiteering, and with limited knowledge of how to do it right, the repercussions are often severe, Eaton says, and could include the termination of instructors' contracts or the closing down of programs.

In chapter eleven, *Managing a New Diversity in a Small Campus: The Case of l'Université Moncton (Canada)*, Mathieu Wade and Chedly Belkhodja explore the changing role of the university in the context of growing international mobility and demand for regional immigration through a case study of l'Université de Moncton, in New Brunswick, Canada, part of a broader research project on the impact of Francophone universities on regional immigration in four Canadian cities. Through an analysis of federal, provincial and municipal policies concerning international students, interviews with city officials and university administrators, and focus groups with international students, Wade and Belkhodja consider l'Université de Moncton's situation in light of the recent policy changes in Canada aiming for a greater attraction and retention of international graduates outside major urban centers. They present the strategies in place for recruitment, the services offered for integration, and the overall retention of international graduates in the city of Moncton. At the end, they discuss the challenges of retention in second- and third-tier cities and in so doing, introduce the next section which focuses on youth's experiences in schooling in international settings as well as second generation youth's experiences with mobility as identity in schools in three Canadian cities.

V. YOUTH MOBILITIES: NEW ISSUES, FRAGMENTATION, AND ROUTES TO KNOWLEDGE AND IDENTIFICATIONS

The multiple routes of youth mobility call upon identity capital, in which mobility of mind, body and boundary are seriously at play. One prominent form of youth mobility is at the heart of international student exchanges which experience serious difficulties within a market economy. The next four small chapters specifically focus on student mobility. With the factual intensifications of global labour, professional mobilities and by extension, educational fluidities, higher education institutions, especially those in the West, have portrayed themselves as important learning sites that have both the educational and cultural capitals to provide the necessary training for future personal and career development. Interestingly, and while the focus of these chapters is not entirely on those, today's student mobility trends show some continuation of the educational hegemony of western institutions, which are perceived as offering superior education and credentials vis-à-vis colleges and universities in the so-called developing countries. By-and-large, the trends of student mobility seem to be driven, as much as anything else, by economic calculations (Guo, Schugurensky, Hall & Fenwick, 2010). Even when it is within a single country, the possibility of the educational ideologies and programs having some saliency over the lives of all is not uncommon.

In chapter twelve, *Student Mobility in Europe, Tunisia and French Speaking Canada*, Stéphanie Garneau discusses the case of three young people who share a common goal in pursuing their university studies in an era marked by a global trend toward the internationalization of higher education, Justine, Omar and Isabelle are also three young people whose academic and work integration paths are being mapped in very different political, economic, social and cultural contexts. In analyzing the situation, the author examines the academic and career paths of these French-speaking graduates using three different scales of observation (European, national, regional).

In chapter thirteen, *Tunisian Students Abroad: New Routes to Knowledge*, Abdelwahab Ben Hafaiedh notes how in 1980, about 900,000 youth in the world expatriated themselves to study abroad, and how in current terms, this number has almost tripled. The five counties which attract 70% of these students are the United States of America, England, Germany, France and Australia, while China, South Korea, India, Japan and Greece are main source countries. Ben Hafaiedh adds how the Maghreb countries are at the very bottom on this list, with possibilities of change complicated by select exclusionary issues that are inherent in the very processes of globalization which were supposed to facilitate these movements.

In chapter fourteen, *The Cosmopolitan 'Bildung' of Erasmus Students' Going Abroad*, Vincenzo Cicchelli notes how, in 1987, the European Commission instituted an interuniversity exchange program, *Erasmus*, later integrated into a more ample instrument called *Socrates*. Among its proposed goals, the author suggests that this education to alterity, termed cosmopolitan *Bildung*, is less of a long-lasting and irreversible learning than an ambivalent and incomplete tentative to make a place for the other in one's identity. Moreover, although the program is open to all member states of the European Union and its neighbours, it is actually Spain, France, Germany, Italy and Great Britan who share the largest number of participants coming and going.

In chapter fifteen, *Student Mobility and the Canadian Francophone: Individual and Community Issues*, Annie Pilote discusses how issues linked to student mobility are not always closely related to the internationalization of higher education. She adds that the identity dynamics that exist in any mobility process can also be found within national borders. In Canada, she notes, the post-secondary paths of Francophone students from French-speaking minority communities present specific issues for both students and their communities. For French-speaking communities in provinces outside the Francophone majority province of Québec, Pilote points out how the school is a vital locus for linguistic and cultural reproduction. Also in these provinces, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees access to elementary and secondary instruction in the language of the linguistic minority, but that is not happening to the extent and the depth it should, thus lowering the possibilities for cultural and linguistic viability.

For youth living in a multicultural polyglot country such as Canada, the positioning of self may be both joyful and problematic. Currently the focus of much research and policy attention are second generation youth, that is, youth born of parents who migrated and settled in Canada, for the question arises: *how long does integration take?* Based on graphic and narrative data recently collected in three Canadian cities, Calgary, Winnipeg and Toronto, Yvonne Hébert, Lori Wilkinson and Mehru Ali, in chapter sixteen, analyse second generation youth's patterns in glocal spaces where transcultural modes of belonging are created and lived. Their analysis focuses on attachments to locality and a continuum of mobilities of mind, body and boundaries. The findings with respect to new modes of becoming are interpreted in terms of the complexities of their integration processes as well as their relevance to social policy development. Their mobilities and complex fluid identifications are situated in complex realities, localities and transcultural processes of becoming, contextualised and heavily influenced by globalisation and its attendant processes of identity formation in multicultural contexts such as Canada. Thus, four brief research notes and one chapter (sixteen) contribute to a better understanding of the realities of

youth mobility as part of international education and of youth integration as part of migration.

VI. CHANGING THE WORLD: CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES

In this final section of the book, the contributors re-engage with the ongoing critical notations and practices of select epistemic and programmatic power relations that seem to be inherent in the conventional dispensations that have been attached to diverse contexts of international education and knowledge exchange and sharing. From extensive linguistic dominations that continually favour the case of colonially attached lingua franca, to problematic sustaining of learning situations that perpetuate clusters of socially sanctioned internal colonization, to the perforce imposition of uni-directional and ideologically driven educational and development blueprints that marginalize more than they enfranchise, and the need to expand to different forms and locations of knowledge, there is much that still needs to be re-analyzed and critiqued in the terrain of international education. It is by means of such critical interventions that the probability of relevant policy and programs could be enhanced.

In chapter seventeen, *English as a Tool of Neo-Colonialism and the Market Economy: Examples from Asia*, Suzanne Majhanovich notes how at the beginning of the 21st Century, the English language has become the *de facto* lingua franca of the modern world. It is the most popular second or foreign language studied such that there are now more people who learned English as a second language and speak it with some competence than there are native English speakers. But why has English gained such prominence? What effect does this have on the globalised world? In this chapter, Majhanovich argues that the importance of English in many ways promotes a neo-colonialism and certainly abets the neo-liberal ideals of encouraging a market economy. To strengthen her points, Majhanovich draws examples from Cambodia, Malaysia and Hong Kong.

Furthering inquiry into the changing nature, or not, of educators, Peter Joong and Thomas Ryan, in chapter eighteen, *Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of Secondary Reform and Implementation: China and Canada Comparison,* use survey questionnaires to discuss how teachers deal with and respond to change. In so doing, they use data from sixteen sample schools in Southwest China, and sixteen schools in six school districts in Southern Ontario. Their research findings reveal that most teachers in both jurisdictions were able to make changes that supported the reforms even though the changes required more time, effort, and new knowledge. The teachers, however, had difficulty with transitioning and with altering current teaching praxes (teacher talk) and student evaluation modes (tests). Both students and teachers experienced difficulties that arose from the conflict between activity-based

learning and exam-oriented systems. Based on these points, the authors suggest that parents and society, especially in China, need to change their mindsets of valuing exam achievements.

In chapter nineteen, *Teaching China to the Chinese: Rich Opportunity for Critical Reflection or Neo-colonial Conceit*, Michael O'Sullivan explains how teaching an international and comparative education class to a cohort of Chinese graduate students raises normative issues relating to educational reform in China that might well be construed as a neo-colonial conceit. At the same time, he adds, that such a class has the potential to provide a rewarding opportunity for these students to reflect on their lived experiences and to acquire a new set of scholarly skills which could prepare them to return to China and make an informed and unique contribution to the educational reform processes that are underway in their homeland. In discussing these issues, O'Sullivan reflects on a 2007-08 academic year graduate course for a cohort of fifteen Chinese students. The objective of the course was to encourage the students to reflect deeply on the momentous changes that characterize Chinese society and the impact this is having, or soon will have, on the country's system of education. Based on this experience and feedback from the students, both positive and negative, this case study examines the legitimacy and ethics of presuming to "teach China to the Chinese". In doing so, the author raises fundamental questions of undoubted importance to professors in Canadian faculties of education who increasingly find themselves in classes composed largely, or in this case, entirely of foreign students.

The naming and work of the 'teacher' in initiatives of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) serves as the focus of chapter twenty, titled *Educating the World: Teachers and their Work according to UNESCO*. Helen Harper and Judith Dunkerly trace the implicit and explicit naming of the 'teacher' and the work of the teachers in documents produced by UNESCO over the last ten years. With particular attention to the *Education for All* initiative, they discuss how teaching and the teacher are articulated by the UN in relation to recent scholarship on globalization and the development of the cosmopolitan/ world teacher, and conclude with how the policies and initiatives of the UN along with recent scholarship on world/cosmopolitan teacher can be used to reformulate teacher education for and beyond the nation state.

In chapter twenty-one, *The Role of Education in the New Democracy of Bhutan*, Ann Sherman discusses the introduction of democracy in governmental structures and follows a change in the education processes used in schools, within the Ministry of Education, in the creation of educational policies. What does it mean to democratise Bhutan and its educational system? This question serves as the central focus of the planning with changes being slowly introduced by the Bhutanese Ministry of Education. Teachers are urged to think about what their roles might be within Bhutanese schools in a

democratic society. Are teachers to become advocates for their students and themselves within a more democratic context? What does a democratic classroom look like and how does it differ from Bhutanese classrooms of the last few decades? The teacher education programs must also be examined carefully if it is to be revamped in a way that helps teachers think about ways to encourage student voice, the sharing of opinions, collaborative work and approaches that enable decision-making in classroom activities. As such, the magnitude of the challenges regarding the role of the educational system in a new democracy becomes very apparent, especially that the democratisation process has been imposed by the current government, rather than claimed by the populace, thus raising another question of whether democracy can be imposed on a people.

The focus on teachers continues in chapter twenty-two, *Building a Civil Society in Post-conflict Kosovo: Educators and Civil Society.* Anna-Marija Petrunic focuses on the role of educators in building effective civic spaces in post-conflict situations with respect to the Kosovo situation. Her chapter examines how learning for a democratic citizenry ensures continuous discussion that impacts upon the identity formation of young Kosovar educators especially as they move toward a more transcultural, globalised and integrated society. Petrunic points out how Kosovar Albanians and Kosovar Serbs are at different stages of adopting civil society initiatives as they emerge from conflict. With identity and self-awareness serving as key principles of the foundation upon which processes of civil society can evolve and take root, both should understand the need for a transcultural civic identification that affirms the fact of living and sharing territorial space, which itself implies an interconnectedness that will never be disengaged or divided. Continually grasping onto ethno-historical/national cleavages, however, serves to maintain the tension between Kosovar Serbs and Kosovar Albanians. But, as Petrunic points out, it does not supersede the fact that both groups dwell in a shared civic space and that, with the realities of globalization, both groups need to realize that ethnic tensions need not be dichotomous and should superseded by shared civic culture, which must be inculcated in the public sphere.

Further to democratisation efforts in the Bhutan, Marilyn Tobin engages and explores the potential for Indian women educators to attain self-actualization and to become respected partners across genders. In chapter twenty-three, Women Educators in India: Challenges, Empowerment and Template for Change, she first outlines India's gendered context and its uniqueness and emphasizes the challenges confronting Indian girls and women. Second, she describes Indian women educators' empowerment as a process, highlighting their perspectives about its complexity. Third, she etches a template for change in India, including strategic alliances in the attainment of desired results and a discussion about Indian women's positive initiatives. In closing, Tobin comments on the growing need for Indian women educators to speak out as freedom fighters with a vision.

Assumptions regarding the 'goodness' and justice of global interconnections and distributions of knowledge through educational structures worldwide are considered by Dalene Swanson, in chapter twenty-four, *The Owl Spreads its Wings: Global and International Education Within the Local from Critical Perspectives*. She questions the assumption that sharing knowledge, especially between an 'all-knowing North' with a 'helpless South', is for the greater good of all humanity; and further examines issues of re-contextualisation in localities which take up a 'progressive' educational discourse, whether 'new ways' necessarily serve local interests and whether such engagements provide promised recognition and access to political and economic empowerment. Swanson writes, 'developing' nations are so caught up in the development project that resistance or fora for imagining otherwise is increasingly difficult. The author likens this, in the Hegelian sense, to Minerva's owl which spreads its wings at the falling of the dusk, with the imaginative capacity to think and assert otherwise coming too late for a meaningful restructuring for all global citizens in local contexts of the Earth's ecosystems. Drawing on her research in contexts of constructed disadvantage in schooling in South Africa, complemented by her experiences in a teacher education program in Western Canada, and teaching in an online international trans-disciplinary course on global citizenship based at a Canadian university, she addresses the complexities and difficulties of the above-mentioned issues from critical perspectives.

In chapter twenty-five, Intensive Globalizations and African Education: Re-interrogating the Relevance of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs), Ali A. Abdi notes how extensive and intensive realities of new globalizations have been impacting negatively on African education and development. Although school enrolments rose dramatically after independence in the 1960s and into the late 1970s, there was always a certain fragility of the qualitative context. And while that might have been dealt with in one way or another, with the advent of what many now identify as the most organized systems of globalization in history, the effects of the externally imposed Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) have expansively added to the already weakened provision of quality education in the Sub-Saharan African context. The chapter examines these and related issues and attempts to critically locate possible ways of addressing the situation.

In the final chapter twenty-six, Development, the Two-Way Knowledge Gap and Open Access to Research and Scholarship, John Willinsky discusses the contribution of the scholarly journal to the development of a sense of larger community in modern universities around the world. First he reviews the historical and contemporary situation in developing countries, then discusses the impact of a number of global initiatives to build developing countries' technical infrastructure, as exemplified by the rise of connectivity among African scholars. Finally he discusses what is meant by the access principle in the contexts of developing countries, its first major boom in 2002, its challenges, and its successes.

CONCLUSION: KNOWLEDGE-AS-SHARED-SOCIO-CULTURAL-CONSTRUCTION

Among the main objectives of this book was to discuss and critique contemporary contexts of international education as well as the internationalization of knowledge. As we have seen above, the terrain may still be conducive to the promise of education as an important vehicle for social well-being. While the rhetoric of internationalization is commonplace, the select economizations of education can sometimes be overwhelming and developmentally problematic. But while even that is, in and of itself, not entirely undesirable, the evidence of over 60 years of international education as a first-world driven project of internalization and international development does not seem to bear much witness to the achievement of the still elusive arenas of community progress that have been multi-temporally and multi-spatially heralded.

To push the boundaries of re-reading and re-critiquing the constructions and well as the global locations of international education, therefore, we may need to heed the call for a multi-perspective and multi-centeric understanding of the meanings, the functions as well as the intentions of knowledge. This should help us at least answer some of the questions we have started with this chapter, i.e., what is the role of education in human well-being; what learning prospects can respond to today's globalizing poltical and economic contexts; what does knowledge-making entail; and how do contemporary knowledge contructions respond to prevailing social contexts.

In reading the chapters of this book, it is clear that the need for a non-monocultural, de-hegemonizing and historically inclusive international education would be required if education is to serve the interests of all. From these times of intensive and extensive globalizations, we may move beyond the exemplary suggestions of postmodernism, so as to value technically and differently created multiple knowledge systems, and to aim for a a new plateau where educational threads that connect the past are taken into account with the current and the future, leading to an appreciation of the default mandate to co-analyze, co-construct and share contemporary knowledge and, by extension, educational platforms that belong to all of us. For this to happen and for the need to affirm all current knowledge systems as hybrid blocks that represent the common of all humanity, we can clearly see, and indeed, fully accept all knowledges as shared (and shareable) socio-cultural constructions.

REFERENCES

Abdi, A. A. (1998). Education in Somalia: History, destruction and calls for reconstruction. *Comparative Education, 34*(3), 327–340.

Abdi, A. A. (2006). Culture of education, social development and globalization: Historical and current analyses of Africa. In A. Abdi, K. P. Puplampu, & G. J. Sefa Dei (Eds.), *African*

Education and Globalization: Critical Analyses (pp. 13–30). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Abdi, A. A. & Guo, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Education and Social Development: Global Issues and Analyses*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Ake, C. (1996). *Democracy and Development in Africa*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Ake, C. (2000). *The Feasibility of Democracy in Africa*. Dakar, Senegal: CODESRIA.

Alberta Prime Time. (2011, June 07). *Going against the Grade: A Panel Discussion*. http://albertaprimetime.com/Stories.aspx?pd=2420

Anderson, W. T. (2001). *All Connected Now: Life in the First Global Civilisation*. Cambridge, MA: Westview Press, a member of the Perseus Books Group.

Anief, P., Blais, J.-G., McAndrew, M., Ungerleider, C., & Sweet, R. (2004). *Academic Performance and Educational Mobility of Youth of Immigrant Origin in Canada: What Can We Learn from Provincial Data Banks?* Research report. Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC).

Apple, M. W. & Beane, J. A. (Eds.). (2007). *Democratic Schools: Lessons in Powerful Education* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Apple, M. (2005). Are new markets in education democratic? In M. Apple, J. Kenway, & M. Singh (Eds.), *Globalizing Education: Policies, Pedagogies & Politics* (pp. 209–230). New York: Peter Lang.

Arnove, R. (1980). Comparative education and world-systems analysis. *Comparative Education Review, 24*(1), 48–62.

Baker, D., & LeTendre, G. (2005). *National Differences, Global Similarities: World Culture and the Future of Schooling*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Banks, J. A., & McGee-Banks, C. A. (1995). *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. New York: Macmillan.

Bauman, Z. (2006). *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2011). *Collateral Damage: Social Inequalities in a Global Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beauvais, C., & Jenson, J. (2002). *Social Cohesion: Updating the State of the Research*. CPRN Discussion Paper No. F 22. http://www.cprn.org/doc.cfm?doc=167&l=en

Beck, U. (1999). *World Risk Society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Becker, G. (1964). *Human Capital*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Becker, G. (2006). The age of human capital. In H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, & H. Halsey (Eds.), *Education, Globalisation & Social Change* (pp. 292–295). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bell, D. (1973). *The Coming of the Post-Industrial Society*. New York: Basic Books.

Benhabib, S. (2002). *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Benhabib, S. (2004). *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bernard, P. (1999). *Social Cohesion: A Critique*. CPRN Discussion Paper, No. F 09. http://www.cprn.org/doc.cfm?doc=311&l=en

Berque, J. (1985). *L'immigration à l'école de la République*. Rapport d'un groupe de réflexion remis au ministre de l'Éducation Nationale, Centre national de documentation pédagogique. Paris: Al Documentation Française.

Boli, J. & Thomas, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Constructing World Culture: International Non-government Organizations Since 1875*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Borg, C., & Mayo, P. (2005). The EU Memorandum on lifelong learning. Old wine in new bottles? *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 3*(2), 203–225.

Bouchard, G., & Taylor, Ch. (2009). *Building the Future: A Time for Reconciliation*. Abridged Version, Rapport de la Commission de consultation sur les pratiques d'accommodement reliées

aux différences culturelles. Gouvernement du Québec: Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec.

Brown, P., & Lauder, H. (2006). Globalization, knowledge and the myth of the magnet economy. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 3*(2), 183–202.

Bruno-Jofré, R. & Aponiuk, N. (Eds.). (2001). *Educating Citizens for a Pluralistic Society*. Calgary: Canadian Ethnic Studies.

Burton-Jones, A. (1999). *Knowledge Capitalism: Business, Work and Learning in the New Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Camara, M. (2006). *Accessibilité à l'enseignement Postsecondaire en Guinée, Barrières et Stratégies d'amélioration*. Thèse de doctorat, Université Laval.

Casey, C. (2009). Organizations, workers, and learning: New prospects for citizenship at work? *Citizenship Studies, 13*(2), 171–185.

Castells, M. (1996). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Vol. I: The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cheng, K., & Yip, H. (2006). *Facing the Knowledge Society: Reforming Secondary Education in Hong Kong and Shanghai*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Clayton, T. (1998). Beyond mystification: Reconnecting world-system theory for comparative education. *Comparative Education Review, 42*(4), 479–496.

Collier, P. (2007). *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What Can Be Done About It*. London: Oxford University Press.

Creswell, T. & Merriman, T. (Eds.). (2010). *Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects*. Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate.

Crossley, M., & Tikly, L. (2004). Postcolonial perspectives and comparative and international research in education: A critical introduction. *Comparative Education, 40*(2), 147–156.

Crul, M. (2007). The Integration of immigrant youth. In M. Suarez-Orozco (Ed.), *Learning in the Global Era: International Perspectives on Globalization and Education* (pp. 213–231). Berkeley, CA and East Hampton, NY: University of California Press and Ross Institute.

CTV. (2011, May). *School Division to Roll Out New Report Card System for Junior High Students*. http://edmonton.ctv.ca/servlet/an/local/CTVNews/20110530/edm_reportcard_110530/2011053 0/?hub=EdmontonHome

Cummins, J. (1979). The language and culture issue on the education of minority language children. *Interchange, 10*(4), 72–88.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering Minority Students*. Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.

De Rivero, O. (2002). *The Myth of Development: The Non-viable Economies of the 21ˢᵗ Century*. London: Zed Books.

DeVoretz, D., & Ma, Z. (2002). Triangular human capital flows between sending, Entrepôt, and Rest-of-the-World Regions. *Canadian Population Studies, 29*(1), 53–69.

DeVoretz, D., & Zhang, K. (2004). Citizenship, passports and the brain exchange triangle. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis, 6*(2), 199–212.

Dewing, M. (2009). *Canadian Multiculturalism*. Parliamentary Information and Research Services. Ottawa: Library of Parliament.

Ding, Y. (2010). *Negotiating Individual Space: An Inquiry into the Experiences of Chinese Return Migrants from Canada*. MA thesis, University of Calgary.

Dolson, D. P., & Mayer, J. (1992). Longitudinal study of three program models for language minority students: A critical examination of reported findings. *Bilingual Research Journal, 16*(1–2), 105–157.

Durand, J.-P. (2007). *The Invisible Chain: Constraints and Opportunities in the New World of Employment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Drucker, P. (1993). *Post-capitalist Society*. New York: Harper Collins.

Egan, K. (1986). *Teaching as Story Telling*. London, ON: The Althouse Press.

Egan, K. (1997). *The Educated Mind: How Cognitive Tools Shape our Understanding*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Egan, K. (2005). *An Imaginative Approach to Teaching*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Egbo, B. (2008). *Teaching for Diversity in Canadian Schools*. Toronto: Pearson Education Canada.

European Commission. (2000). *A Memorandum on Lifelong Learning*. Working Paper, SEC/1832. Brussels: European Commission. http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/other/c11047_en.htm

Frankenberg, R., & Mani, L., (1992). Cross-currents, crosstalk: Race, 'post-coloniality' and the politics of location. *Cultural Studies*, *7*(2), 292–310.

Fauré, E., Herrera, F., Kaddoura, A. R., Lopes, H., Petrovsky, A., Rahnema, M., et al. (1972). *Learning to Be. The World of Education Today and Tomorrow*. Paris: UNESCO.

Fenwick, T. (2001). Questioning the concept of the learning organisation. In C. Paechter, et al. (Eds.), *Knowledge, Power and Learning* (pp. 74–88). London: Paul Chapman/SAGE.

Field, J. (2001). Lifelong education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *20*(1), 3–15.

Friere, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowland & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Gabbard, D. (2000). Introduction. In D. Gabbard (Ed.), *Global Constructions of Multicultural Education: Theories and Realities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Galisson, R. (1980). *D'hier à aujourd'hui, la Didactique des Langues étrangères: Du Structuralisme au Fonctionnalisme*. Paris: CLÉ International.

Gelpi, E. (1985). *Lifelong Education and International Relations*. London: Croom Helm.

Ghosh, R. (1996). *Redefining Multicultural Education*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

Ghosh, R., & Abdi, A. A. (2004). *Education and the Politics of Difference: Canadian Perspectives*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Ghosh, R. & McDonough, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Diversity and Education for Liberation: Realities, Possibilities and Problems*. Special Edition of *Canadian Issues/Thèmes canadiens*, Spring, 96 pp. for the 55th Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES).

Glenn, J. U., & De Jong, E. (1996). *Educating Immigrant Children: Schools and Language Minorities in Twelve Nations*. New York: Garland.

Greene, J. (1998). *A Meta-anjalysis of the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education*. Claremont, CA: Thomas Rivera Policy Center.

Guo, S., Schugurensky, D., Hall, B. Rocco, T., & Fenwick, T. (2010). Connected understanding: Internationalization of adult education in Canada and beyond. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, *23*(1), 73–89.

Guo, S. (2009). Difference, deficiency, and devaluation: Tracing the roots of non-recognition of foreign credentials for immigrant professionals in Canada. *The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, *22*(1), 37–52.

Hagan, J. J. (1998). Social networks, gender, and immigrant incorporation: Resources and constraints. *American Sociological Review*, *63*(1), 55–67.

Harding, S. (1998). *Is Science Multicultural? Postcolonialisms, Feminisms and Epistemologies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harding, S. (2008). *Science from Below: Feminisms, Postcolonialities and Modernities*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hayek, F. (1945). The use of knowledge in society. *American Economic Review*, *XXXV*(4), 519–530. Available at http://www.hayekcenter.org/friedrichhayek/hayek.html

Hearn, G. (2007). Foreword. In C. Kapitzke & M. A. Peters (Eds.), *Global Knowledge Cultures* (pp. vii–ix). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Hébert, Y. (2000). Curriculum goals and objectives in aboriginal language and literacy education. In M. Castellano, L. Lahache, & L. Davis (Eds.), *Aboriginal Peoples in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Hébert, Y. (Ed.). (2002). *Citizenship in Transformation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hébert, Y., Lee, W. J., Sun, X. W., & Berti, C. (2003). Citizenship as social capital: Young people's friendship networks. *Encounters on Education/ Encuentros sobre Educación/ Rencontres sur l'éducation*, *4*, 83–106. http://educ.queensu.ca/~eoe/2003/index.html

Hébert, Y., Kowch, E., & Sun, X. S. (2004). Focusing on youth: Social capital, diversity and educational outcomes. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *5*(2), 229–249.

Hébert, Y., Wanner, R., et al. (2009). *Calgary à la Lumière: Étude de la Redéfinition d'une Francophonie Urbaine*. Research report. http://educ.ucalgary.ca/profiles/yvonne-hebert

Hébert, Y., & Wanner, R. (2010). *L'immigration de Langue Française à Calgary*. Research Capsule, http://educ.ucalgary.ca/profiles/yvonne-hebert, http://pmc.metropolis.net/frameset_e.html

Held, D. & McGrew, A. (Eds.). (2004). *The Great Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Hoerder, D., Hébert, Y., & Schmitt, I. (Eds.). (2006). *Negotiating Transcultural Lives: Belongings and Social Capital among Youth in Comparative Perspective*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press & Göttingen: V&R Unipress.

Huntington, S. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World's Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Huntington, S. (1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, *72*(3) (Summer), 22–49.

Isajiw, W. W., (1999). *Understanding Diversity: Ethnicity and Race in the Canadian Context*. Toronto: Thompson.

Joppke, C. (2004). The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: Theory and policy. *British Journal of Sociology*, *55*(2), 237–257.

Kapitzke, C. & Peters, M. A. (Eds.). (2007). *Global Knowledge Cultures*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kazemipur, A. (2006). The market value of friendship: Social networks of immigrants. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, *38*(2), 47–71.

Kazemipur, A. (2008). *Social Capital Profiles: Immigrants and the Native-born in Canada*. PMC Working Paper Series, WP02-08, Prairie Metropolis Centre. http://pmc.metropolis.net/

Kazemipur, A. (2009). *Social Capital and Diversity: Some Lessons from Canada*. Bern: Peter Lang AG: International Academic Publisher.

Kim, Y. (1999). *A Common Framework for the Ethics of the 21st Century*. DRG099/WS/3. Paris: Division of Philosophy and Ethics, UNESCO.

Knight, J. (2003). Updating the de Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, *33*, 2–3.

Kothari, U. (2006). *A Radical History of Development: Individuals, Institutions and Ideologies*. London: Zed Books.

Krashen, S. (1996). *Under Attack: The Case Against Bilingual Education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Kumar, M. P. (2009). Review essay: Humanism and its other: Difference and disjuncture in postcolonial theory. *Distinktion*, *18*, 89–101.

Lawrence, B., & Dua, E. (2011). Decolonizing Anti-Racism. In A. Mathur, J. Dewar, & M. DeGagné (Eds.), *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation through the Lends of Cultural Diversity* (pp. 234–262). Aboriginal Healing Foundation Research Series. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation. Reprinted from *Social Justice*, *32*(2005)(4), 120–143.

Ley, D., & Kobayashi, A. (2005). Back to Hong Kong: Return migration or transnational sojourn? *Global Networks*, *5*(2), 111–127.

Leys, C. (1996). *The Rise and Fall of Development Theory*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Li, P. S. (2003). *Destination Canada: Immigration Debates and Issues*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Li, P. S. (2000). Earning disparities between immigrants and native-born Canadians. *Canadian Review Sociology and Anthropology*, *37*(3), 289–311.

Lucas, R. E. (1988). On the mechanism of economic development. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, *22*, 3–22.

Longino, H. (2002). *The Fate of Knowledge*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mackey, W. (1970). A typology of bilingual education. In T. Anderson & M. Boyer (Eds.), *Bilingual Schooling in the United States*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Mbele, C. R. (2009). Pour une critique de l'afro-pessimisme et de l'afro-dénigrement dans le discours dit « postcolonial ». In R. L. dans Ombga (Ed.), *L'image de l'Afrique dans les Littératures Coloniales et Postcoloniales* (pp. 299–314). Paris: Harmattan, coll. Espace l'Harmattan Cameroun.

McAndrew, M. (2007). The education of immigrant students in a globalized world: Policy debates in comparative perspective. In M. Suarez-Orozco (Ed.). *Learning in the Global Era: International Perspectives on Globalization and Education* (pp. 232–255). Berkeley, CA and East Hampton, NY: University of California Press and Ross Institute.

McAndrew, M., Potvin, M., & Triki-Yamani, A. (Eds.). (2011). *The Academic Achievement of Immigrant Origin Students*, thematic edition of *Canadian Issues/Thèmes Canadiens*, Winter, 102 pp.

McAndrew, M., & Cicéri, C. (1998). Immigration, diversity, and multilingual education: The Canadian example. *Zeitschrift für International Erziehungsund Socialwissenschaftlich Forschung*, *15*(2), 295–322.

McHugh, M., & Challinor, A. E. (2011). *Improving Immigrants' Employment Prospects through Work-Focused Language Instruction*. Migration Policy Institute. www.migrationpolicy.org

Merkel, A. (2010). Diversity dead? Merkel's 'MultiKulti' speech fires up immigration debate. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UKG76HF24_k

Meyer, J., Kamens, D., & Benavot, A. (Eds.). (1992). *School Knowledge for the Masses: World Models and National Primary Curricular Categories in the Twentieth Century* (pp. 165–197). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Olson, L. (2006). Ambiguity about preparation for workforce clouds efforts to equip students for future. *Education Week*, *25*(38), 1, 18–20.

Painchaud, G., d'Anglejean, A., Armand, F., & Jesak, M. (1993). Diversité culturelle et littératie. In M. McAndrew (Ed.), *Pluralisme et Education: Perspectives Québécoises,* Special Issue, *Répères, Essais en Education*, *15*, 77–94.

Peters, M. A., Britton, A., & Blee, H. (Eds.), *Global Citizenship Education: Philosophy, Theory and Pedagogy*. Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Peters, M. A. (2006). *Building Knowledge Cultures: Education and Development in the Age of Knowledge Capitalism* with T. Besley. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Peters, M. A. (2003). Education policy in the age of knowledge capitalism. *Policy Futures in Education*, *3*(2), 361–380.

Rahnema, M. & Bowtree, V. (Eds.). (1997). *The Post-development Reader*. London: Zed Books.

Ramirez, F. O. (2003). The global model and national legacies. In K. Anderson-Levitt (Ed.), *Local Meanings, Global Schooling: Anthropology and World Culture Theory* (pp. 239–255). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Reich, R. (1991). *The Work of Nations: A Blueprint for the Future*. New York: Vintage.

Reid, A., Gill, J., & Sears, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Globalization, the Nation-State and the Citizen: Dilemmas and Directions for Civics and Citizenship Education*. New York/London: Routledge.

Rist, G. (1997). *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith*. London: Zed Books.

Rodney, W. (1982). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Romer, P. M. (1994). The origins of endogamous growth. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *8*, 3–22.

Sahlberg, P. (2006). Educational reform for raising economic competitiveness. *Journal of Educational Change*, *7*, 259–287.

Saïd, E. W. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, Random House, Inc.

Saunders, D. (2011a). Xenophobia creeps into Mainstream Scandinavia. *Toronto Globe & Mail*, 29 July. http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/europe/xenophobia-creeps-into-mainstream-scandinavia/article2115067/

Saunders, D. (2011b). Norway shows we must expose dangerous fictions. *Toronto Globe & Mail*, 30 July. http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/opinions/opinion/norway-shows-we-must-expose-dangerous-fictions/article2114680/

Schuetze, H., Kuehn, L., Davidson-Harden, A., & Weber, N. (2011). Globalization, neoliberalism and Schools: The Canadian story. In L. Olmos, C. A. Torress, & R. Van Heertum (Eds.), *Educating Global Citizens: Thirty Years of Educational Reform in North America*. Bentham e-Books.

Schugurensky, D., & Davidson-Harden, A. (2003). From Córdoba to Washington: WTO/GATS and Latin American education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *1*(3), 321–357.

Schurmann, F. (1993). *Beyond the Impasse: New Directions in Development Theory*. London: Zed Books.

Solow, R. (1994). Perspectives on growth theory. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *8*, 65–94.

Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the Rise of the Global Economy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Spring, J. (2006). *Pedagogies of Globalization: The Rise of the Educational Security State*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Spring, J. (2008). Research on globalization and education. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*(2), 330–363.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2004). Blazing a trail for policy theory and practice. In G. Steiner-Khamsi (Ed.), *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending* (pp. 201–220). New York: Teachers College Press.

Stoer, S., & Magalhaes, A. (2004). Education, knowledge and the network society. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, *2*(3), 319–335.

Stiglitz, J. (2002). *Globalisation and Its Discontents*. London: Allen Lane.

Stormquist, N. (2002). *Education in a Globalized World: The Connectivity of Economic Power, Technology, and Knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Suarez-Orozco, M. M. (Ed.). (2007). *Learning in the Global Era: International Perspectives on Globalization and Education*. Berkeley, CA and East Hampton, NY: University of California Press and Ross Institute.

Tobin, M. (2004). *Indian Women Educators: Networking for Educational and Societal Change*. PhD Dissertation, University of Calgary, Alberta.

Tröhler, D. (2008). Stability or stagnation, or why the School is not the way reformers would like. *Encounters on Education*, *9*, 3–15.

van Braun, J., & Meinzen-Dick, R. (2009). Land grabbing by Foreign investors in developing Countries: Risks and opportunities. *IFPRI Policy Brief*, *13*. International Food Policy Research Institute. http://www.ifpri.org/pubs/bp/bp013.pdf, http://www.ifpir.org/pubs/bp/bp013Table01.pdf

Wanner, R. A. (2008). Social mobility in Canada: Concepts, patterns, and trends. In E. Grabb & N. Guppy (Eds.), *Social Inequality in Canada: Patterns, Problems, Policies* (5th ed.). Toronto: Pearson Prentice-Hall.

Wallerstein, I. (1984). *The Politics of the World-economy: The States, the Movements, and the Civilisations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Weiler, V. (2001). Knowledge, politics, and the future of higher education: Critical observations on a world-wide transformation. In R. Hayhoe & J. Pan (Eds.), *Knowledge across Culture: A Contribution to the Dialogue among Civilisations* (pp. 25–45). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.

Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to Divide the World: Education at Empire's End*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wines, M., & Lafranière, S. (2011). State censureship no match for microblogs in wake of train tragedy, *Toronto Globe & Mail*, 29 July. http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/chinese-state-censorship-no-match-for-microblogs-in-wake-of-train-tragedy/article2115259/

Wong, J. (1997). *Red China Blues: My Long March from Mao to Now*. Doubleday.

Woo-Paw, T. (2011). *Temporary Foreign Workers: Clash between Provincial Needs and Federal Policy. Report to the Minister of Employment and Immigration*. Alberta Government.

Xiao, Y. (2011). *The Education of Migrant Workers' Children in China: Lived Inequities and Policies*. MA thesis, University of Calgary, Canada.

York, G. (2009). Land: Africa's last great treasure. *The Globe and Mail*, Wednesday, May 6, p. A12.

Zajda, J., Davies, L., & Majhanovich, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Comparative and Global Pedagogies: Equity, Access and Democracy in Education*. Melbourne: Springer.

Zong, L. (2004a). International transference of human capital and occupational attainment of recent Chinese professional immigrants in Canada. *American Review of China Studies*, *5*(1&2), 81–89. Also Working Paper Series, WP03-04, Prairie Metropolis Centre. http://pmc.metropolis.net/

Zong, L. (2004b). Brain drain and brain gain in transnational communities: Highly trained Chinese professional immigrants in Canada, presentation at the 5th Conference of the International Society for the Study of Chinese Overseas, May 10–14, Elsinore, Denmark.

Zong, L. (2007). Recent Mainland Chinese immigrants and covert racism in Canada . In S. P. Hier & B. S. Bolaria (Eds.), *Race and Racism in 21st Century Canada: Continuity, Complexity and Change* (pp. 111–129). Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Zong, L. (2009). Recent Mainland Chinese immigrants in Canada: Trends and obstacles. In H. Ling (Ed.), *Asian America: Forming New Communities, Expanding Boundaries* (pp. 244–261). Chapel Hill, NC: Rutgers University Press.

Yvonne Hébert
Faculty of Education,
University of Calgary
Prairie Metropolis Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration
Observatoire Jeunes et Société, U Québec
Centre for Culture, Identity and Education, U British Columbia

Ali A. Abdi
Department of Educational Policy Studies & Centre for Global Citizenship
Education and Research (CGCER)
University of Alberta

KUMARI BECK

2. MAKING SENSE OF INTERNATIONALIZATION

A Critical Analysis

INTRODUCTION

As more Canadian universities, colleges and schools invite and recruit international students onto their campuses and programs, and offer more 'study abroad' opportunities for their own students, notions of global citizenship, intercultural and international competencies circulate and settle to legitimate and confirm that international education is here to stay. At home, the numbers of international students arriving in Canada are increasing, and international activities and programs are on the rise. All ten provinces (except Nunavut) engage in international education (Savage, 2005) and internationalization have been identified as "an integral part of Canadian universities' institutional strategies" (AUCC, 2007b, p.5).

The presence of international students and the proliferation of programs and international activities often suffice to claim progress on internationalization at university campuses. This increased activity has not been reflected, however, in a matching productivity in research, nor has it resulted in research-based decision-making regarding policy and practice in internationalization. In Canada there has been little critical appraisal of beliefs and values that underlie both theory and practice, including the complexity of the phenomenon.

Some of the key 'problem' areas in research on internationalization, in summary, relate to conceptualizing the field (Stier, 2004), gaps in theoretical understanding (Altbach & Knight, 2006), simplistic interpretations regarding rationales for internationalization including the predominant market orientation of internationalization (Stier, 2004; Marginson, 2010), little attention to curriculum and almost none related to pedagogy, the absence of faculty and student perspectives (Bond, 2009), and overall, an uncritical acceptance of the 'imperative' to internationalize (Beck, 2001; Beck 2008, Stier, 2004).

This chapter illustrates some aspects of my attempts to make sense of internationalization from the perspective of international students arriving in Canada. Highlighting some of the rhetoric that surrounds internationalization and international education, I will argue that the assumption of an academic rationale in its present form is problematic. I will then present elements from a conceptual framework used in my research, illustrating how this framework is useful in

theorizing internationalization in its complexity. Using the framework to problematize prevailing notions of the intercultural and international in the internationalizing process, I will illustrate this analysis with selected data from my study of international students enrolled in a Western Canadian university. In conclusion I will raise questions relating to popular perceptions about the benefits of internationalization and highlight implications for practice and policy.

THE RHETORIC

Internationalization of higher education in Canada is being promoted by universities and colleges as a strategy to develop intercultural and international literacies among their students. In its statement on internationalization adopted by the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada (AUCC, 1995), the university, referred to as inherently international, is cited as a key site for internationalization. It then describes internationalization as facilitating excellence in research and education across borders, contributing to the quality of life, and ensuring 'prominence for Canada' internationally. Its overall message, explicitly stated, is that the university is an agent of change in the internationalization process (AUCC, 1995).

This ideal appears to be reflected in the findings of the most recent AUCC study on internationalization, at first glance (AUCC, 2007b). Key findings include claims of increased attention to and increasing evidence of international activities, programs, mobility, and so on, leading to the conclusion that internationalization is becoming more mainstream. Ninety-four percent (94 %) of respondents stated they were internationalizing their institutions to prepare graduates who are interculturally and internationally competent, an increase of 19% over the previous results whereby 75% of respondents from a previous survey (Knight, 2000). This, together with the third top reason for internationalization, the promotion of innovation in curriculum and diversity of programs (AUCC, 2007, p.3), is cited as evidence of "strong academic rationales" governing internationalization in Canadian higher education institutions (AUCC, 2007b, p. 5). Domestic students enrolling in study abroad programs increased, albeit still a low 2.2 % and more institutions (81%) provided financial support for these programs. Enrolments in internationally oriented degree programs were higher, and more institutions delivered offshore programs and training. Institutions offered more scholarships to both undergraduate and graduate international students. Recruitment of international students was an increasing priority, in particular, in the light of the competitive market for international students. "Particularly, institutions increasingly appreciate the intrinsic value of globalizing their campuses and place it above any considerations of immediate revenue generation" (AUCC, 2007a, p. 6). The second priority, it should be noted however, was revenue generation.

In the absence of details of the study,[1] it is unclear what 'the intrinsic value' of a globalized campus might signify, and how the university might be fulfilling its mandate as an agent of change. Is the notion of change in the internationalization process simply satisfied by increasing activity and higher enrolment in international education? And what evidence did the respondents draw on to make claims about academic rationales and progress in internationalization? As an example of the problematic implications, while the top reason for recruiting international students was "to promote an internationalized campus and greater diversity on campus" (AUCC, 2007a, p. 6), only 47% of the respondents stated that they offered specific programs and strategies to ensure that the students had a successful experience. Furthermore, senior administrators, rather than faculty and students, provided much of the data in this and other national surveys on internationalization limiting the validity of these findings. Hence, more research is needed both across and within institutions that include data from students, faculty and staff in order to make conclusions about the purposes and motivations behind internationalization, and the notion of the university as an agent of change in the internationalization process must be critically assessed.

Agreeing with Dei (1992) that "[t]here are complex issues of international study in Canada and an attempt to understand some of the problems should begin by focusing on the subjective lived experiences as narrated by the students themselves" (p. 1), I turned to international students enrolled in a Canadian university to make sense of internationalization. Given the perimeters of this paper, I will draw on my larger study to illustrate just one aspect of this issue, the claim that universities promote interculturalism through the internationalization strategy of enrolling international students on their campuses.

A FRAMEWORK FOR COMPLEXITY

The conceptual/theoretical framework for my study integrated three theoretical strands, selected to encompass the complexity of the context, the relationships and the people who come to study on Canadian campuses. As Dale and Robertson (2003) assert, globalization is often identified as being a key influence, but analyses of its processes are rarely incorporated in educational theory and practice. Globalization theory forms the first part of my framework to understand the context of internationalization, and I argue that one cannot theorize internationalization without seeing how the economic, political and cultural dimensions of globalization influence internationalization.

The second aspect of my framework explores the nature of relationships in internationalization. While there are many approaches to analysing social relations at the internationalized university, I chose postcolonial theory to understand these relations from the perspective of power and how it operates in the multiple social and professional relationships the students must negotiate

during their time of study. The third main strand of my framework is connected to understanding the participants of my study: their identities, in particular, national and cultural identity, how they come to be both identified and identify themselves as international learners in a foreign university. I will select just one key discussion point from each theme.

Theme 1: Globalization

Explicit and detailed commentaries have been written on the connections between globalization and education (e.g. Burbules & Torres, 2000; Currie and Newson, 1998; Edwards & Usher, 2000; Odin & Manicas, 2004; Rizvi & Lingard, 2000; Scott, 2000; Smith 2006; Van der Wende, 2007), but these are not reflected in mainstream North American scholarship and practices of internationalization of higher education. Theorizing these connections, I argue, will make it possible not only to see the influences of one on the other, but also to address problematic aspects that counter the ideals of internationalization.

Globalization has been theorized in multiple dimensions, mainly, economic, political, and cultural. The growth of transnational production characteristic of economic globalization, and the weakening of the social welfare state has precipitated intensification of the linkages between the purposes of economic globalization (and the market) and higher education (Häyrinen-Alastalo & Peltola, 2006; Magnussen, 2000; Marginson, 1999). The impact of the economic dimension on higher education accordingly, has been described as well connected to the labour market in both the public and private sectors, in a nationalist context. Tensions between the nation and the university in the face of increasing transnational possibilities for the university and the loss of state funding have driven the university to take on an entrepreneurial and even corporate identity. Another tension for the university is that it is trying to establish itself in the global marketplace through a distinct national (in this case, Canadian) identity, aligning itself to national interests, promoting a marketing image that projects a national identity. Simultaneously, the university is trying to establish an internationalizing agenda that promotes an international outlook.

Academic and student mobility tends to be influenced, argues Scott (2000), by international relations and alliances in a geopolitical context. It is his contention that internationalization, because of its reliance on the nation state and relationships among them, reproduces existing hegemonic and unequal international relations. The implications of this analysis are that it firmly places the university within a nationalistic field of influence rather than the autonomous institution that it is imagined to be, and furthermore, it implicates the university in furthering relationships and alliances that entrench and maintain a hierarchical system. This includes the seemingly 'neutral' and independent act of recruiting international students and participating in academic exchanges. The university is

caught up in promoting a national agenda for higher education, through preparing graduates to live and work in contemporary globalized conditions. These trends reflect the changing ideas about the purposes of higher education, and a greater alignment to economic considerations.

> Globalization…refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole (Robertson, 1992, p.8).

This might lead to the assumption that globalization leads to homogenization particularly heightened in the intensification of consumption and the movement of ideas and media through communication technology. Arguing that the homogenization theory is not an adequate one to explain globalization, Appadurai (1990) asserts the central problem of globalization as the "tension between cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization" (p. 295). The more connectedness and unity produced by globalization, the more diversity it produces. Homogenization implies reproduction, and in that sense cultural forms do not reproduce themselves faithfully. Globalization, then, is not the same as homogenization, although it involves the use of a variety of homogenizing methods and tools such as communication technology, media, and so on (Appadurai, 1990). Edwards and Usher (1998) make a similar argument showing how "globalization diversifies and creolises" (p. 164), resulting in the coexistence of contradictory and paradoxical conditions and phenomena. The limits of this chapter do not allow for an in-depth discussion of the cultural dimensions, but I have argued elsewhere that these cultural dimensions are sites for resistance to the dominant manifestations of economic globalization, leading to possibilities for agency (Beck, 2008).

Theme 2: Colonial Legacies

Parallels have been drawn between colonization and globalization in a variety of disciplines (Ashcroft, 2001; McMurtry, 1998; Prasad, 2003; Smith, 2006; Young, 2001), the most commonly noted similarity being the extent of domination and control exerted first through colonization, followed by the market forces of globalization. What was notable about western (European) colonization was its domination of ideology and culture, and the extent to which dependency on the West was created (Castle, 2001). These forms of dependency that began in the economic realm continue to exert influence and have resulted in the elevation of European/Western values to a canonical status that prevails long after decolonisation (Loomba, 1998; Nandy, 1983). It has been argued that the economic dimension of globalization, explicitly represented by the agenda of multinational corporations, builds upon and reproduces these perceptions and beliefs (Altbach, 2001; Smith, 2006) and explains the demand for

Western/Northern education and credentials as the driver of the intensification of international education.

Another aspect of my framework draws from Bhabha's (1990) theory on cultural creation and containment. Bhabha situates cultural diversity in a liberal tradition that values the co-existence and encouragement of many different cultures. This is a fundamental principle of multicultural policy in nations such as Canada (Sandercock, 2005). Along with the creation of cultural diversity, however, Bhabha argues that there is a containment of cultural difference as dominant cultures 'accommodate' others only within their own norms and frames (Bhabha, 1990). "[T]he universalism that paradoxically permits diversity masks ethnocentric norms, values and interests" (Bhabha, 1990, p. 208) leaving room, for example, for many forms of racism and exclusion. This paradox of creation/containment echoes the themes of homogenization and diversity in globalization theory. This point of analysis helps to assess the rhetoric of interculturalism that drives internationalization.

Theme 3: Identity and identification

Globalization has intensified the conditions that produce cultural fluidity, and this complicates the question of how we understand our place in the world. We have come to understand identity as fluid, formed in relationship, and dialogical (Hall, 1992; Gismondi, 1999; Holland et al., 1998). Yet the story of nationhood that is created for citizens imposes an image of national identity as an essence, or as having core traits that represent an 'imagined' community (Anderson, 1991; Appadurai, 1996). Globalizing forces have on the one hand, an undermining effect on national identifications, in creating notions of 'global citizenship', and 'global village'. On the other hand, resistance to these homogenizing forces has resulted in the strengthening of national identifications, even fundamentalism, producing barriers for the newcomer. Bauman (1998) argues how these conditions produce the strategies that are used in the treatment of strangers: a demand for assimilation or exclusion.

The intensification of human migration and movement has resulted in new forms of national and transnational identifications. Globalization has heightened awareness of national affiliations and identifications, as well as produced the conditions for transcending those affiliations through notions of cosmopolitanism and transnationalism. Identities, as Rizvi (2005) maintains, are defined against "encroaching forces of globalization" (p. 331). With the emergence of 'new cultural space' of the conditions of globalization, "social identities are no longer tied unambiguously to territories" (Rizvi 2005, 337). With reference to the extent of migration patterns, people define themselves "in terms of multiple national attachments…that encompass plural and fluid cultural identities" (Calgar, 1997, 169).

The implications for internationalization of higher education lie in examining how international students understand their own cultural and national identities in the context of their international study abroad, and whether and how these differ from how they are assigned identities. While I explore these questions in depth in other work (Beck, 2008), I thought it important to highlight the intersections between identity, globalization and notions of interculturalism in internationalization.

METHODOLOGY

The larger study I refer to in this chapter, investigated internationalization of higher education by examining the experiences of international students studying at a Canadian university. It was guided by the research question "What are the experiences of international students enrolled in a mid-sized university in Western Canada?" and sought to understand diverse aspects of internationalization through the lenses of student experience. The study[2] was conducted in a mid-sized university in Western Canada, 'Good University'. GU had an enrolment of 19,979 undergraduate students and 3,666 graduate students in the 2005/2006 academic year, and of this number, 1,805 (or 9.1%) undergraduates, and 505 (or 15.4%) graduate students were identified as international or visa students (GU statistics).[3] The values that guide internationalization at GU include: adherence to the university's mission, enhancing the university's standing in Canada and abroad "as a leading comprehensive university," and a belief that internationalization should "enrich educational and professional experience" of faculty, students and staff by "introducing them to the languages, cultures, and intellectual traditions of other nations" (GU website).

The students who responded to my invitation to participate were a mix of undergraduate and graduate students: 12 undergraduates from Asian countries: China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan and Bangladesh, and 17 graduate students from a wider variety of backgrounds although they were still predominantly from the Asian continent: China, Japan, Sri Lanka, Iran, Mauritius, the U.K. and the U.S.A. In relation to their disciplines, the undergraduate students were from Engineering, Computing Science, Science, Business, Fine Arts and Linguistics departments, while the graduate students were from Physics, Mathematics, Biology, Computing Science and Education.

The main data collection was carried out through qualitative interviewing (Fontana & Frey, 2000; Gubrium & Holstein 2002; Kvale, 1996; Mishler, 1986; Rubin & Rubin, 2005; Viruru & Cannella, 2006; Warren, 2002). The interviews were conducted in small groups and some individually, according to the preferences of the participants. In rejecting the idea of an 'objective'

account that must be measured by a 'gold standard', I selected analytical processes that favour contextualized interpretation, and which are based on an active and engaged role for the researcher. Following Lather (1985, 2002), who critiques positivist notions of validity, redefining it as "a discursive site that registers a passage to the never arrived place where we are sure of our knowledges and ourselves" (Lather, 2002, p. 247), I attempted to include participant involvement in making sense of the data. This focus, I hoped, would shift from having validity solely as a legitimation process, to "research as praxis" (Lather, 1986) that will "enable[s] people to change by encouraging self-reflection and a deeper understanding of their particular situations" (p. 263).

And now for a few illustrations…

DESIRING AN INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE

The students who came forward to participate in this study were generous with their time, were somewhat surprised (and pleased) to be invited to participate in a study of this nature, and appeared to be eager to share their stories. I have selected brief summaries of selected topics from the rich and diverse data generated from our conversations to shed light on intercultural activity and learning at GU, through their eyes.

Leaving home. For most students, going abroad was a goal for personal and professional growth. For undergraduate students, prevailing attitudes in the home country about the desirability of a western education, the status of a credential from an English-speaking Western university, the marketability of the degree in getting good jobs both at home and abroad, and the cultural/linguistic value of international study, appeared to have influenced students' decisions to study abroad.

For most of the undergraduate students, ideals of Western superiority were a key factor in their decision to study overseas. Long describes the situation in China, his home country:

> Now that there are more foreigners in China, there is more influence from the Western world. There is a trend to study outside… There are many companies in China who need people, those who speak English fluently — when you study abroad and come back to search for a job, it's easier, I had a strong desire to go out.

Krystal (China) talked about how an imaginary of western ideas, people and way of doing things was created for her and her family by a family member who had travelled to the West. Her "definition of North America" was "a really beautiful place, really rich, and people are high quality… From her mouth, North America was like heaven (laughter among the 4 of us)"

…[W]hite people … do things better than us", do things "the right way", and "they are smarter than us and work harder". Some families used the promise of economic benefits to pressure their children as in the case of Sherry (Taiwan) and Sushant (India) who did not want to leave their home countries at all. Other parents groomed their sons and daughters towards an international education by raising them to be 'world citizens'.

For graduate students, professional and academic growth was the predominant reason for studying overseas. Graduate study in their disciplines was not available for students from some countries; some of the other factors related to availability of financing, family pressures, and economic factors, including the benefits of a western university credential. Peter, a doctoral student in Computer Science from China, explains:

> For me, it was a boyhood dream to go and study in an advanced country. It depends also on the discipline — some subjects like computer studies, it is in countries like that that there are lot of things happening, and it is an advantage to come and learn here and take the knowledge back to my country. For developing countries, there is no other way I think.

The two students who moved here with family chose Canada to provide learning and other opportunities for their children. Carlos left a secure and good faculty position in Mexico, to come to Canada as a PhD student in Biology: "I am here for my children. I want my children to have access to another culture, to have ideas." Canada's and Vancouver's positioning as a site for intercultural exchange and learning was clearly established among all of the students as a benefit of living, working and learning here.

In terms of early and pre-arrival interactions with the university, most of the students (both undergraduate and graduate students) reported a welcoming, invitational tone and positive experience. Visas, transcripts, and the processing of documentation were all handled extremely well by GU, according to the students. Once students had made initial contact, faculty and staff at the university were proactive, welcoming, and flexible. This is a "good, decent university" (Parth), "a really, really, flexible university" (Shabnam).

Learning. Studying abroad conjured up exciting prospects for the students when they planned their futures. After getting here, however, the excitement was tempered by the details of settling in, and encountering the reality of studying in a new place, and in many cases, in new ways, and for many, in a foreign language. For many students whose first language is not English, the conversations about their learning experiences, the quality of their experience and how they rated their programs, were described in terms of the barriers and affordances related to their fluency (or lack of) in English. Hence, 'learning' in their course work and program was seen to parallel or was even conflated with

how they saw their progress with English and academic literacy. Michelle, a doctoral student in Education, summarized these student experiences well:

> [Our] major problem is our language deficiency, you know, we are classed on the basis of our incompetences. But we are good thinkers…We'll be more successful at studying and working if we can find a way to overcome our language deficiencies. So you get quiet — and when you get quiet, you … It's another suffering for us — And these are very harmful, and no one understands. It does not mean that we don't know anything. You have to be in our place to understand this — The measure is not fair I think. The measure is not fair.

Data on classroom experience from undergraduate students highlighted several challenges. Some who were not fluent in English had difficulty with course selection in the Humanities courses, as the lack of fluency interfered with participation, writing, and pace of the classroom. Fellow students in their classes were mostly unfriendly, noted in particular in the Business classes where the competitive environment exacerbated the unfriendly relations. Three students who described easier relationships with their peers were those who fit in well with the culture, language and social interactions. The large class sizes (compared to other community and university colleges) did not contribute to successful learning as professors and TAs were not as accessible. Information on resources such as learning support was not well known and not distributed. For graduate students, the main concern was a lack of respect, and disinterest from their peers. Figuring out differences in expectations, standards, and technology were other common issues.

Social lives. Undergraduate and graduate students spoke extensively of their social lives both on and off campus. They all missed their families and familiar social networks, but the impact of this loss was different on each student. For some students, it was quite debilitating, and others shrugged it off as something to be expected in a new environment, and to be suffered in order to achieve their long term goal of getting a foreign credential. Making friends was important for them, and some were successful and others were not so successful. Some spoke of taking the initiative of reaching out, and of being courageous in seeking out friends from different cultural background. Those who had families with them were unlikely to seek friendships outside of their family. For others, friendships were easier to form within students' own cultural groups, or among other international students in residence, with the exception of students like Jay and Lefty, who arrived at GU already well used to having intercultural friendships. Residence life was a positive experience for some, and for others it was isolating and lonely. In general, students' experiences with peers rated high when they assessed their learning experience in Canada.

Being international: As designated international students, it was important for the students to explore how they themselves understood internationalization. I shared the definitions of the terms and asked whether, in their opinion, the process of internationalization was happening on the campus. It was, as with other themes, a mixed response. For the most part, however, students did not think that internationalization of the campus or domestic students was happening in noticeable ways.

Chris offered the observation that, "if students don't interact, it's not really international — everyone sticks with their own, and nothing changes." Many students agreed with this, noting the lack of interaction between local or Canadian students and the international students. They could not tell if the groups of same-background students were all international students, or whether they were domestic, immigrant groups clustering with others of their own background. Asked what impact they might be having on others, the students reported surface interactions which served to correct perceptions about students' backgrounds and home countries. Hiroki stated that he didn't bring anything to the campus, and that the diversity on the campus was created by the immigrant population. Other students agreed that, in their opinion, they didn't add much to the university or their classrooms by way of personal experience, opinions, expertise, or background. The only time they were officially recognized by the university or programs was when there were international student events. In this sense, 'international' was understood as the mixing and interaction of international students among one another. In Jay's opinion,

> the Canadians are too local — they should be more outgoing and try to mix with others more because this is what it means for the future, to mix all different cultures of people.

Carlos was critical of the lack of a language requirement, citing his home university in Mexico, which required graduate students to have three languages to graduate. In his opinion, "an immersion in another's language is the first brain opener [to another's perspectives, culture etc]."

Naomi spoke of the lack of interaction as a matter of reciprocity and mutuality:

> It's more like GU offers something to us, but does not expect something from us. In that sense it is not an equal thing. Their focus is how they can introduce programs to others, not how they [the students] are going to contribute to things here. I think they just want to provide their values in their own way. If it's reciprocal, that will be very nice. Right now it's just all one way.

A REALITY CHECK

Making sense of these data, the notion of higher education as being available beyond national borders is well established among the participants who were part of creating this 'global demand'. This transnational pursuit of higher education is predominantly operating through an economic dimension as we see how the benefits of studying abroad are well connected to economic benefits for all of the students. The university is tapping into an already established globalized market for international education.

A glimpse at the country of origin confirms the trends in international student mobility in that East and South Asian countries lead the demand for study abroad (Savage, 2005). Students also have a role in maintaining western universality and dominance in what is considered 'a good education'. The graduate students were very aware of this unequal power and economic differential between their countries and Canada, but were very much caught up in fulfilling their dreams of studying in an advanced country. From this perspective, the university is implicated more in maintaining the status quo of an international 'order' than serving as a site for change or transformation of historical inequities. These trends, while illustrating the paradoxes produced by globalization, also show how the categories of advanced and less advanced, developed and under-developed or developing country categories are reproduced. The continuing dependence on Western universities and Western education further advances and entrenches former colonial influences. On the other hand, the reality in many 'developing countries' is that opportunities for higher education are scarce, especially for graduate studies.

The recruitment of international students is of benefit to the receiving country and university, both economically, and in terms of the anticipated benefits of diversity. One of the negative consequences being ignored is the issue of 'brain-drain' from 'developing' countries. By recruiting the 'best and brightest', GU and Canada are participating in the continued depletion of resources (human resources in this instance) from other countries. In proceeding with internationalization, universities must address the questions relating to how Canadian universities could mitigate the damage of this phenomenon, especially with declining support for development aid in the higher education sector. This issue is gaining further prominence as Canada prepares a campaign to attract international students to continue working in Canada, and even immigrate here to off-set predicted short falls in professional cadres (Bond et al., 2007).

In terms of the perception that international students contribute to the internationalisation of the university, the experiences of the students illustrate the theories of cultural creation and containment advanced by Bhabha (1990). There is much enthusiasm for facilitating the arrival of international students, and thus, a commitment to create diversity through their presence. There are

repeated references in both policy documents and promotional material about the benefits of having international students at GU who enrich the campus, and encourage cross-cultural exchange of knowledge and ideas. The flexibility, the invitation, the warmth even of their pre-arrival relations with university staff and faculty correspond with this intention.

The student narratives, however, present a different reality. With the absence of consistent interaction and socialization with domestic students, there is little opportunity for cross-cultural exchange: not in the classroom, not in regular interactions with fellow students, not with faculty members or staff. In fact, the culture of the campus (with little welcome from domestic students) encouraged them to cluster in their own 'international' groupings, thus reproducing the stereotyping of international students as being exclusive, not mixing with others and drawing boundaries around themselves. The message that the students received is that "no one is interested" (Samshul). The data strongly suggest that, in order to be successful, students had to conform to dominant practices, cultural, linguistic and social. Indeed, the most successful of the students, repeatedly spoke of their own initiatives to 'fit in', join in activities, and dissociate from their 'international student' identities. There is little of the mutuality and reciprocity that students came to expect from an international experience. After their arrival, the students became invisible; the very differences that would contribute to interculturalism kept them marginalized.

In spite of this general rejection of cultural difference,[4] it is the international students themselves who were becoming internationalized. They recognize the value of an intercultural experience, and are developing those skills in the course of their study at GU. They were navigating different contexts, learning in a different language, doing 'hard things' and developing comparative/international perspectives about their fields of study and their environments. They are developing networks outside of their home and moving towards a cosmopolitan identity. In a more extended analysis, I show how the cultural dimensions of globalization facilitate this transformation (Beck, 2008).

The university has become complacent in its practice and participation in internationalization, based on the assumption that the presence of international students facilitates the infusion of intercultural and international dimensions (Mestenhauser, 2002). More attention needs to be paid to just how those intercultural interactions might be facilitated across the learning and social spaces of the university. There must be stronger commitment to critically evaluate practice and learn from student experiences, so that internationalization itself can avoid reproducing the harmful influences of globalization and colonial legacies, and become more relational and embedded in inclusive, mutually satisfying practices.

The recognition of the economic dimensions allows for resistance to and undermining of those impacts. The students' experiences illustrated the many connections between globalization and the internationalization of the university so that their experience is linked to systemic and structural issues rather than being seen as individual difficulty. Transformative action must begin with an education of university administrators, policy makers and educators of the issues that permeate internationalization and, most especially, the lived experience of the international students invited to our campuses. Difficult questions about real accountability, that is, accountability for and to the international students themselves, must be raised. Developing an understanding of internationalization through a comprehensive analysis of this process will support educators and scholars alike to discern and implement ethical practices.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P. G. (1991). Impact and adjustment: Foreign students in comparative perspectiveAltbach, P. G. (1991). Impact and adjustment: Foreign students in comparative perspective. *Higher Education*, *21*(3), 305–323.

Altbach, P. G. (2004). Higher education crosses borders. *Change*, *36*(2), 18–24.

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2006). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *NEA Almanac of Higher Education* (pp. 27–36). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Altbach, P. G., & Teichler, U. (2001). Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized university. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *5*(1), 5–25.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (2nd ed). London & New York: Verso.

Ashcroft, B. (2001). *On Post-colonial Futures*. London & New York: Continuum.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage.

AUCC. (1995). *Statement on Internationalization and Canadian Universities*. Retrieved January, 2006, from http://www.aucc.ca/publications/statements/1995/intl_04_e.html

AUCC. (2007a). *Canadian Universities and International Student Mobility. Report on Findings of the 2006 Survey on Internationalization*. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Retrieved September, 2008, from http://www.aucc.ca/_pdf/ english/publications/student_mobility_2007_e.pdf

AUCC. (2007b). *Internationalizing Canadian Campuses. Report on Findings of the 2006 Survey on Internationalization*. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canda. Retrieved January, 2008, from http://www.aucc.ca/_pdf/english/publications/aucc-scotia_web_e.pdf

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Beck, K. (2001). *An Ethic of Inclusion for International Education: A Response to Globalization*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Simon Fraser University.

Beck, K. (2008). *Being International: Learning in a Canadian University*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Simon Fraser University.

Bhabha, H. (1990). Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Burbules, & Torres. (2000). *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York & London: Routledge.

Bond, S. (2009). *Transforming the Culture of Learning: Evoking the International in University Curriculum*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Canadian Society for Studies in Higher Education, Carlton University, Ottawa, ON.

Caglar, A. S. (1997). Hyphenated identities and the limits of culture. In T. Modood & P. Werbner (Eds.), *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe*. London & New York: Zed Books Ltd.

Castle, G. (Ed.). (2001). *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*. Oxford & Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Currie, J. & Newson, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Universities and Globalization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dale, R., & Robertson, S. L. (2003). Editorial. Introduction. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 1*(1), 3–11.

Dei, G. J. S. (1992). *The Social Reality of International Post-secondary Students in Canada*. CBIE Research, No. 3. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (1998). 'Moving' experiences: Globalisation, pedagogy and experiential learning. *Studies in Continuing Education, 20*(2), 159–174.

Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (2000). *Globalization and Pedagogy: Space, Place and Identity*. London & New York: Routledge.

Featherstone, M. (1995). *Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

Fontana, A., & Frey. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In Denzin & Lincoln (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 645–672). Thousand Oaks, London & Delhi: Sage Publications.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gismondi, M. (1999). *Aurora Interview with George Sefa Dei*. Aurora. Retrieved November, 2005, from http://aurora.icaap.org/talks/dei.html

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2002). From the individual interview to the interview society. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Interview Research: Context & Method* (pp. 3–32). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

King, R., Marginson, S., & Naidoo, R. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of Higher Education and Globalisation*. London: Edward Elgar.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hall, S. (1992). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held, & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and Its Futures*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Hayrinen-Alestalo, M., & Peltola, U. (2006). The problem of a market-oriented university. *Higher Education, 52*(2), 251–281.

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Jr., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds*. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press.

Knight, J. (2000). *Progress and Promise: The 2000 AUCC Report on Internationalization at Canadian Universities*. Ottawa, Ontario: AUCC.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodelled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*(1), 5–31.

Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (1999). Strategies for internationalization of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. In Knight & de Wit (Eds.), *Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education*. Paris: OECD.

Lather, P. (1986a). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(3), 257–277.

Lather, P. (1986b). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange, 17*(4), 63–84.

Lather, P. (2002). Validity as an incitement to discourse: Qualitative research and the crisis of legitimation. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 241–250). Washington, DC: AERA.

Loomba, A. (1998). *Colonialism – Postcolonialism*. London, GBR: Routledge.

Magnusson, J.-L. (2000). Canadian higher education and citizenship in the context of state restructuring and globalization. *Encounters on Education, 1*(Fall), 107–123.

Marginson, S. (1999). After globalization: Emerging politics of education. *Journal of Education Policy, 14*(1), 19–31.

McMurtry, J. (1998). *Unequal Freedoms: The Global Market as an Ethical System*. Toronto, Ontario: Garamond Press.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mestenhauser, J. (2002). The utilization of foreign students in internationalization of universities. In S. Bond & C. Bowry (Eds.), *Connections and Complexities: The Internationalization of Higher Education in Canada* (pp. 13–28). Occasional Papers in Higher Education. No. 11. Winnipeg, Manitoba: The Centre for Higher Education Research and Development, The University of Manitoba.

Nandy, A. (1983). *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Nederveen Pieterse, J. (2004). *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Odin, J. K., & Manicas, P. T. (2004). *Globalization and Higher Education*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Prasad, A. (2003). The gaze of the other: Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*. New York & Hampshire, England: Palgrave MacMillan.

Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education, 2*(1), 248–270.

Rizvi, F. (2005). Identity, culture and cosmopolitan futures. *Higher Education Policy, 18*, 331–339.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2000). Globalization and education: Complexities and contingencies. *Educational Theory, 50*(4), 419–426.

Robertson, R. (1990). Mapping the global condition: Globalization as the central concept. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London, Newbury Park, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sandercock, L. (2006). Mongrel cities of the 21st century: In defense of multiculturalism. *Commentary Series*. Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis. Retrieved November, 2006, from http://www.riim.metropolis.net/research/commentary/index.html

Savage, C. (2005). *The National Report on International Students in Canada 2002*. Ottawa: CBIE. Retrieved June, 2007, from http://www.cbie.ca/download/Publications/NationalReport_02.pdf

Scott, P. (2000). Globalization and higher education: Challenges for the 21ˢᵗ century. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 4*(1), 3–10.

Scott, P. (1998). Massification, internationalization and globalization. In P. Scott (Ed.), *The Globalization of Higher Education*. United Kingdom: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Smith, D. G. (2006). *Trying to Teach in a Season of Great Untruth: Globalization, Empire and the Crises of Pedagogy*. Rotterdam & Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 2*(1), 1–28.

Van der Wende, M. (2007). Internationalization of higher education in OECD countries: Challenges and opportunities for the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 274–290.

Viruru, R., & Cannella, G. (2006). A postcolonial critique of the ethnographic interview: Research analyzes research. In N. Denzin & M. Giardina (Eds.), *Qualitative Inquiry and the Conservative Challenge* (pp. 175–192). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Warren, C. (2002). Qualitative interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Interview Research: Context & Method* (pp. 83–102). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Waters, M. (1995). *Globalization*. London & New York: Routledge.

Young, R. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Kumari Beck
Faculty of Education,
Simon Fraser University

NOTES

[1] The AUCC has not released a detailed research report as it did with its previous study, Progress and Promise (Knight, 2000).

[2] I have made a decision not to include methodological details of the study, in this chapter, beyond very basic information. Please contact the author for more details or refer to Beck (2008).

[3] These and other statistics and references, as well as documents from GU have been masked for reasons of anonymity.

[4] None of the participants mentioned the fact that Canada is bilingual and that French is an official language of Canada.