

Towards different conversations about the internationalization of higher education

Vers des conversations différentes au sujet de l'internationalisation de l'enseignement supérieur

Sharon Stein, University of British Columbia

Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti, University of British Columbia

Judy Bruce, University of Canterbury

Rene Suša, University of Oulu

Abstract

As institutional commitments to internationalize higher education continue to grow, so does the need to critically consider both the intended purposes and actual outcomes of the programs and policies that result. In particular, there is a risk that internationalization efforts may contribute to the reproduction of harmful historical and ongoing global patterns of educational engagement. In this paper we explore these issues by offering a social cartography of four possible articulations of internationalization, and considering their relation to an often-unacknowledged global imaginary, which presumes a colonial hierarchy of humanity. We also address the practical and pedagogical possibilities and limitations of enacting each articulation within mainstream institutional settings, and propose that social cartographies offer a means of reframing and deepening engagement with the complexities, tensions, and paradoxes involved in internationalizing higher education.

Résumé

Comme les engagements institutionnels visant à internationaliser l'enseignement supérieur continuent de croître, il en va de même de la nécessité de considérer de manière critique à la fois les buts prévus et les aboutissements réels des programmes et des politiques qui en découlent. En particulier, il existe un risque que les efforts d'internationalisation peuvent contribuer à la reproduction d'historiques modèles/motifs globaux d'engagement éducatif, nuisibles et en cours. Dans cet article, nous explorons ces questions en proposant une cartographie sociale de quatre articulations possibles de l'internationalisation, et en considérant leur relation avec un imaginaire mondial souvent inavoué, ce qui suppose une hiérarchie coloniale de l'humanité. Nous abordons également les possibilités et les limitations pratiques et pédagogiques de la promulgation de chaque articulation au sein des cadres institutionnels traditionnels, et avançons que les cartographies sociales offrent les moyens de recadrer et d'approfondir l'engagement avec les complexités, les tensions et les paradoxes impliqués dans l'internationalisation de l'enseignement supérieur.

Keywords: internationalization; higher education; social imaginary; colonialism; racism; social cartography

Mots clés: internationalisation; enseignement supérieur; imaginaire social; colonialisme; racisme; cartographie sociale

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Academy of Finland for the support provided for the completion of this article through the project 'Ethical Internationalism in Higher Education in Times of Crises'.

The acceleration of institutional commitments to "internationalize" higher education over the past few decades has resulted in a pressing need for reflection on the practice, pedagogy, and study of this work. A decade after offering her widely cited definition of the term,¹ Jane Knight (2014)

¹ Knight's oft-cited definition of internationalization is "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (as cited in Knight, 2004, p. 11).

lamented, “internationalization has become a catch-all phrase used to describe *anything* and *everything* remotely linked to the global, intercultural or international dimensions of higher education and is thus losing its way” (p. 76, emphasis added). In response to this identity crisis of internationalization, Knight proposes, however, not to revise the definition of the term, but rather to focus on examining “the fundamental values underpinning it” (p. 76).

In this article, we respond to Knight’s call (and others’, e.g., Tarc, Clark, & Varpalotai, 2013; de Wit, 2014; Madge, Raghuram & Noxolo, 2015) to rethink the “fundamentals” of internationalization by mapping the landscape of its existing and potential articulations. This approach is also motivated by concerns that a failure to examine the less celebratory elements of internationalization may contribute to the reproduction of harmful patterns of economic and epistemological dominance on a global scale (see Shultz, 2015). Although a growing number of scholars have raised ethical questions about the theory and practice of internationalization (e.g., Adnett, 2010; Naidoo, 2010; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Suspitsyna, 2015), there remains a widespread consensus about its positive benefits and a reluctance to engage with the more difficult and unsettling paradoxes and challenges that arise in its enactment (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Teichler, 2010). In our efforts to initiate and facilitate substantive conversations around these complex and difficult issues with other scholars and practitioners, we also realized that there is a dearth of shared vocabularies and frameworks that would allow us to do so. We further found, when compiling undergraduate and graduate syllabi for courses in this area, that there is a need for more accessible yet conceptually rigorous texts in this area.

Based on these experiences as well as a detailed review of existing scholarship, this paper brings into conversation diverse approaches to internationalization in an effort to enable students, scholars, and practitioners alike to engage in more collective, self-reflexive examinations of the challenges involved in the internationalization of higher education. Specifically, we draw on decolonial scholarship to suggest that most institutional internationalization efforts operate from within a dominant global imaginary that tends to naturalize existing racial hierarchies and economic inequities in the realm of education and beyond. This imaginary acts as a structuring frame that legitimizes certain perspectives and delegitimizes others. Using social cartography (Andreotti, Stein, Pashby & Nicholson, 2016; Paulston, 2000), we consider how four articulations of internationalization relate to this imaginary by tracing their situated histories, orientations, and assumptions.

We begin this paper by introducing the concept of the dominant global imaginary, including its modern/colonial origins and its contested but enduring ordering logics. Next we detail our social cartography of internationalization, and provide an illustration of a higher education initiative (i.e., policy, program, or project) that exemplifies the goals, driving motivations, and educational aims of each articulation, even as we acknowledge that most practices and policies are a contingent assemblage of multiple articulations operating at once. We then consider different possible readings of this cartography, and finally consider how cartographies can facilitate new kinds of conversations about internationalization that might bring us to the edges of the dominant global imaginary.

The Dominant Global Imaginary

The term “social imaginary” refers broadly to the organizing structure of shared understanding that makes legible or illegible certain relationships and practices within a given community (Taylor, 2002). Although social imaginaries have been variously theorized and applied, in this paper we largely follow Charles Taylor’s approach to the term. For Taylor, social imaginaries are

neither purely ideational nor material, but rather occupy “a fluid middle ground between embodied practices and explicit doctrines” (Gaonkar, 2002, p. 10). Because social imaginaries condition common sense and organize social relations, they circumscribe the questions deemed worth asking and delimit the answers considered viable or valid. Thus, they link present conditions to future aspirations, but at a collective rather than individual level (Rizvi & Savage, 2015).

Social imaginaries operate on various scales, but are often framed as either national or global (Brydon & Dvorak, 2012; Steger, 2008). According to Steger, national imaginaries emerged during the Enlightenment, but following World War II, they were confronted with a global imaginary that normalized incorporation into a global capitalist system. In contrast to Steger, we date the origins of the dominant global imaginary much earlier, to the concurrent and co-constitutive beginnings of modernity, colonialism, and the trans-Atlantic slave trade in the 15th century. It was at this time that Europe first envisaged and asserted a totalizing—i.e., global—vision for the planet, through a single narrative of space and time in which Europe stood as the geographic centre, and as the leader of linear, universal human progress. In this modern/colonial global imaginary, non-European peoples were classified and categorized as less developed, and therefore, justifiably colonized or enslaved (Silva, 2015; Tlostanova & Mignolo, 2012; Wynter, 2003). Indeed, the promises that this imaginary made to those in the West—such as security, material prosperity, possessive individualism, linear progress, democracy, meritocracy, and universal knowledge—were only made possible through the reproduction of harmful social relations and processes for the West’s Others—such as insecurity, exploitation, expropriation, material poverty, and onto-epistemological dominance.² Although European empires were not the first empires with universalist ambitions, their scope and scale were unprecedented. Particularly as the power of the church waned, and secular authorities and the capitalist market rose in prominence, European powers articulated their national imaginaries with reference to a global horizon that served as the constitutive outside of national contexts.

We understand this global imaginary as dynamic, contested and enduring. While the *content* of the modern/colonial global imaginary has shifted over time, its general *frame* has endured and remains dominant, undergirded by accumulated ideological and material power and resources. For instance, following World War II, Western powers continued to define national imaginaries against their non-Western Others, but the post-War context demanded a revision to the content of the global imaginary that would officially contest colonialism and racism. This shift served as a means to assert the benevolence of the West, and refute both Nazi racial science and Soviet communism (Kapoor, 2014; Melamed, 2006). Yet post-War international development efforts were often led by the West and largely benefited its economic and political interests (Biccum, 2010). This iteration of the modern/colonial imaginary effectively recapitulated a racist hierarchy of humanity and narrow visions of viable economic, political, and social organization. Over the past several decades, shifts in the organization of global capital and the governance of nation-states have been glossed as “globalization.” In fact, the internationalization of higher education is often framed as a response to “largely inevitable” changes associated with globalization (Altbach, 2004, p. 5). However, some contest this characterization of globalization as neutral and inevitable (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), and of universities as merely reactive (Cantwell

² Throughout this text we use the terms “the West/non-West” as well as “the Global North/South”. These sets of reference have different significations and histories, and are not synonymous. As well, they can obscure diversity within the groups they are meant to describe. However, they remain useful for indicating global divisions and power relations in social, political, and economic arenas, particularly as they were/are constructed through the dominant global imaginary that we address in this article.

& Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009), while others note that capitalism has since its beginning been dependent on its global reach (Biccum, 2010).

Today's iteration of the enduring modern/colonial global imaginary continues to support capitalist social relations, to normalize liberal Western notions of politics and governance, and to naturalize a racialized hierarchy of existence (Silva, 2015). Shultz asserts (2015), "The violence of colonialism, along with its companions, patriarchy and imperialism's global capitalism, become embedded into our organizations" (para. 11), which we argue includes colleges and universities. For individuals as well, whether motivated by economic interests, altruism, self-development, civic duty, or some combination thereof, the desire to gain the knowledge and skills to become marketable employees and engaged citizens tends to be rooted in philosophical and political economic traditions that presume the universal value of Western knowledge and values, re-centre the individual, and place both the capitalist market and nation-state above critique.

Since its beginnings there have been efforts to resist and replace the modern/colonial global imaginary, including assertions of alternative imaginaries (global or otherwise). However, through consent, coercion, and brute force, it has achieved a position of dominance. Within mainstream institutions like universities, alternative imaginaries are often made to appear either unintelligible and/or outside of the realm of possibility, as both individuals and institutions seeking to preserve their power and their sense of innocence must disavow the systemic harm that is required to maintain these. If in fact the promises and presumptions that animate the dominant (i.e. modern/colonial) global imaginary and fuel its reproduction are strong in the case of both educational institutions and individuals, this poses important challenges for pluralizing possibilities for internationalization that exceed what is offered by this imaginary.

Mapping Articulations of Internationalization

Callan (2000) argues that interpretations of internationalization in higher education tend to shift according to "the varying rationales and incentives for internationalization, the varying activities encompassed therein, and the varying political and economic circumstances in which the process is situated" (p. 16). Social cartographies can create opportunities for tracing the histories of these variables, and for collective consideration of their potentially conflicting and contradictory implications. Paulston (2000) argues that a map produced through social cartography has the "potential to serve as a metaphorical device for the provisional representation and iconographic unification of warring cultures and disputatious communities" (p. xxi). By bringing diverse perspectives or articulations of an issue into conversation, such maps can foster spaces for "interpretation and comprehension of both theoretical constructs and social events" (p. 2).

Our social cartography differs from other typologies of internationalization (e.g. Knight, 2007; Stier, 2004) because it is not meant to be a static representation of an objective reality of options but rather an interactive, performative design that invites further engagement. Far from attempting to "capture" and fix possible approaches to internationalization, cartographies extend and complexify conversations by inviting nuanced and sober examinations of existing approaches in order to address their possibilities as well as their limitations. This, in turn, may create opportunities to articulate previously unasked questions, generate new shared vocabularies, and collectively imagine alternative futures for the internationalization of higher education. We nonetheless note that all maps in social cartography are situated within the always partial perspective of their producers. In our case, this mapping was generated in consideration of how different articulations are positioned in relation to the modern/colonial global imaginary, so as to

offer more structure and historical context to current conversations about the ongoing power of colonial patterns in internationalization.

In the next section, we outline the main features of each articulation: internationalization for the global knowledge economy; internationalization for the global public good; anti-oppressive internationalization; and relational translocalism (see Figure 1 for an illustration of how each relates to the modern/colonial global imaginary). In order to clearly illustrate the primary elements of each, we also provide a practical example in which each articulation is clearly dominant. The two examples from Brazil (Universidade Federal da Integração Latino-Americana/Federal University for Latin American Integration [UNILA] and Bill Calhoun’s program) are based on ethnographic observations made during site visits by two of the authors of this paper; the other two are analyses based on initiatives whose content is publicly available on the web.

Finally, we emphasize that in policy and practice, internationalization is usually enacted as assemblages of *multiple articulations*, rather than as discrete or pure ideal types (Rizvi & Savage, 2015). Thus, while it is often the case that one or two of the four will be dominant in a single instance of international engagement, in general there is no one-to-one correlation between particular projects, individuals, or institutions, and a particular articulation of internationalization. As a result, one may find each of the four approaches in practice at a single institution, or even being utilized by a single program or individual. However, for the purposes of clarity and illustration we have chosen examples that are dominant in one of the four articulations, an approach that aligns with social cartography’s performative rather than representational methodological orientation.

Figure 1: Four articulations of internationalization in Higher Education



Internationalization for a Global Knowledge Economy

The first articulation of internationalization frames higher education as central for success in a “global knowledge economy.” According to Ozga, the notion of a knowledge economy “appears as a meta-narrative that assumes the commodification of knowledge in a global system of production and competition” (as cited by Metcalfe & Fenwick, 2009, p. 210). Government policies

drafted within the presumed trajectory of a knowledge economy frame education and training as “significant instruments of economic and social change,” with which a country can build and support innovation, develop a competitive workforce, and promote self-reliance amongst its citizenry (Ozga & Jones, 2006, p. 2). Notwithstanding critiques about the extent to which “knowledge economy” is an accurate depiction of either the Global North or the global economy more generally (Gibb & Walker, 2011), as a concept it significantly shapes education policy (Peters, 2003; Robertson, 2005).

In this articulation, higher education is understood as vital to national economic growth and global competition through the preparation of graduates, and the production of research, inventions, and innovations (Atlbach, 2004; Dodds, 2008; Nokkala, 2006). Certain fields, such as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) are prioritized over humanities or social science knowledge (Boden & Epstein, 2006), and students “invest” in international education experiences, such as studying/volunteering abroad or learning a new language, to better compete in a global labour market or otherwise become global leaders (Adamson, 2009; Callan, 2000). Meanwhile, success for faculty is measured by income-generating research outputs (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), collaborations with institutions of higher ranking and prestige, and publication in high-impact, internationally recognized journals (Paasi, 2013).

Aligned with the modern/colonial global imaginary, this articulation largely presumes the universal value of Western knowledge, such that many non-Western countries are thought to have lower GDP because they lack adequate “knowledge capital” that would allow them to increase productivity (Grenier, 2013; Sachs, 2005). Thus, the potential for Eurocentric epistemological standardization through processes of internationalization may be understood as a positive outcome. At the same time, certain non-Western knowledges are valued if deemed to have exchange-value; for example, if they lead to the development of new profit-making pharmaceutical drugs, or other instrumentalizable benefits such as improved institutional branding or international prestige (Nandy, 2000). Overall, from this articulation internationalization initiatives are subject to careful cost-benefit analyses, and relationships are assessed according to their potential for calculable gain.

The example with which we offer to illustrate this articulation is the “21 Day International Challenge” recently launched by the University of Canterbury in New Zealand. In this project, teams of higher education students compete against each other to develop the most innovative and enterprising solution to problems identified by a “struggling community” in Tarong, the Philippines (The University of Canterbury, 2015a, 2015b). Setting the scene for this competition, one student participant blogged, “30 students, 30 mentors, 21 days, and a village on the other side of the world riddled with poverty. Our mission: to create a business plan to change the lives of those less fortunate than ourselves” (UC Student Blog, 2015). Participating students have never been to Tarong but are given just three weeks to generate a business plan that is “relevant, appropriate and feasible for the community” (The University of Canterbury, 2015a). Although the students are briefed that “it is critical that the teams listen to, probe and develop a true understanding of the community they are working with to be able to develop a suitable solution” (The University of Canterbury Business and Law, 2015a), they are predominantly mentored by New Zealand-based industry partners as well as by a senior fellow and ‘Entrepreneur in Residence’ at the university, who is described as the “ultimate humanitarian aid worker...a cross between Florence Nightingale and Indiana Jones” (The University of Canterbury Business and Law, 2015c). After the 21 days, the teams are judged on their proposed projects, and the winning team receives the reward: an all-expenses-paid trip to Tarong, where they will help implement their winning solution.

Situated primarily within the global knowledge economy articulation, the “21 Day Challenge” encourages the development of student entrepreneurs who are globally-aware, enterprising, innovative, and highly competitive (Ozga & Jones, 2006). Networking with local industry leaders, the project is meant to foster creativity, cultural awareness, and divergent thinking skills as are demanded by international employers and governments in an increasingly globalized labour market. In addition to arming students with valuable experiences and skills, the program allegedly benefits the community of Tarong, offering students “a unique opportunity to make an amazing difference to real people with real problems” (Cruse, quoted in The University of Canterbury, 2015a). The notion that solutions to a Filipino community’s problems could be adequately or appropriately identified and addressed through interventions designed by distant undergraduate students in a New Zealand university also illustrates a foundational premise of the global knowledge economy articulation: that mastery of capitalist business acumen qualifies one to address and improve social issues around the world. This assumption aligns with various presumptions of the dominant global imaginary, including the notion that Western market principles are a force for positive change, and that Western institutions can offer knowledge and expertise of universal value to the rest of the world, despite having minimal knowledge about the particular, local context of its application.

Along with the “human capital” developed by the students in New Zealand, and the assumed utility of business logics for addressing complex problems in the Philippines, the challenge also mobilizes paternalistic humanitarian desires through an appeal to ethnocentric, self-affirming benevolence that is most evident in the assumption that the program will benefit the people of Tarong. For instance, participating students report that they are “passionate” about “making a difference” for “struggling communities” (The University of Canterbury Business and Law, 2015b). Here the global knowledge economy articulation overlaps with the global public good articulation; both are firmly situated within the modern/colonial global imaginary but emphasizing different elements. In the following section, we explore the global public good articulation in more detail.

Internationalization as a Global Public Good

The global public good articulation emphasizes the importance of democratizing access to higher education on a global scale as well as ensuring that an imagined “global public” will benefit from what is produced by universities (particularly universities in the Global North). The notion of a global public good itself is generally framed as an extension of the liberal political economic theory of public goods from a national to global scale (Deneulin & Townsend, 2007). In classical liberal political economic theory, public goods are non-exclusive and non-rivalrous, but colloquially “the public good” has also come to refer to the idea of collective and individual benefits that exceed what can be produced through investments made only for private gain. At a global level, this may be accomplished, for example, through civil society initiatives around health, trade, or climate change (Kaul et al., 1999).

In this articulation of internationalization, higher education is understood to play a vital role in the production of the global public goods of democracy, prosperity, “good governance,” and, of course, knowledge (Grenier, 2013; Peters, 2003; Stiglitz, 1999). According to Marginson (2007), “Global public goods in higher education are *the* key to a more balanced, globally-friendly, ‘win-win’ worldwide higher education environment” (p. 331, emphasis in the original). Although both emphasize the value of knowledge, the global public good articulation may critique the narrow economic emphasis of the global knowledge economy for compromising a commitment to

public goods. However, the global public good articulation does not question the basic legitimacy of modern institutions, including nation-states, universities, and capitalist markets. Rather, emphasis is placed on expanding access to these institutions and working towards greater fairness and inclusion within them by enabling more social mobility and access to their resources. Thus, the fundamental structure and benevolence of universities in the Global North is rarely questioned. Through faculty research and students' humanitarian service, higher education is understood to transmit universal knowledge, skills, and values to address climate change, poverty, and health epidemics (Bryan, 2013; Jefferess, 2012). This articulation largely ignores Western universities' historical and ongoing complicity with racial, colonial, and economic violence, both domestically and abroad (e.g., Chatterjee & Maira, 2014; Grosfoguel, 2013; Hong, 2008; Mignolo, 2003; Wilder, 2013), and does not problematize the inherited presumption of *noblesse oblige* toward the non-West. Epistemic diversity may be acknowledged, but rarely to the extent that it transforms basic institutional structures.

To illustrate this articulation, we turn to “The World Beyond 2015—Is Higher Education Ready?” a campaign launched by the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU, 2013). The aim of the campaign was to “raise awareness of how higher education can and should respond to global challenges beyond 2015,” in anticipation of the new United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Over a hundred submissions from alumni and faculty of universities around the world on the campaign website offer reflections about the role of higher education in global development in response to six questions around which the campaign was framed. The questions are:

Why does the Post-2015 agenda matter for higher education? How are universities already addressing local, national, and international issues? How can universities prepare to respond to the Post-2015 agenda? What partnerships should universities establish to achieve their objectives? How can universities champion their contributions to wider society? How relevant and realistic are the Post-2015 goals likely to be? (ACU, 2013)

The structure of the questions, as well as many of the posted responses, indicates that the thrust of the campaign is not critical reflection on the various ways in which universities are already responding to global challenges, including examination of how existing practices of research, community outreach, service-learning, and internationalization are potentially contributing to the perpetuation and deepening of the very challenges they aim to address (Naidoo, 2010). Rather, they are largely geared towards the celebration and extension of existing achievements and contributions.

The ACU campaign is therefore structured by the assumption that universities are the primary producers of relevant and appropriate knowledge and answers to the roots of many pressing global challenges, such as poverty, environmental (un)sustainability, and health epidemics. For instance, the FAQ page notes, “We want to draw the attention of policymakers to the crucial role that higher education plays in economic and social development.” However, it does not specify *which* and *whose* visions for economic and social development will be privileged. This is of concern not only given the numerous critiques about the colonial nature of mainstream notions of development in general (Biccum, 2010; Kapoor, 2014; Silva, 2015; Wainwright, 2008), and in the context of higher education in particular (Andreotti, 2014; Gonzalez, 1982; Shahjahan, 2013; Tikly, 2004), but also given the fact that prestigious universities in the Global North are understood as models for higher education institutions world-wide (Deem, Mok, & Lucas, 2008; Rhoads, 2011). Additionally, although the campaign solicited input from “diverse voices in the higher education sector...particularly in the global South,” it remains necessary to consider which

voices are explicitly welcomed. For instance, the FAQ page notes “we are keen to hear from a wide range of voices, from within universities (senior management, academics, students) and also from outside the sector (policymakers, funders, partners).” Unmentioned here are, for example, unaffiliated community members, activists, university service staff, and others whose voices may be unwelcome or illegible from within the modern/colonial global imaginary.

Overall, the Beyond 2015 campaign illustrates many features of the global public good articulation of internationalization, with implicitly narrow ideas about the kinds of knowledge and transformation that higher education can support, and with a presumption of its benefit to an abstract and apparently universally-valued global public good. Further, those that might contest this vision of higher education from outside of the dominant global imaginary are silenced by the framing of the campaign. This critique may be offered from an anti-oppressive approach to internationalization, reviewed below.

Anti-Oppressive Internationalization

The anti-oppressive internationalization articulation is based on a commitment to work in solidarity for systemic change toward greater social justice. It problematizes the dominant global imaginary (as illustrated in Figure 1) and critiques the global knowledge economy articulation in its uncritical support for capitalism and its presupposition that global economic competition occurs on a level-playing field. It also questions the global public good articulation by problematizing who is imagined to constitute the “public” and what is considered to be “good” (Brennan & Naidoo, 2008). Anti-oppressive approaches contest internationalization practices that emphasize access but require as a prerequisite the negation or selective depoliticization of difference, and demand conformity to Western educational standards or modes of knowledge production (Ahmed, 2012; Shahjahan, 2013; Tlostanova & Mignolo, 2012). In doing so, they question the benevolence of higher education that is largely presumed by the global knowledge economy and global public good articulations of internationalization.

The anti-oppressive articulation draws its understanding of social justice from feminist, anti-capitalist, anti-colonial, anti-imperial, and anti-racist commitments, and articulates a commitment to support and defend those thought to be harmed by internationalization programs and policies. For instance, study or volunteer abroad experiences are critiqued for: potentially exploitive or disruptive for host communities (Jefferess, 2012); promoting an elitist and exclusionary cosmopolitanism (Rizvi, 2008); and perpetuating Western students’ feelings of universal entitlement (Zemach-Bersin, 2007). Student volunteer and service-learning programs in particular are critiqued for forestalling students’ interrogation of how their own positions within the highly uneven and racialized global political economy contribute to the very harm they have supposedly travelled abroad to address (Andreotti, 2011; Bryan, 2013; Heron, 2007; Jefferess, 2012). Thus, in the anti-oppressive articulation there is an emphasis on developing students’ awareness of their complicity in harmful local and global structures, not as an endpoint but as one step toward creating radical change (Bruce, 2013). There is also an expressed commitment to centre oppressed peoples, their knowledge, and their visions for justice and change, rather than to import and assert dominant Western knowledge or values.

This articulation is also critical of Eurocentric universalisms that underlie international university rankings and the education policies of organizations like the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and World Bank (Shahjahan, 2013). However, anti-oppressive approaches to internationalization may also argue that knowledge should be made more readily accessible through open-access journals or mainstream publications. This is only one of

several potentially contradictory positions contained within this articulation. For example, some critique institutions for not extending equal educational opportunity globally (Tannock, 2009), while others suggest globalized higher education may undermine domestic equity goals (in the Global North and South) (Brown & Tannock, 2009; Wanyenya & Lester-Smith, 2015). This articulation also holds ambivalent views about Western nation-states—although they are critiqued for reproducing colonial and racist logics, the decline in nation-state funding for higher education is also resisted.

To illustrate this articulation and consider how it looks when operating in an institutional context, we consider the example of the Universidade Federal da Integração Latino-Americana (UNILA). In fact, an international orientation is built into the very mission of the institution of UNILA, an inter-regional university set up in 2007 by the Brazilian federal government at the tri-border of Argentina, Brazil, and Paraguay. The creation of UNILA was part of the third cycle of expansion of higher education in Brazil. While the first two cycles focused on expansion of access to less populated areas of the country's interior and on expanding and restructuring already existing universities, the aim of the third cycle was to promote international cooperation within the regional context of Latin America under Brazilian leadership. UNILA is thus constructed on the 40 hectares of land donated by Itaipu Binacional—the same company that operates the electric dam on the Parana river (Brackman, 2010).

UNILA embodies what Morosini (in Brackman, 2010) refers to as the Latin American model of university—different from both Napoleonic (Enlightenment-based, elitist professional education) and Humboldtian (focusing on personal development and academic freedom) ideals. This Latin American model suggests that the university

should be inserted in the community [emphasizing] collective reflection on social reality and the search for ways to transform it that emerge from this reflection [which] should serve as guidance for the academic community. (Morosini in Brackman, 2010, p. 24)

As stated in its mission statement—“Solidarity Cooperation: Brasil and the Countries of Latin America” (n.d.), UNILA also welcomes students from “non-Latin Caribbean countries” and positions itself to support discussions on common problems in Latin America and scientific cooperation programmes in the region and other continents, emphasizing links with Africa. UNILA's first students were recruited in remote areas of Latin America, and special attention was paid to the recruitment of Indigenous students. Unlike other Brazilian universities, plurilingual instruction (including local Indigenous languages) was also foundational to the political-pedagogical project of the university.

Nonetheless, in what may be understood as a critical approach to hegemonic tendencies, UNILA's mission statement does not communicate aspirations for leadership, prestige, economic imperatives, or corporate branding that abound in mission statements of Western universities (Ayers, 2005; Sauntson & Morrish, 2010; Morrish & Sauntson, 2013). Instead, what is emphasized is the need to “construct programmes and policies for South America, being mindful of an eventual Brazilian hegemonic power, through South-South cooperation” (UNILA, n.d.). While the relationship between the mission statements of universities and how they manifest in the real politics of governments and realities on the ground are complex and not necessarily consistent, it is notable that a university is pre-emptively mindful of a potential emergence of hegemony and unequal power relations by its founding and sponsoring government.

The political-pedagogical orientation of UNILA is a powerful example of institutionalized efforts to rethink and reimagine the patterns that reproduce the dominance of the modern/colonial global imaginary, including addressing power relations, overturning the supremacy of Western

knowledge, and rethinking approaches to relationality that prioritize solidarity over competition, reciprocal partnerships over top-down leadership, and substantive engagement and involvement of Indigenous and racialized students in place of tokenistic inclusion. There are significant questions as to whether and how it might be possible to implement this orientation in other contexts, particularly at mainstream, established universities in the Global North. Currently in the Global North, most anti-oppressive approaches to internationalization are enacted outside of formal university channels; for example, through NGOs or unaffiliated groups (e.g., activist-created videos that parody paternalistic Western students' humanitarian efforts), or within universities, but not sanctioned by the administration (e.g., student groups pressuring endowments to divest from mining or fossil fuel companies). Nonetheless, UNILA gestures toward important possibilities for institutionalized internationalization otherwise.

While anti-oppressive internationalization efforts offer significant challenges to the capitalist global knowledge economy and Eurocentric global public good articulations, they still tend to frame internationalization toward instrumental ends. This may require consensus and foreclose opportunities for dissensus and for the development of unscripted engagements and relationships. Further, if the pursuit of social justice is motivated by desires for affirmation and an arguably impossible position of individual or institutional innocence from complicity in harmful structures, then it may ultimately recentre the interests of the university, student, or faculty member engaged in anti-oppressive activity, thereby challenging the content but not the structuring frame of the dominant global imaginary. In the fourth and final articulation that follows, we consider a relational translocalist approach to international engagement that seeks to challenge both the frame and content of the modern/colonial global imaginary.

Relational Translocalism

The fourth articulation challenges what is currently possible for internationalization within the logics and mainstream institutions of global capitalism, Westphalian nation-states, and Cartesian forms of subjectivity—that is, what is possible within the modern/colonial global imaginary. As in the anti-oppressive articulation, there is a recognition that racialized patterns of dominance and cycles of violence are often reproduced through these logics and institutions. Yet in addition to critiquing them, there is also a strong commitment to recognize one's complicity within them, and to affirm relationships based on the possibility of connections not mediated through them. The fourth articulation is therefore thoroughly disillusioned not only with the content but also the framing offered by the dominant global imaginary, which is recognized to be unsustainable and harmful by enabling prosperity and safety for some at the expense of others who are subjected to austerity and violence. However, relational translocalism also sees the risks of potentially reproducing the imaginary's harmful logics and hierarchical patterns when operating solely from a reactive stance.

This articulation is rooted in the notion that exposure to more knowledge about the systemic harms of the dominant global imaginary is necessary but insufficient for addressing problems caused by those harms, and for nurturing possibilities for knowing and being otherwise. Similarly, a mere reversal of existing power relations will not necessarily dismantle the harmful logics of the imaginary itself. Hence, dominance is understood not only to be epistemological and economic, but also ontological and metaphysical, limiting possibilities of existence to modern, logo- and ego-centric meanings and denying interdependence (Ahenakew, Andreotti, Cooper, & Hireme, 2014; Alexander, 2005; Cajete, 2000; Donald, in press; Silva, 2013). This articulation holds in unresolved tension the contradictory need to engage in political struggle based on the

contestation, reformulation, and perhaps ultimately the dismantling of relations and institutions that unevenly distribute vulnerability and life chances (e.g., through the production and protection of spaces for marginalized peoples and knowledges in higher education); *and* to foreground relational possibilities beyond those that are mediated by social institutions like nation-states, universities, and capitalist markets (Alexander, 2005). Recognizing entanglements that exceed rigid national (and other) borders, while also recognizing the highly uneven material effects of these borders, this articulation replaces “internationalization” with “translocalism.” Educationally, it emphasizes the need to learn to identify and unlearn existing attachments, decentre the interests of individual people and institutions, and experiment with efforts to rearrange modern desires without guarantees or fixed visions for the alternatives that may develop in their place (Andreotti, 2007; Spivak, 2012).

A unique study program for international (mostly North American) students in Brazil illustrates some aspects of this articulation. The program, coordinated by Bill Calhoun in Fortaleza, has been running for almost 30 years and seeks to address the origins and effects of what is conceptualized as “existential poverty.” The initial days of the program offer a glimpse of its orientation: students arrive in Brazil and are taken to one of the biggest *favelas* in the country, where some of them stay for several weeks. On the first day, students are offered a “reality check”: they are told that their aspirations to “make a difference” are part of the problem that they think they came to Brazil to address, and they are asked to consider poverty as a material effect of their own harmful ideology, which is premised on separability, the protection of their economic advantage, and the denial of the violence that was necessary to establish that advantage and that remains necessary to maintain it (Alexander, 2005; Donald, in press; Moten, 2014).

In this program, addressing “existential poverty” involves rediscovering a sense of connection with one’s body, creative forces, other people and other-than-human beings. This is done through aesthetic, embodied, and spiritual practice as well as critical intellectual engagements. However, the pedagogical process is designed to happen “from the guts, to the heart, to the head”, not the other way around, as Western schooling presumes. As they progress in the program, students are also placed for short periods of time with organizations and social movements as part of a network that spans three states in Brazil, which involves Indigenous communities, *quilombolas*, the landless movement as well as NGOs and local governments. The program upholds a relational orientation that brings different people together, but also encourages students to self-reflexively face their complicity in violent and unsustainable structures and global systems, and the contradictions that arise both within those systems and in within efforts to transform them.

In sum, relational-translocalist approaches to internationalization engage the limits of investments and norms that characterize the dominant global imaginary, such as logocentrism, anthropocentrism, possessive individualism, the idea of universal reason, and teleological history. A primary challenge for those interested in this articulation is to consider context-specific ethical possibilities for educational engagements that might disrupt students’ existing satisfactions, as well as their desire to turn away from difficulty, complexity, and complicity in the search for comfort, certainty, innocence and control.

Table 1: Summary of four articulations of internationalization

	Internationalization for the global knowledge economy	Internationalization for the global public good	Anti-oppressive internationalization	Relational translocalism
Main goal	Improve individual and national economic advantage within global “knowledge society”	Democratize access to modern institutions; expand opportunities for social mobility	Work in partnership for systemic change toward global justice, anti-colonial and anti-racist approach	Centre interdependence, expand imaginaries of existence beyond what is currently possible, but cautious of escapism
Secondary goals	Income generation (particularly to address deficits generated by public defunding)	Make the dominant/ existing system fairer and more inclusive	Theorize links between different systemic oppressions; problematize and contest “inclusion”	Decentre and disarm; contextualize and deprioritize the logic of modernity and global capitalism; pluriversality
Institutional driver	Branding and prestige; novel resource streams; performance and productivity	Equitable balance between international / local students; advancing liberal democratic ideals	University as critic and conscience of society; enactment and protection of academic freedom	Protect spaces of dissent; revitalize marginalized knowledge; experiment with alternatives; trace existing patterns of violence
Main personal motivation	Improve CVs; develop differential human capital for success in global labour market	Self-betterment; benevolent social entrepreneurship and public responsibility (<i>noblesse oblige</i>)	Act in solidarity with marginalized people and groups in pursuit of social justice; affirm critical hope	Disillusion and disenchantment with existing imaginaries, relationships, existence (including currents and counter-currents)
Educational aims	Develop human capital and competencies for innovation, leadership and entrepreneurship in the global markets	Develop values, skills for altruism, democracy, equality, inclusion, social cohesion, consensus on ends and means of progress globally	Transform oppressive structures and politics of knowledge through empowerment, voice, activism; framed by critical pedagogy	Political and existential questions and commitments kept in tension; interrupt enchantment with modernity; uncoercively rearrange desires; unlearn, work without guarantees
Example	21 Day Challenge	ACU Beyond 2015	UNILA	Bill Calhoun’s project

Different Readings of the Internationalization Cartography

Precisely because social cartography is interactive and performative rather than static and representational, we recognize that we cannot control how the resulting maps are received, and therefore, there is a need to account for multiple potential readings. Based on our own experiences presenting this cartography to different audiences, a common way of reading it has been to understand the four approaches to internationalization as discrete choices, as if the map were a menu of distinct options. This also led some to engage in a related reading of the map as if it charted a progressive development of critical sophistication, moving from left to right on the summary Table 1. Alternatively, some understood the map as an invitation to determine which combination of the four approaches best approximated a particular program at their own institution or department.

Recognizing this tendency to engage in representational interpretations, we sought to expand available readings of the map by initially presenting only the first column of the table, and then inviting responses. Many people noted that they could identify this approach in their institution, and often had thoughtfully considered critiques of its narrow possibilities for global engagement. We then presented column two, which prompted some people to remark that it captured some limitations of column one, and to recognize similar patterns in their institutions. It was only

after substantive discussion of columns one and two that we presented columns three and then four, which we framed not as “better” alternatives but rather as provocations and invitations for people to engage with the limitations of the first two approaches—in particular the possibilities that could not be imagined from within them—as well as to self-reflexively consider their own investments in elements of all four articulations. We also emphasized that the latter two approaches come with their own limitations, and that this was not an exhaustive list of all available possibilities for internationalization, including those still “yet to come.”

Particularly given that many higher education institutions are funded and regulated by nation-states, and are significantly bound up with global flows of capital through university-industry research partnerships, grant funding, student loan debt, and other avenues (Bousquet, 2008; Calderone & Rhoads, 2005; Chaput, 2008; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), we argue that internationalization for the global knowledge economy and the global public good are the two most common approaches at universities in both the Global North and South (Nandy, 2000). These articulations are firmly rooted in both the content and the frame of the dominant, modern/colonial global imaginary, including its commitments to Western-defined notions of progress, social mobility, and success, though they have somewhat different emphases.

Although examples of anti-oppressive or relational translocalist approaches may be found within mainstream higher education institutions, these are nonetheless not likely to be dominant, and where they do exist, they are often marginalized, or operate unsanctioned or “under the radar.” We suggest that much of the difficulty of enacting the third and fourth articulations within mainstream institutional settings exists because these articulations contest the dominant global imaginary, particularly the fourth articulation which raises questions about the basic purposes and structures of the modern university itself. These articulations challenge many institutional imperatives, including much of what has come to be expected by students and others funding higher education (including local and national governments), such as the dissemination of state-sanctioned knowledge as well as the development of knowledge and skills recognizable as “human capital.”

In light of these challenges, there remains much conceptual and practical work to be done to support the exploration of the possibilities offered by these two articulations. At the same time, to explore the possibilities and risks offered by each of the four articulations (as well as other possible articulations that we did not map), it will be necessary to experiment with pedagogies that do not presume it is either feasible or desirable for educators to limit their students’ international engagements to any one approach. Rather, we argue for critically-informed examination of all available possibilities and of the dominant global imaginary itself, including self-reflexive consideration of individual and institutional investments and complicities in potentially harmful patterns of engagement.

Conclusion: Shifting Conversations about Internationalization

Our experiments with social cartographies have been driven by our collective desire to move conversations about internationalization from comfortable spaces that reaffirm benevolence, redemption, and innocence, towards deeper historical and systemic analyses and the development of new vocabularies that would enable us to engage with the complexities, tensions, difficulties, and paradoxes of this field. If these different conversations can take us to the edge of the enduring modern/colonial global imaginary, then we might learn to sit with the challenge of facing our own investments in the harmful systems that reproduce a severely uneven distribution of resources and labour, valuation of life, and politics of knowledge production, and that circumscribe available

possibilities for relationships and structures of being. Perhaps it is only by exhausting the “desire to transcend” these systems “without giving anything up” that we can face the difficult task of imagining something radically different (Jefferess, 2012, p. 19).

In other words, if the realm of what is possible to imagine is grounded in existing investments and satisfactions, derived as they often are from the same system that creates the problems we are trying to address, we need conversations that can invite us to engage the realm of the seemingly impossible from within the imaginary we have inherited. In this sense, social cartographies might help to clarify paradoxes, tensions, and differences between orientations and also take us to generative spaces of disillusionment. It is in this space that we might also be able to quieten the modern/colonial demand for self-affirmation and heroic self-centering agency, and learn to listen to the silence of possibilities that have been rendered unintelligible and invisible.

References

- ACU. (2013). *The world beyond 2015—Is higher education ready?* Retrieved from <https://beyond2015.acu.ac.uk/>
- Adamson, M. (2009). The human capital strategy. *ephemera: theory & politics in organization*, 9(4), 271-284.
- Adnett, N. (2010). The growth of international students and economic development: Friends or foes? *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(5), 625-637.
- Ahenakew, C., Andreotti, V., Cooper, G., & Hireme, H. (2014). Beyond epistemic provincialism: De-provincializing Indigenous resistance. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 10(3): 216-231.
- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Alexander, M. J. (2005). *Pedagogies of crossing: Meditations on feminism, sexual politics, memory and the sacred*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Altbach, P. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(1), 3-25.
- Andreotti, V. (2007). An ethical engagement with the other: Spivak’s ideas on education. *Critical literacy: Theories and practices*, 1(1), 69-79.
- Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Andreotti, V. (2014). Conflicting epistemic demands in poststructuralist and postcolonial engagements with questions of complicity in systemic harm. *Educational Studies*, 50(4), 378-397.
- Andreotti, V. D. O., Stein, S., Pashby, K., & Nicholson, M. (2016). Social cartographies as performative devices in research on higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1125857>
- Ayers, D. F. (2005). Neoliberal ideology in community college mission statements: A critical discourse analysis. *The Review of Higher Education*, 28(4), 527-549.
- Biccup, A. (2010). *Global citizenship and the legacy of empire: Marketing development*. London: Routledge.
- Boden, R., & Epstein, D. (2006). Managing the research imagination? Globalisation and research in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4(2), 223-236.
- Bousquet, M. (2008). *How the university works: Higher education and the low-wage nation*. New York: New York University.
- Brackman, M. M. (2010). Internacionalização da educação superior e política externa Brasileira: Estudo da criação da Universidade Federal da Integração Latino-Americana (UNILA).
- Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 62(Winter), 15-17.
- Brennan, J., & Naidoo, R. (2008). Higher education and the achievement (and/or prevention) of equity and social justice. *Higher Education*, 56(3), 287-302.
- Brown, P. & Tannock, S. (2009). Education, meritocracy and the global war for talent. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(4), 377-392.
- Bruce, J. (2013). Service learning as a pedagogy of interruption. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 5(1), 33-47.
- Bryan, A. (2013). “The impulse to help”: (Post) humanitarianism in an era of the “new” development advocacy. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 5(2), 5-29.
- Brydon, D., & Dvorak, M. (2012). *Crosstalk: Canadian and global imaginaries in dialogue*. Waterloo:

Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

- Cajete, G. (2000). *Native science: Natural laws of interdependence*. Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers.
- Calderone, S., & Rhoads, R. A. (2005). The mythology of the “disappearing nation-state”: National competitive advantage through state-university collaboration. *Education and Society*, 23(1), 5-23.
- Callan, H. (2000). Higher education internationalization strategies: Of marginal significance or all-pervasive? The international vision in practice: A decade of evolution. *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(1), 15-23.
- Cantwell, B., & Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2009). Four stories: Confronting contemporary ideas about globalisation and internationalisation in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 7(3), 289-306.
- Chaput, C. (2008). *Inside the teaching machine: Rhetoric and the globalization of the US public research university*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Chatterjee, P., & Maira, S. (Eds.). (2014). *The imperial university: Academic repression and scholarly dissent*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- de Wit, H. (2014). The different faces and phases of internationalisation of higher education. In A. Maldonado-Maldonado and R.M. Bassett (Eds.), *The forefront of international higher education: A Festschrift in honor of Philip G. Altbach* (pp. 89-99). Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media.
- Deem, R., Mok, K. H., & Lucas, L. (2008). Transforming higher education in whose image? Exploring the concept of the “world-class” university in Europe and Asia. *Higher Education Policy*, 21, 83-97.
- Deneulin, S., & Townsend, N. (2007). Public goods, global public goods and the common good. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 34(1/2), 19-36.
- Dodds, A. (2008). How does globalization interact with higher education? The continuing lack of consensus. *Comparative Education*, 44(4), 505-517.
- Donald, D. (in press). Homo economicus and forgetful curriculum: Remembering other ways to be a human being.
- Gaonkar, D. P. (2002). Toward new imaginaries: An introduction. *Public Culture*, 14(1), 1-19.
- Gibb, T., & Walker, J. (2011). Educating for a high skills society? The landscape of federal employment, training and lifelong learning policy in Canada. *Journal of Education Policy*, 3, 381-398.
- Gonzalez, G. (1982). Imperial reform in the neo-colonies: The University of California's basic plan for higher education in Colombia. *Journal of Education*, 330-350.
- Grenier, F. (2013). The global educational challenge: How Canada can contribute to global developmental solutions through innovation in higher education. *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, 19(3), 354-367.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2013). The structure of knowledge in Westernized universities. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, 11(1).
- Heron, B. (2007). *Desire for development: Whiteness, gender and the helping imperative*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Hong, G. K. (2008). "The future of our worlds": Black feminism and the politics of knowledge in the university under globalization. *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism*, 8(2), 95-115.
- Jefferess, D. (2012). The ‘me to we’ social enterprise: Global education as lifestyle brand. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 6(1), 18-30.
- Kapoor, I. (2014). Psychoanalysis and development: contributions, examples, limits. *Third World Quarterly*, 35(7), 1120-1143.
- Kaul, I., Grunberg, I., & Stern, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Global public goods: International cooperation in the 21st century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Knight, J. (2007). Internationalization: Concepts, complexities and challenges. In J.J.F. Forest & P.G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 207-227). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Knight, J. (2014). Is internationalisation of higher education having an identity crisis? In A. Maldonado-Maldonado and R.M. Bassett (Eds.), *The forefront of international higher education: A Festschrift in honor of Philip G. Altbach* (pp. 75-87). Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media.
- Madge, C., Raghuram, P., & Noxolo, P. (2015). Conceptualizing international education: From international student to international study. *Progress in Human Geography*, 39(6), 681-701.
- Marginson, S. (2007). The public/private divide in higher education: A global revision. *Higher Education*, 53(3), 307-333.
- Melamed, J. (2006). The spirit of neoliberalism: From racial liberalism to neoliberal multiculturalism. *Social Text*, (24), 1-24.

- Metcalfe, A. S., & Fenwick, T. (2009). Knowledge for whose society? Knowledge production, higher education, and federal policy in Canada. *Higher Education*, 57(2), 209-225.
- Mignolo, W. (2003). Globalization and the geopolitics of knowledge: The role of the humanities in the corporate university. *Nepantla: Views from South*, 4(1), 97-119.
- Morrish, L., & Sauntson, H. (2013). "Business-facing motors for economic development": An appraisal analysis of visions and values in the marketised UK university. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 10(1), 61-80.
- Moten, F. (2014). Wykład prof. Freda Motena: Performans i "czarność" [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://vimeo.com/100330139>
- Naidoo, R. (2010). Global learning in a neoliberal age: Implications for development. In E. Unterhalter & V. Carpentier (Eds.), *Global inequalities in higher education: Whose interests are we serving?* (pp. 66-90). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nandy, A. (2000). Recovery of indigenous knowledge and dissenting futures of the university. In S. Inayatullah and J. Gidley (Eds.) *The university in transformation: Global perspectives on the futures of the university* (pp. 115-123). Westport: Bergin and Harvey.
- Nokkala, T. (2006). Knowledge society discourse in internationalization of higher education. *Revista Española de Educación Comparada*, 12, 171-201.
- Ozga, J., & Jones, R. (2006). Travelling and embedded policy: The case of knowledge transfer. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21(1), 1-17.
- Paasi, A. (2013). Fennia: positioning a 'peripheral' but international journal under conditions of academic capitalism. *Fennia*, 191(1), 1-13.
- Paulston, R. (Ed.). (2000). *Social cartography: Mapping ways of seeing social and educational change*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Peters, M. A. (2003). Classical political economy and the role of universities in the new knowledge economy. *Globalisation, societies and education*, 1(2), 153-168.
- Rhoads, R. A. (2011). The US research university as a global model: Some fundamental problems to consider. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, 7(2), 1-27.
- Rizvi, F. (2008). Epistemic virtues and cosmopolitan learning. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 35(1), 17-35.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. London: Routledge.
- Rizvi, F., & Savage, G. C. (2015). From imagination to social imaginary: Some notes on the 'imaginative turn' in education policy studies. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.
- Robertson, S. L. (2005). Re-imagining and rescripting the future of education: Global knowledge economy discourses and the challenge to education systems. *Comparative Education*, 41(2), 151-170.
- Sachs, J. D. (2005). *The end of poverty: Economic possibilities of our time*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Sauntson, H., & Morrish, L. (2010). Vision, values and international excellence: The "products" that university mission statements sell to students. In M. Molesworth, R. Scullion & E. Nixon (Eds.). *The marketisation of higher education and the student as consumer* (pp. 73-85). London: Routledge.
- Shultz, L. (2015). Claiming to be global: An exploration of ethical, political, and justice questions. *Comparative and International Education/Éducation Comparée et Internationale*, 44(1).
- Shahjahan, R.A. (2013). Coloniality and a global testing regime in higher education: unpacking the OECD's AHELO initiative. *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(5), 676-694.
- Silva, D. F. D. (2013). To be announced: Radical praxis or knowing (at) the limits of justice. *Social Text*, 31(1 114), 43-62.
- Silva, D. F. D. (2015). Globality. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, 1(1), 33-38.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (2012). *An aesthetic education in the era of globalization*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Steger, M. (2008). *The rise of the global imaginary: Political ideologies from the French revolution to the global war on terror*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 2(1), 83-97.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (1999). *Knowledge as a global public good*. Washington: The World Bank.
- Suspitsyna, T. (2015). Cultural hierarchies in the discursive representations of China in the "Chronicle of Higher Education." *Critical Studies in Education*, 56(1), 21-37.

- Tannock, S. (2009). Global meritocracy, nationalism and the question of whom we must treat equally for educational opportunity to be equal. *Critical Studies in Education*, 50(2), 201-211.
- Tarc, P., Clark, J. B., & Varpalotai, A. (2013). Theorizing international education: (Shifting) contexts, concepts, methods. *Comparative and International Education/Éducation Comparée et Internationale*, 41(3).
- Taylor, C. (2002). Modern social imaginaries. *Public Culture*, 14(1), 91-124.
- Teichler, U. (2010). Internationalising higher education: Debates and changes in Europe. In D. Mattheou (Ed.), *Changing educational landscapes: Educational policies, schooling systems and higher education – A comparative perspective* (pp. 263-283). Springer Netherlands.
- Tikly, L. P. (2004). Education and the new imperialism. *Comparative Education*, 40(2), 173-198.
- Tlostanova, M. V., & Mignolo, W. (2012). *Learning to unlearn: Decolonial reflections from Eurasia and the Americas*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
- UC Student Blog. (2015, May 8). 21 Day International Challenge—Week one. Retrieved from <http://blogs.canterbury.ac.nz/insiders/2015/05/08/21-day-international-challenge-week-one/>
- UNILA (n.d.). *Relações Internacionais: Cooperação Solidária: Brasil e países da América Latina*. Retrieved from <http://www.unila.edu.br/conteudo/rela%C3%A7%C3%B5es-internacionais>.
- The University of Canterbury (2015a). Help change the world with the 21 Day International Challenge [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/future-students/news/2015/help-change-the-world-with-the-21-day-international-challenge.html>
- The University of Canterbury (2015b). UC students start their 21-Day International Challenge [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.comsdev.canterbury.ac.nz/rss/news/?feed=news&articleId=1694>
- The University of Canterbury Business and Law (2015a). 21 Day International Challenge: More details. Retrieved from <http://www.buslaw.canterbury.ac.nz/news/21DayInfo.shtml>
- The University of Canterbury Business and Law (2015b). 21 Day International Challenge: Student teams. Retrieved from <http://www.buslaw.canterbury.ac.nz/news/Students.shtml>
- The University of Canterbury Business and Law (2015c). Linda Cruse—Humanitarian aid worker. Retrieved from <http://www.buslaw.canterbury.ac.nz/news/21DayLinda.shtml>
- Wainwright, J. (2008). *Decolonizing development: Colonial power and the Maya*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wanyenya, P., & Lester-Smith, D. (2015). Neoliberalism and public university agendas: Tensions along the global/local divide. *Journal of Feminist Scholarship*, 7-8, 93-101.
- Wilder, C. S. (2013). *Ebony and ivy: Race, slavery, and the troubled history of America's universities*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation--An argument. *CR: The New Centennial Review*, 3(3), 257-337.
- Zemach-Bersin, T. (2007). Global citizenship & study abroad: It's all about U.S. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 1(2), 16-28.

Sharon Stein is a PhD candidate in the Department of Educational Studies at the University of British Columbia, Canada. Her research examines the complexities and contradictions of internationalization in higher education, and the educational challenges of imagining alternative futures.

Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti is a Canada Research Chair in Race, Inequalities and Global Change at the University of British Columbia, Canada. Her research examines historical and systemic patterns of reproduction of inequalities and how these limit or enable possibilities for collective existence and global change.

Judy Bruce lectures at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. She is primarily involved in teacher education, and has recently completed research on ways of framing ethical relationality within education. Her research primarily intersects fields of global citizenship education, higher education, service-learning and community engagement.

Rene Suša is a PhD candidate at the University of Oulu, Finland. His research focuses on critiques of modernity and the modern subject based on postcolonial and decolonial thought. More specifically he is interested in how modern subjectivities are being re-inscribed in the processes of internationalization of higher education.

Copyright of Comparative & International Education is the property of Canadian & International Education and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.