

Globalization/s: Reproduction and Resistance in the Internationalization of Higher Education

Kumari Beck

Simon Fraser University

Abstract

Internationalization of higher education has become a significant feature of the Canadian educational landscape. Considered to be a product of and response to globalization, internationalization is being critiqued for having an economic orientation. This paper will begin with a brief overview of internationalization research in Canada, and the main focus is a conceptual discussion prompted by the relationship between internationalization and globalization. Informed by sociological and cultural studies' accounts of the multiple dimensions of globalization, I argue that an uncritical pursuit of internationalization can result in a reproduction of the economic dimensions of globalization, and yet resistance to commodification can be found in other dimensions of globalization that offer useful theoretical bases for both research and practice in Canadian internationalization.

Keywords: internationalization of higher education, globalization, international education

Résumé

L'internationalisation de l'enseignement supérieur est devenue un élément important du paysage éducatif canadien. Considérée à la fois comme un produit et une réponse à la mondialisation, l'internationalisation est critiquée pour avoir une orientation économique. Cet article commence par un bref aperçu de l'internationalisation dans la recherche au Canada, et l'accent est mis ensuite sur une discussion conceptuelle motivée par la relation entre l'internationalisation et la mondialisation. Renseigné par des études socioculturelles qui font état des multiples dimensions de la mondialisation, je soutiens que la poursuite non critique de l'internationalisation peut se traduire par une reproduction des dimensions économiques de la mondialisation, et pourtant la résistance à la marchandisation peut être trouvée dans d'autres dimensions de la mondialisation, ce qui offre des bases théoriques utiles à la recherche et à la pratique en matière d'internationalisation au Canada.

Mots-clés: Internationalisation de l'enseignement supérieur, la mondialisation, l'éducation internationale

Globalization/s: Reproduction and Resistance in the Internationalization of Higher Education

Internationalization is changing the world of higher education, and globalization is changing the world of internationalization.

(Knight, 2004, p. 5)

To call globalization a form of human imaginary, opens the possibility for that imaginary to be not only critiqued but also revised when subject to influences that can reveal its limitations.

(Smith, 1999a, p. 4)

We are surrounded by images, messages, news bytes, and constant reminders that we are part of ‘one world,’ whether through natural disasters, human-generated crises, commercial messages to consume, media and technology-assisted connectivity, or as part of the ongoing everyday movement of ideas, people, and things within and across borders. These mobilities and flows are exerting an enormous influence on many aspects of our life, education included. As we are called on in this Special Edition to reflect on the shifting landscape of Canadian education in globalized times, my own commentary will be located in the rapidly changing terrain of a particular field of education that is considered to be a product of and even a response to globalization: international education and the phenomenon known as internationalization of higher education.

The prevalent understanding of internationalization, widely used by Canadian universities and colleges, is that it is a process integrating an inter-cultural and international dimension into all areas of the university (Knight, 2003). Internationalization of higher education is not considered to be the same as globalization (Knight, 2004), although in recent times internationalization scholars such as de Wit (2011) are concluding that “it seems that both terms act like two connected universes, making it impossible to draw a distinctive line between them” (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011, p. 16). In the face of these apparent connections and contestations, it is surprising, however, that apart from a few assertions—such as the Knight (2004) quote about the two phenomena—there is little consideration in Canadian research on internationalization of the relationship between globalization and internationalization. Are there distinctions between the phenomena and, if so, what are they? What are the influences of globalization on higher education, and the internationalization of higher education? What are the implications for practice in Canadian higher education? What rationales and theoretical foundations drive internationalization, and how is research supporting its development?

The apparent reluctance to explore these questions may be related to the common association of internationalization with the manifestation of neoliberal discourses of globalization (Smith, 1999b). I have argued elsewhere that theorizing internationalization must begin with an analysis of the complex connections between globalization and internationalization to both critique harmful influences and to also re-align internationalization towards ethical and principled practices (Beck, 2009). As Marginson and Rhoades (2002) argue, globalization is simply identified in educational discourse rather than theorized. In this paper, I will take up the call to theorize globalization, and will consider the desirable and unintended consequences of the

influences of one on the other, examining in particular the possibilities for re-imagining internationalization. In other words, I am interested in seeing how recognizing multiple globalizations may also encourage us to recognize a multiplicity in internationalization processes, to provide points of theoretical pathways to resist the influences of instrumentalist rationales. A conceptual discussion of these issues will be the focus of this paper—a discussion, I argue, whose implications are important for Canadian internationalization efforts.

I will begin with a very brief overview of what is known about Canadian internationalization, identifying the gaps in our knowledge. From that point I will provide an overview of the visible and invisible connections among globalization, higher education, and internationalization and show how internationalization has taken on an entrepreneurial and market-oriented dimension. An analysis of how globalization is influencing practices of internationalization in the direction of commodification is a necessary step in order to challenge and resist these trends. I will then turn my attention specifically to globalization. While we commonly attribute a singular, unitary status to globalization, mostly the economic, it is complex, multidimensional, and fluid, leading us to consider globalization/s in its plurality.

It is important to understand the complexity of globalization and how it operates in order to see that there are dimensions beyond the economic. The cultural dimensions of globalization are one such avenue for exploration. I will select three themes—namely, the local-global, space and place, and Appadurai's (1990; 1996) notions of globalization and indigenization as an imaginary—to illustrate how these tropes offer possibilities for resistance to the dominant voice of the economic dimension. We need such pathways to move internationalization away from what Luke (2010) calls 'edu-business' towards more educational, sustainable, life-serving practices. I suggest that a re-imagining of globalization and an ability to counter some of the harmful effects, such as the current market orientation of higher education, are connected to having a deeper understanding of the complexity and even contradictory nature of globalization. Following a discussion of how these themes are useful for research and practices of internationalization, I will conclude by tying these conceptual conversations back to the Canadian context and demonstrating their usefulness in moving Canadian internationalization initiatives forward.

The Status Quo of Canadian Internationalization

The early Canadian research on internationalization surveyed administrators and practitioners to generate definitions about internationalization (Frances, 1993; Knight, 1994; McKellin, 1998). More extensive national surveys followed with findings relating to the status of internationalization across the country (AUCC 2007; Knight, 1995, 2000). Key findings included claims of increased attention to and increasing evidence of international activities, programs, mobility, and so on, leading to the conclusion that internationalization was becoming more mainstream and attracting increasing support from institutions. These studies illuminated the growing understanding of internationalization as a process rather than a collection of strategies that are designated or that specifically promote 'international' such as the recruitment of international students, study abroad programs, exchanges, and so on (Knight, 1995, 2000, 2004). The findings also confirm, however, that internationalization is still not widely understood. Another key finding of two influential national surveys (AUCC, 2007; Knight, 2000) is the notion that an academic rationale drives internationalization, a finding that I have challenged in earlier work (Beck, 2008, 2012).

Jane Knight's groundbreaking scholarship on institutional frameworks and structures—in addition to her review of models, rationales, and strategies—has been seminal in its influence in shaping practice, policy, and quality assurance in Canada and internationally (e.g., Knight, 1994, 1995, 2000, 2004). Institutional frameworks have been strengthened by recent attention to policies in the context of national issues such as labour markets, immigration, and government support of academic mobility (Bond, Areepattamannil, Braithwaite-Sturgeon, Hayle, & Malekan 2007; Desai Trilokekar, Jones, & Shubert, 2009; Qiang, 2003). Faculty experience in internationalization initiatives has received greater attention recently (Barndt, 2009; Bond, 2009; Hanson, 2009) and these studies problematize the prevailing definitions of internationalizing the curriculum (as infusion), illustrate the role of faculty in internationalization, and raise questions about the usefulness of making distinctions between internationalization and issues in diversity and equity in learning and teaching at the university. What we currently know about internationalization and higher education in Canada can be summarized as follows: internationalization is a common component of institutional mission statements and a key aspect of their strategic plans (Jones, 2011), and over 200 higher education institutions engage in international activity (AUCC, n.d). International activities, programs, and initiatives in universities and colleges across Canada have increased dramatically, both in numbers and diversity, over the past decade (Jones, 2011; McMullen & Angelo 2011; Savage, 2005). A majority of post-secondary institutions in Canada agree that internationalization is a high priority for their institutions (AUCC, 2007; Knight, 2000). These activities are sanctioned on the basis that academic rationales and objectives drive them. However, in the absence of more evidence that educational goals of promoting international and intercultural knowledges are being realized, and over-intensified activity in recruitment of international students, these claims are hardly substantiated (Beck, 2008). Knight (2008) has noted a propensity towards an economic rationale with intensified competition in the recruitment of international students, branding, the increase of study abroad programs and exchanges, cross-border delivery of programs including satellite campuses, partnerships with universities in 'developing countries' for the delivery of sought-after educational programs, all contributing towards this trend (Knight, 2008).

In summary, some of the key gaps in Canadian research on internationalization relate to a conceptual confusion in the field; the lack of understanding of the perspectives, practices, and experiences of the participants engaged in internationalization; the implications of this on how internationalization is conceptualized and practised; little attention to curriculum (Bond, 2009); and almost none related to pedagogy (Beck, 2008). In a recent conference presentation on globalizing Canadian universities, Glen Jones (2011) identified how overall, there is little research on internationalization in Canadian universities, and no comparative data or case studies on institutional experiences. There is an urgent need to investigate the complexity of internationalization if knowledge about internationalization is to be advanced.

As mentioned earlier, my focus in this paper is to demonstrate the salience of engaging in a conceptual discussion on globalization and internationalization in order to align internationalization practices with desirable educational outcomes.

Globalization, Higher Education, and Internationalization

Globalization and internationalization are not the same, assert some scholars, although many confuse one for the other (Altbach, 2004; Altbach & Knight, 2007; Knight, 2003; Matthews, 2002). Knight (2003) sees globalization as influencing internationalization, asserting

that they are not one and the same, but does not articulate how they are different. She emphasizes the use of a non-ideological definition of globalization (although this notion itself is problematic), illustrating how the very use of the term globalization in association with internationalization may cause a defensiveness. In a later article, Knight and Altbach describe the influence of globalization on internationalization as “the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290), and identify the strong influence of global capital on the emergence of a knowledge society. The distinction between the two phenomena, in their view, is one of agency: globalization “may be unalterable, but internationalization involves many choices” (p. 291). It appears, however, that this agentic option in internationalization has been little exercised if, indeed, economic, social, and political forces are the drivers of higher education, these being key influences on internationalization itself. Altbach and Knight (2007) assert that internationalization is “a two-way street” (p. 291), but acknowledge that power and control of educational mobility, knowledge production and cross-border delivery resides with Northern universities. Power relations would appear to be a strong factor in the creation of the internationalized knowledge economy and the ‘two-way street’ of internationalized relations a wish rather than reality.

Turning to scholarship on globalization, the connections between globalization and many elements of planetary life, both human and non-human are well-studied and commented on. Influences on education have been taken up on research in diverse aspects of educational domains. It is not my intention here to chart the evolution of these developments in understanding the influences of globalization on higher education except to establish that this analysis has become more commonplace and widely accepted.

The literature strongly supports the argument that economic globalization is making its mark on education (e.g., Bartell, 2003; Bond & Lemasson, 1999; Cambridge, 2002; Edwards & Usher, 2000; Rizvi & Lingard, 2000; Unterhalter & Carpentier, 2010). This trend has been noted in higher education as well (e.g., Altbach, 2004; Altbach & Knight, 2007; Bartell, 2003; Brustein, 2007; Burbules & Torres 2000; Edwards & Usher 2000; Häyrynen-Alestalo & Peltola 2006; Knight, 2011; Marginson, 2004, 2006; Odin & Manicas 2004; Rizvi & Lingard, 2000; Smith, 2006). Furthermore, many of the scholars cited above have argued that universities are becoming more consumer- and market-oriented. As Dixon summarizes,

The move of the university from a service profile to a market profile has caused significant concern and dilemmas for academics and university policy makers. Universities are seen to be forced into the market place in ways that are reshaping them in their purposes and in the knowledge they create and disseminate. (Dixon, 2006, p. 320)

As an example of this trend, Edwards and Usher (2000, chap. 4) citing Lyotard's (1984, cited on p. 76 - 81) analysis of knowledge production in postmodernity, describe this in terms of “performativity,” which means performing to external demands, a phenomenon that has increased with globalization. They describe performativity as being located within wider discursive practices of economic globalization, neo-liberal economics, and competitiveness. Thus, education becomes the means of attaining and maintaining the flexibility that is considered necessary in the face of the technological and socio-economic change required by globalizing conditions. It is “restructured as part of the economy ... no longer viewed as a universal welfare right so much as a form of investment in the development of skills that will enhance global

competitiveness” (Peterse, 1996, cited in Edwards & Usher, 2000, p. 76). The resulting orientation of higher education to market influences suggests that these considerations cannot be ignored in internationalization itself.

Scholars known for their strong promotion of the benefits of internationalization for higher education have, in recent years, been expressing alarm and dismay over the dominance of commercial interests and ideologies in internationalization (Brandenberg & de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2011). Reporting on a 2005 International Association of Universities (IAU) Survey on internationalization worldwide, Knight (2007) highlights that the commercialization of higher education programs is one of the top three risks and areas of concern identified by participants in the study confirming the global trend towards the market model of internationalization. Brandenberg and de Wit (2011) have even proclaimed the death of internationalization, proposing a post-internationalization era, which would move away from commodification to educational and academic goals and values. These and other authors (e.g., Unterhalter & Carpentier, 2010) are strident in their denouncement of the ‘business’ of international education. If globalization and internationalization are different phenomena—and if, as Knight and Altbach suggest, there are choices to be made in internationalization—how then did internationalization go the way of economic globalization? Where can agency be found? As Brandenberg and de Wit (2011) suggest, can the current state of internationalization be more accurately described as the globalization of higher education? A closer look at the terrain of globalization would be helpful to understand if, indeed, there are more desirable pathways that Canadian institutions can follow in the internationalization of higher education.

Seeking Agency

Dixon (2009) observes that globalization is thus “neither fixed nor certain ... [and u]nderstanding of globalisation and notions of time, space, subjectivity, and agency are socially constructed, multiple, and complex” (p. 320). The complexity of the phenomena then becomes a problem for the researcher, as there are multiple entry points into the debates and discussion around globalization. Waters (1995) identifies the different approaches possible; for example, social, cultural, political, economic, and so on. There are limitations when selecting any strand of analysis to the exclusion of others, as well as the recognition that such analyses are partial and irreducible. On the other hand, this is not grounds for neglecting such explorations and the possibilities they offer to tread new theoretical paths in support of complex phenomena such as internationalization. The economic dimensions of globalization itself provide grounds for much debate, critique, and analysis, but to proceed with my argument, it is not the only dimension. Indeed, it is to avoid this single account of globalization and examine aspects of its complexity and ambiguity that is the present task, and in order to do so, I will now examine sociological accounts of the nature and forces of globalization and have selected the themes of global and local, space and place, and Appadurai’s account of globalization ‘scapes’ to situate my discussion. More importantly, I am making a case that these analyses will provide a useful counterpoint to the popular economic discourse on globalization, and a space from which to launch a response to the dominant ‘economic fundamentalism’ (Smith, 1999b) generated by globalization.

Smith (1999b) described globalizations in terms of two modalities: a “kind of imaginary. ... a construct of human imagination that serves to organize and mobilize certain forms of action in certain ways” (Smith, 1999b, p. 2); and “a facticity of globalization” (p. 3), which identifies

all of the dimensions of globalization, the globalizing acts as well as those acts of resistance and response. Smith locates agency in the spaces between the intentions of the actors of the first group and the actions of the second. Following this line of thought, I ask whether we could identify the imaginary of internationalization, the ‘wish’ or ‘desirability’ for internationalization to bring benefits of intercultural and international knowledges and experiences to higher education through international activities and programs, learning and teaching within and across borders. Continuing on, how could the facticity of internationalization (the many dimensions, the commercial aspect, and those acts of resistance) be identified so that ‘choices’ referred to by Altbach and Knight (2007) related to internationalization can be made effectively? I will continue with this process of revisioning with the next stage of discussion.

Local and Global

The tropes ‘local’ and ‘global’ have been employed in global sociology to explain globalization (Giddens, 1990; McGrew, 1992; Robertson, 1990) and in the popular imagination are upheld as opposites describing globalization as the local being superseded by the global, or the global as the homogenizing force that engulfs the local. The phenomenon is more complex. Giddens (1990) describes the process as consisting of “mutually opposed tendencies” (p. 64). He posits that globalization results in ‘disembedding’—a “‘lifting out’ of social relations from local contexts of interaction and their restructuring across indefinite spaces of time-space” (1990, p. 21). Thus, for Giddens, globalization is a stretching of worldwide social relations (p. 64), a process much more complex than a mere inter-connectedness between nation-states. This stretching reduces the significance of local activities and events over people’s lives and their autonomy, continuing the cycle of disembedding.

Carrying this discussion forward, Robertson (1992, 1997), theorizes globalization as a complex and sometimes contradictory interplay between the particular and the universal. This complex interaction and synthesis of globalizing and localizing tendencies means that the boundaries of local and global as separate entities have become blurred, and one cannot exist without the other. As Edwards and Usher (2000) argue, each must be understood as part of the other.

How do these tropes play out in internationalization? Strategies of internationalization such as study abroad, the recruitment of international students, and exchange programs tend to promote fixed ideas of the global as ‘going out there’ and the local as being ‘here,’ particularly in relation to culture and the notion of intercultural literacy. It would be important in the conceptualization of internationalization and its practices to recognize the porousness of the boundaries between global and local in moving to a more fluid understanding of internationalization. In considering the stretching of relationships and disembedding, the desire for international study itself is a good example of how global trends supersede and, indeed, become the local. In seeking more equitable or balanced responses to this trend, in what ways can the practices of international education identify and recognize local needs, values, practices, and identities of those who arrive in Canada to learn? Furthermore, the notion of internationalization as creating diversity by inviting the presence of international students from ‘somewhere else’ ignores the already existing and proliferating cultural diversity of local Canadian communities, which not only carry the global as its local, but also the important element of indigeneity as an ignored but significant aspect of the local.

Such interrogations of the global and local surface yet another key consideration in internationalization; namely, the colonial antecedents of international education both ‘here’ and

‘there.’ The connections between colonization and globalization have not gone unnoticed in identifying how power relations established through colonizing processes continue to be exacerbated through new economic and cultural relations (Ashcroft, 2001; McMurtry, 1998; Prasad, 2003; Smith, 2006; Young, 2001). The impetus to educate beyond and within our borders was tinged with the drive to improve and help those seen as backwards, needing our help, and seeking improvement. A discussion of these issues is outside the scope of this paper, but is important to identify as an element of how the local and global become instantiated through the legacy of colonial relationships. As Willinsky (1998) has argued, the forms of dependency created by colonization have left a legacy not only on the colonized, but rather a legacy that has shaped many of our present ideas about education.

Place and Space

As globalization is about movement—the movement of people, ideas, things across borders—it is inevitable that this movement and the consequences of globalization will disrupt notions of place, home, space, and time. “[T]he warp of these stabilities is everywhere shot through with the woof of human motion” (Appadurai, 1990, p. 297).

In this sense, globalization has been seen as ‘re-imagining geography’ (Edwards & Usher, 2000, p. 14). As the boundaries of geographical place are dissolving with space-time compression (Robertson, 1990), they present varied impacts. Waters (1995) uses the phenomenon of fragmentation of place to describe globalization as “a social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede, and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding” (p. 3). Appadurai (1990) theorizes this as one of deterritorialization where locale no longer defines identity.

To illustrate the co-existence of contradictory phenomena, a feature of globalization, Edwards and Usher (2000) argue that the heightened consciousness of the world as ‘one place’ produced by globalization results in an increased, intensified awareness of the “interconnectedness of local ecologies, economies and societies, of the significance of place and location” (p. 10). Their work is particularly concerned with globalization as a ‘conceptualization of space’ and its reconfiguration both physical and imagined (p. 15). They map the resulting tensions between local and global identifying the co-existence of paradoxical forces. Hence, there is at once the experience of disembeddedness and an acute awareness of the significance of place and location. Edwards and Usher (1998, 2000) provide ample food for thought on this issue of positioning and location.

“Globalization, by surfacing the locatedness of each and all, highlights the significance of location and practices of locating” (Edwards & Usher, 1998, p. 160). They trace the emergence of metaphors of location and space in proposing a theory of pedagogy for contemporary times and argue that positioning and being positioned “entail forms of dislocation – of disidentifying and being positioned as other, and where *positioning is itself mobile*, always on the move” (p. 160, emphasis added). Referring to globalization as “(dis)location” (p. 160), they follow Brah (1996, cited on p. 160) in theorizing it as a “diaspora space,” unbounded, not closed, and marking “an intersectionality of contemporary conditions of transmigration of people, capital, commodities and culture” (Brah, 1996, cited on p. 160). In explaining their concept of (dis)location, they cite Laclau (1990, cited on p. 160) and the notion that dislocation indicates a decentred condition where new and multiple identities and situations can emerge from a diversity of locations. The use of parentheses in the word indicates the simultaneity of how location and dislocation exist together; in other words, “a positioning with simultaneously

one and many positions” (p. 161). It produces the simultaneous feeling of being neither here nor there, and yet being of here and there. Drawing on Derrida (1981, cited on p. 161) they argue that while (dis)location is a decentering of privileged locating forces, a refusal to privilege a certain position or voice, that decentering is never complete as “locating processes will always be present” (p. 161).

The concepts of ‘positioning on the move’ and (dis)location add a layer of complexity to the theorizing of how globalization operates through the tropes of local, locale, and location, and in particular, of the people caught up in these movements. These theories become useful in the analysis and discussion on ‘locating’ students, for example, and other actors in the landscape of globalizing educational processes, as well as seeing how they are positioned and are being positioned. Frameworks for internationalization often ignore the experiences and needs of those involved in the process, and I suggest that theories of place, space, and (dis)location are useful both in research analyses as well as in pedagogies for the higher education classroom. To illustrate the possibilities, here is an example: on the one hand, international students arriving on Canadian campuses are perceived to be ‘fixed’ in their locale, a different place, from over there. In attempting to settle into a new locale and with a new location as ‘international’ student, they experience (dis)location and are perceived as dislocated from the host environment. The concept of (dis)location allows us to see the co-existence of paradoxes and contradictions in the condition of globalization as lived out by those who are caught up in these global flows.

Considering ‘Scapes’

Cultural studies scholar Appadurai (1990, 1996) proposes a theory that moves beyond traditional notions of globalization as a process of homogenization, an engulfing of the peripheries by the centre. Appadurai shifts the focus from a Marxist analysis of capital (as advanced by world systems theorists such as Wallerstein) to the cultural dimension of globalization, in particular, the movement of people and that of the media. He views global cultural flows as composed of complex, overlapping, and disjunctive orders that are not homogenous. His theory challenges the binary centre-periphery model of world systems theory, in which forces of Western modernity penetrate and absorb peripheral cultures. He dismisses homogenization and simplistic explanations for cultural flows, positing a process of indigenization which adapts and changes—or indigenizes—a global idea, activity, or object when assimilated into a local community. To understand this indigenization, he proposes a framework of five ‘scapes’:

ethnoscapes (the distribution of mobile individuals as tourists, refugees, migrants, etc.), technoscapes (the distribution of technology); finanscapes (the distribution of capital), mediascapes (the distribution of information through a variety of media), and ideoscapes (the distribution of political ideas and values). (Appadurai, 1990, p. 296–297)

Flows occur among these “scapes” through trajectories that are diverse and commonly unpredictable in their directions (p. 301).

Appadurai (1990; 1996) does not discount the role that capital plays, especially in influencing what gets valued and by whom, but rather, adds the significance of other dimensions to provide a more contextual and relational alternative to the exclusively economic explanations or representations of globalization. He emphasizes the role of the imagination in perceiving linkages between the scapes, which provide an appropriate metaphor to convey the fluidity, the

irregularity, and great variety of the globalization process. While being a useful framework to understand the extremely complex relationships among these dimensions and the multiple ways in which flows occur among them, it also serves to unravel the nature of those relationships. Consequently, the nature of globalization is uneven and has varied impacts, and the ‘scapes’ do not just influence and reconfigure local cultures in the ‘periphery’ of the system, but affect the cultures of the ‘core’ as well. Appadurai’s arguments go beyond the convergence theories to theorize on the simultaneity of convergence and fragmentation, and offer an alternative to the common analysis of globalization as being a homogenizing force, or one that valorizes and essentializes the local.

Following Appadurai, I have articulated the internationalization of higher education, as an ‘eduscape’ (Beck, 2008). An ‘eduscape’ could be conceptualized as the flow of educational theories, ideas, programs, activities, and research in and across national boundaries. As with the other dimensions of this framework, the global relationships with the other scapes would be “deeply disjunctive” and “profoundly unpredictable” because “each is subject to its own constraints and incentives ... at the same time as each acts as a constraint and a parameter for movements in the others” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 35). We cannot understand one in isolation without taking into consideration the influences of other scapes upon each. Hence, the flow of an eduscape will be influenced or intersected by ethnoscares (the movement of people — relatives and friends who contribute to ideoscapes), mediascares (how ideas about education are formed and influenced by the media), finanscares (the movement of money in personal lives, as well as nationally and internationally) and ideoscapes (the manufacturing of ‘ideas’ about education). Sometimes an eduscape could be driven by finanscares, and other times, initiated by a combination of ethnoscares and ideoscapes.

The current understanding of internationalization in Canada has been limited to definitions such as the one generated by Knight: “The process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2004, p. 11). As becomes apparent from an exploration of the process of globalization—which reveals it to be fluid, complex, and contradictory—internationalization of higher education would be well understood as the complex and diverse terrain of an eduscape, particularly in a nation that is defined by the ethnoscares of its people.

Looking at internationalization as an ‘eduscape’ expands it from being simply an infusion of intercultural and international content into the learning, teaching, research, and service areas of a university, to being an understanding of the diverse connections and flows outside of the so-called ‘learning, teaching, research, and service’ areas of the university. Internationalization as ‘eduscape’ situates the university in a larger flow of internationalizing forces and elements rather than seeing it as point where activity begins and ends. An approach based on simple infusion implies a one-way flow (bringing into the university), and an assumption of stable categories of ‘intercultural’ and ‘international,’ local and global. An eduscape reflects a multi-flow, more nuanced, diverse interaction with various elements of the cultural, social, political, and economic dimensions relating to internationalization.

Moving Forward

This paper has provided an introductory overview of the kinds of theoretical and conceptual journeys I have been following as a researcher of internationalization in Canada. In investigating the experiences of international students (Beck, 2008, 2009, 2012) and current

work on understanding the everyday experiences of all players engaged in internationalization at a university, I have encountered the inadequacies of existing definitions, models, and theoretical frameworks used in internationalization research. I have suggested that current definitions for internationalization, which promote a simplistic understanding of the process of internationalization, may be part of the problem, a challenge that emerges from the present discussion as well. Definitions and uncritical valorization promote an add-on approach to internationalization, provide no basis for educational guidelines for practice and policy-making, and add to the confusion rather than dispel them.

I would further venture that the current disillusionment about the co-opting of internationalization by neoliberal globalization stems from a kind of naïveté that internationalization itself already had a strong theoretical and practical basis for maintaining its own trajectory separate from economic globalization. This has clearly been a fundamental flaw in how internationalization has been conceptualized, promoted, and established in Canadian universities.

Rather than proclaim the death of internationalization or abandon it, a position that recognizes only the economic dimension of internationalization, we need to recognize the fluid and complex nature of internationalization/s. To begin that process, I have argued that a critical reflection on how internationalization falls prey to the market is key to avoiding the consequences. I have advocated for a more critical analysis of internationalization using a discussion of selected themes and issues from globalization theory to illustrate how the analyses would contribute to the conceptual strengthening of internationalization. A revisioning of internationalization can be advanced through rich discussion of multiple globalization/s—in the spaces between the global and local, or the tensions among locale, location, and (dis)location, and the circulation of global flows in internationalization as eduscape. These are some of the other elements of the facticity of internationalization, which can de-centre and challenge the marketization of internationalization.

In discussing some of the possibilities emerging from other dimensions of globalization, I am presenting the argument that through critique, limitations can be identified and new pathways revisioned. There are parallel conversations occurring in the internationalization of curriculum studies, where Wang (2006) for example, finds the notion of internationalization to be a preferable notion to globalization as it “demonstrates a stronger sense of conversation through ‘in between’ fluid spaces where multiplicity and differences are neither excluded nor self-contained” (Wang, 2006, para. 9). Efforts to guide Canadian internationalization towards the ‘right’ track must be located in such conversations and spaces, recognizing the multiplicity of internationalization itself.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (2004). Higher education crosses borders. *Change*, 36(2), 18–24.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290-305.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global culture: Nationalism, globalization and modernity*. London: Sage.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appadurai, A. (Ed.). (2001). *Globalization*. Durham, NC & London: Duke University Press.
- Ashcroft, B. (2001). *On post-colonial futures*. London & New York: Continuum.
- AUCC (n.d.). International study. Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.aucc.ca/policy-issues/global-connections/international-study/>
- 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 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 Canada. Retrieved from http://www.aucc.ca/_pdf/english/publications/aucc-scotia_web_e.pdf
- Beck, K. (2008). *Being international: Learning in a Canadian university* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Simon Fraser University.
- Beck, K. (2009). Questioning the emperor's new clothes: Towards ethical practices in internationalization. In R. Desai Trilokekar, G. Jones, & A. Schubert (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global* (pp. 306 – 336). Toronto: James Lorimer & Co. Ltd., Publishers.
- Beck, K. (2012). Making sense of internationalization: A critical analysis. In Y. Hebert & A. Abdi (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on international education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Barndt, D. (2009). Reframing internationalization in a diasporic context: Two experiments at York University. In R. Desai Trilokekar, G. Jones, & A. Schubert (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global* (pp 194 – 212). Toronto: James Lorimer & Co. Ltd., Publishers.
- Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education*, 45(1), 43–70.
- Bhabha, H. (1990). Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bond, S. (2009, May). *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.

- Bond, S., Areepattamannil, S., Braithwaite-Sturgeon, G., Hayle, E., & Malekan, M. (2007). *Northern lights: International graduates of Canadian institutions and the national workforce*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau of International Education.
- Bond, S., & Lemasson, J-P. (1999). *A new world of knowledge: Canadian universities and globalization*. Ottawa, ON: International Development Research Centre.
- Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 62(Winter), 15-17.
- Burbules, N., & Torres, C. A. (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York & London: Routledge.
- CBIE. (n.d.). Canada's participation in international education, 2011. In *Canadian Bureau for International Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbie-bcei.ca/international-education-services/facts-and-figures>
- Cambridge, J. (2002). Global product branding and international education. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 1 (2), 227 – 243.
- Desai Trilokekar, R., Jones, G. & Schubert, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Canada's universities go global*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Co. Ltd., Publishers.
- Dixon, M. (2006). Globalization and international higher education: Contested positionings. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(4), 319 – 333.
- Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (1998). "Moving" experiences: Globalization, 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.
- Frances, A. (1993). *Facing the future: The internationalization of post-secondary institutions in British Columbia*. Vancouver: British Columbia Centre for International Education.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Hanson, L. (2009). Global health and local communities: Internationalizing community health curriculum. In R. Desai-Trilokekar, G. Jones, & A. Schubert, (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Co Ltd Publishers.
- Hayrinen-Alestalo, M., & Peltola, U. (2006). The problem of a market-oriented university. *Higher Education*, 52(2), 251-281.
- Jones, G. (2011). Globalizing Canada's universities: An overview. Paper presented at *The race to globalize higher education in Canada*, conference by the Ontario Colleges and Universities' Faculty Association (OCUFA), Toronto, January 2011.
- Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints*. Ottawa: CBIE.
- Knight, J. (1995). *Internationalization at Canadian universities: The changing landscape*. Ottawa, Ontario: AUCC & Ryerson International.
- Knight, J. (2000). *Progress and promise: The 2000 AUCC report on internationalization at Canadian universities*. Ottawa, Ontario: AUCC.

- Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33(Fall), 2003. Retrieved from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News33/text001.htm
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Knight, J. (2007). Internationalization brings important benefits as well as risks. *International Higher Education*, 46(Winter), 8-10.
- Knight, J. (2008). The internationalization of higher education: Are we on the right track? *Academic Matters*, (Oct-Nov), 2008, 5-9.
- Knight, J. (2011). Five Myths about internationalisation. *International Higher Education*, 62 (Winter), 14-15.
- Luke, A. (2010). Educating the other: Standpoint and theory in the 'Internationalization' of higher education. In E. Unterhalter & V. Carpentier (Eds), *Global inequalities and higher education: Whose interests are we serving?* (pp. 43–65). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marginson, S. (2004). National and global competition in higher education. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 31(2), 1-27.
- Marginson, S. (2006). Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education. *Higher Education*, 52, 1–39.
- Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, 43, 281-309.
- Matthews, J. (2002). International education and internationalization are not the same as globalization: Emerging issues for secondary schools. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(4), 369-390.
- McMullen, K., & Angelo E. (2011). A changing portrait of international students in Canadian universities. *Education Matters: Insights on Education, Learning and Training in Canada*, 7(6). Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/81-004-x/2010006/article/11405-eng.htm>
- McGrew, A. (1992). A global society? In S. Hall, D. Held, & T. MGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures* (pp. 61-116). Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.
- McKellin, K. (1998). *Maintaining the momentum: The internationalization of British Columbia's post-secondary institutions*. Victoria: British Columbia Centre for International Education.
- McMurtry, J. (1998). *Unequal freedoms: The global market as an ethical system*. Toronto, Ontario: Garamond Press.
- Montgomery, C. (2010). *Understanding the international student experience*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 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, 1*, 248-270.
- Rizvi, F. (2000). International education and the production of global imagination. In N. Burbules & C. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives* (pp. 205-225). London: Routledge.
- 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. *Theory, Culture, and Society, 7*(2-3), 15-30.
- Savage, C. (2005). *The national report on international students in Canada 2002*. Ottawa: CBIE. Retrieved from http://www.cbie.ca/data/media/resources/2002_NationalReport_e.pdf
- Scott, A. (1997). Globalization: Social process or political rhetoric? In A. Scott (Ed.), *The limits of globalization: Cases and arguments* (pp.1-24). London & New York: Routledge.
- Scott, P. (2000). Globalization and higher education: Challenges for the 21st century. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 4*(1), 3 – 10.
- Smith, D. G. (1999a). Globalization and education: Prospects for postcolonial pedagogy in a hermeneutic mode. *Interchange, 30*(1), 1 – 10.
- Smith, D. G. (1999b). Economic fundamentalism, globalization and the public remains of education. *Interchange, 30*(1), 93 – 117.
- Smith, D. G. (2000). The specific challenges of globalization for teaching and vice versa. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 46*(1), 7-26.
- Smith, D.G. (2006). *Trying to teach in a season of great untruth: Globalization, empire and the crises of pedagogy*. Rotterdam & Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Spybey, T. (1996). *Globalization and world society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Unterhalter, E., & Carpentier, V. (2010). Introduction: Whose interests are we serving? Global inequalities and higher education. In E. Unterhalter & V Carpentier (Eds.) *Global inequalities and higher education: Whose interests are we serving?* (pp. 1-39). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Unterhalter, E., & Carpentier, V. (Eds.) (2010). *Global inequalities and higher education: Whose interests are we serving?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wang, H. (2006). Globalization and curriculum studies: Tensions, challenges and possibilities. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, 2*(Feb) 2006. Retrieved from <http://www.uwstout.edu/soe/jaaacs/vol2/index.htm>
- Waters, M. (1995). *Globalization*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press.

Young, R. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.